© Kamla-Raj 2016
J Soc Sci, 49(1,2): 34-43 (2016)
PRINT: ISSN 0971-8923 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6756
DOI: 10.31901/24566756.2016/49.1,2.05

The Effects of Assessment Training and Curriculum Supervision on SMT's Job Performance at Maluti District, Eastern Cape

Emmanuel O. Adu[1*], Paulos D. Leboea[2] and Kemi O. Adu[3]

[1]Faculty of Education, University of Fort Hare, P.O. Box 1005, East London 5200, South Africa*
[2]Faculty of Education, University of Fort Hare East London Campus, South Africa
[3]Faculty of Education, University of Fort Hare East London Campus South Africa
E-mail: [1]<eadu@ufh.ac.za>, [2]<leboeagetsmail@yahoo.com>, [3]<201510102@ufh.ac.za>

KEYWORDS Assessment. Curriculum. Implementation. Performance. Policy. Training

ABSTRACT The absence of training as a prerequisite for aspiring SMT members has set the researcher's mind thinking about how school management teams (SMTs) get trained for their jobs, and how they, in turn, do train those directly under their supervision. Hence, this study examines the effects of assessment training and curriculum supervision on SMT's job performance. The study adopted correlational survey research design. Simple random sampling technique was used to select the participants. Self-structured questionnaires were validated and used to elicit information from the respondents. The findings revealed among others that curriculum assessment training is of no effect on SMT's jobs as curriculum assessors, most participants do not design grid analyses for assessment/ measurement units that they let learners write. It was concluded that curriculum assessment training is a dearth of knowledge of the whole organisational policy, and as a result most SMTs cannot implement it.

INTRODUCTION

After the amalgamation of all departments of education in South Africa in 1994, no prerequisite training was made a mandatory requirement for all educators aspiring to assume positions higher than the entry level, which is post level 1. Bush and Middlewood (2006: 143) strengthened the view of the necessity of prerequisite training by saying that no matter how thorough the process of recruitment and selection has been, it is only when the actual work begins that the realities of the nature of the work, the responsibilities and the organisation are fully recognised. This, in effect, explains that winning an interview does not necessarily mean that one will be effective in the job that one applied for – as one will still need to be acclimatised in order to fit the SMT job profile practically.

The foregoing concern is corroborated by English (2006: 661), who posited that many practitioners and scholars alike argue for adequate training opportunities for aspiring principals through longer, more rigorous internships, mentoring and shadowing practical experiences and instruction by model practitioners. 'Aspiring' actually refers to the fact that one is not yet an incumbent, instead one still hopes to apply should a vacancy exist. English (2006) further opined that studies have focused on the mentoring of preservice and in-service teacher populations with attention gradually accommodating prospective and practising administrators.

The absence of such training as a prerequisite for aspiring SMT members has set the researcher's mind thinking about how school management teams (SMTs) get trained for their jobs, and how they, in turn, do train those directly under their supervision, in the light of the fact that only some erstwhile departments of education embarked on prerequisite training while others did not; and also in the light of the fact that in the unified Department of Education – currently referred to as the Department of Basic Education (DBE) – no prerequisite, training has to be undergone by prospective school administrators or school management teams (SMTs). The latter have to ensure that organizational policies (policies of the DBE) are effectively implemented at the level of schools where they serve as managers. Such policies include, though not limited to, induction, mentoring, curriculum assessment training and curriculum supervision, all of which constitute the mainstay of apposite effective schools (Leboea et al. 2015).

Furthermore, South Africa's curriculum has undergone various changes drastically so when the outcomes-based education (OBE) was introduced and not so drastic nuances were added as, and when, the education ministry wel-

comed a new incumbent as a minister. Conspicuous by its absence in those changes is how SMTs get trained for the job that encompasses the following organisation policies: supervision of curriculum implementation at school level, seeing to it that learners are appropriately assessed in line with set quotas and guidelines, and inducting and mentoring new members, and even the old ones, in their departments. SMTs are also expected to spearhead staff development activities in their respective curricular departments (ELRC 2003).

It is against the foregoing background that the researchers wished to explore the level of prerequisite, apposite training for the SMTs both at the point of entry and when they are already engaged in their professional duties with specific emphasis on the policies of curriculum assessment training and curriculum supervision. The aspects such as curriculum assessment training and curriculum supervision are more or less the main thrust of why there has to be an SMT component in each school (Leboea et al. 2015). They have to train and supervise their juniors in the setting of tests and tasks that conform to policy, as well as supervise the implementation of curriculum at school level. The researcher has specifically realised a problem with regard to the SMTs' job performance in the foregoing areas of their roles and responsibilities (Leboea et al. 2015).

Research Objective

The main objective of this study is to investigate the effect of curriculum assessment training and supervision on SMTs performance.

Research Questions

- How does assessment training affect SMTs' job performance?
- What is the relationship between curriculum supervision and SMTs' job performance?

Literature Review

Curriculum Assessment Training

The section on curriculum assessment training forms the bulk of this study because it is one part of the policies under review (cf. curriculum assessment training and curriculum supervision) which constitutes the hallmark of the relationship between itself (policy) and SMTs' job performance, in that educator performance in developing compliant assessment and measurement instruments rests thereon. The same goes for learner performance in tests, assignments, tasks and examinations. The assumption is that if the foregoing assessment items are developed such that they are in sync with policy (subject assessment guidelines and examination guidelines) as embodied in syllabus documents for different subjects, then learner performance may be enhanced. This assumption goes further to point out that, even if educators teach well, if their assessment skills are not in congruence with policy by subjecting learners to assessment products that have no bearing to the end-of-the-year standardized assessment and measurement instruments, the learners' performance will surmise that they were not well taught – which may not necessarily be the case (Leboea et al. 2015).

What is Assessment Training?

Before we embark on explaining what assessment training is, we need to understand the term assessment in the educational context. After curriculum has been delivered to the recipients, the learners, it is important to check how much they have accumulated and mastered the knowledge and skills that were imparted or taught. This would not check only the quantity of knowledge the learner has acquired, but in assessment it would also be necessary to tell learners apart. This can best be done through proper assessment.

In expounding the educator's role as assessor, Killen (2000: 191) quipped that the educator has to understand the crucial role played by learner assessment in the education process and, as such, he has to be able to integrate assessment appropriately in his teaching (Schmeiser and Welch 2006: 309). In other words, the educator has to ensure that assessment is wholly part and parcel of the education process, and should not be treated as just an appendage to the process. Hence learners would have been taught before being assessed properly. Proper assessment would involve sticking to the policy requirements for assessing the different subjects taught at school.

The two ingredients or qualities of assessment that immediately come to the fore are the

validity and reliability of measurement or assessment instruments, namely, tasks, tests and assignments, experiments, practicals – all of which are geared towards measuring or assessing learner achievement at school. In expounding more about the concepts of validity and reliability of testing, the researchers relied on the work of earlier scholars (Leboea et al. 2015).

The Course of Assessment Training

The course of assessment training should embody a number of considerations which the SMT should bear in mind in training their supervisees to develop policy compliant assessment instruments. Thus a number of considerations will be looked into when designing tests and other assessment instruments. When SMTs assume their supervisory roles at school they should of necessity have been trained in developing assessment instruments, the better to afford them the proficiency of training their supervisees.

The researchers are indebted to Schmeiser and Welch (2006: 307) for the following input regarding test/task/assessment instrument development. They postulated the following good considerations or criteria before an assessment instrument is designed: test philosophy, test purpose, intended examinee/learner population and administrative constraints. These scholars further sub-categorised administrative constraints into administrative time, delivery platform, location of administration and administrative model. From other sources, the researchers deemed it necessary to add benchmarking and test/assessment/measurement fairness to the above list.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The current study involved the correlational research design but adopted the survey type in order to collect data on how curriculum assessment training and supervision affect SMTs performance at Maluti District in Eastern Cape.

Population/Sample and Sample Selection

The population of this study comprised of all the Senior Management Team members in Maluti District. Simple random sampling technique was used to select fifty- four SMT members from the total number of eighty-four in all Maluti District.

Research Instruments

Self-structured questionnaires were used to collect information from the respondent on the effect of induction and mentoring on Senior Management Team's job performance. The instrument consisted of the closed-form (structured) questionnaire of modified Likert scale responses from SA to SD that is, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) to be the best instrument for the current study because it will be easy to subject it to statistical analysis. This foregoing questionnaire was used to collect data relating to the researchers study's independent variables, namely, assessmnet training and curriculum supervision.

Another structured questionnaire was used to collect data relating to the SMTs' job performance or job satisfaction, which constitutes our dependent variable. The rating scale used in this case was still of the Likert scale format, although numbers ranging from I to 5 were used, with the numbers representing POOR, FAIR, GOOD, VERY GOOD and EXCELLENT respectively.

Validity and Reliability of Instruments

The instruments were validated by giving the instruments (structured questionnaires) to experts in the Faculty of Education of the university under whose auspices the study was conceived. This leads to looking into how the reliability of the data collecting instrument (the structured questionnaire) was ensured. Hence, the instrument reliability was measured using crombach alpha in which its coefficient is above 8.0 then the instrument (structured questionnaire) was deemed to be reliable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: How does curriculum assessment training affect SMTs' job performance?

This section had 10 sub-questions, which were coded as E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8, E9 and E10, all of which were geared towards providing answers for research question 4.

E1: *Curriculum assessment training does affect your job performance.*

Asked if curriculum assessment training does affect their job performance, participants responded as follows: 4 (7.4%) and 3 (5.6%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 26 (48.1%) and 21 (38.9%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 1).

Table 1: Assessment training and effect on SMT job performance

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	4	7.4	7.4	7.4
Agree	3	5.6	5.6	13.0
Disagree	26	48.1	48.1	61.1
Strongly disagree	21	38.9	38.9	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This can be simply interpreted to imply that only 7 participants (4 plus 3) out of 54 were of the opinion that the training that involves curriculum assessment does have an effect on their jobs as assessors of curriculum, while a resounding majority of participants, 47 (26 plus 21) out of 54, felt that curriculum assessment training is of no effect on their jobs as curriculum assessors. This finding is not supported by Killen (2000: 191) and Schmeiser and Welch (2006: 309), while Leboea et al. (2015) supported the fact that training that involves curriculum assessment do affect the produvtivity of senior management team

E2: *Before becoming an SMT member you underwent training in the principles of assessment.*

Asked if they underwent training in the principles of curriculum assessment prior to becoming SMT members, participants responded as follows: 2 (3.7%) and 15 (27.8%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively. Conversely, there were 27 (50%) and 10 (18.5%) participants who respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed to having received pre-SMT curriculum assessment training (see Table 2).

Table 2: Training on assessment principles

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
Agree	15	27.8	27.8	31.5
Disagree	27	50.0	50.0	81.5
Strongly disagree	10	18.5	18.5	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This simply means that fewer (17) participants received pre-SMT training in the principles of curriculum assessment, while the majority (37) claim not to have received such training. This further means that more participants became SMT members without any clue regarding how they are supposed to orientate their supervisees in the curriculum assessment policy. The foregoing finding is not supported by (Guthrie 2003: 1619; Bush and Middleton 2006: 141; Grobler et al. 2006: 209).

E3: *Before you set questions you design a grid analysis for the planned assessment.*

When participants were asked whether they design question grid analyses before setting questions for planned assessment, they responded in the following way: 3 (5.6 %) and 9 (16.7%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they do design question grid analyses for planned assessment. Conversely, 31 (57.4%) and 11 (20.4%) participants respectively disagreed and disagreed (see Table 3).

Table 3: Designing a question grid analysis

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
Agree	9	16.7	16.7	22.2
Disagree	31	57.4	57.4	79.6
Strongly disagree	11	20.4	20.4	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

A simple interpretation of the above result is that most participants do not design grid analyses for assessment/measurement units that they let learners write. As question grid analyses ensure that whatever planned assessment or measurement adhere to stipulated percentages of cognitive levels, it follows that assessment instruments set by most participants may not be compliant with the policy of curriculum assessment. This finding is not supported by ECDOE (Undated: 49), Kane (2006: 17) and Schmeiser and Welch's 2006: 316).

E4: *All your assessment instruments are compliant with the cognitive-content balance applicable for the subjects that you teach.*

When participants were asked if all their assessment instruments were compliant with the cognitive-content balance that is required by subjects they teach, they gave the following

responses: only 4 (7.4%) participants agreed, none strongly agreed, while 31 (57.4%) and 19 (35.2%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed (see Table 4).

Table 4: Assessment tools' compliance with cognitive-content balance

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Agree	4	7.4	7.4	7.4
Disagree	31	57.4	57.4	64.8
Strongly disagree	19	35.2	35.2	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result can be interpreted as saying that it is only 7.4 percent set assessment instruments (tests, tasks, assignments) that comply with balancing the content with cognitive levels while 57.4 percent and 35.2 percent (a cumulative 92.6%) cannot. This further means that assessment instruments that learners are made to write invariably do not help them reach the necessary achievement grading. This finding is not supported by Education Facilitators (2001: 149), Scholl (2002: 1-2) and DBE (2012: 1-14).

E5: *You do teach your supervisees how to design grid analyses*.

Asked if they do teach their supervisees to design grid analyses, participants responded as follows: 1 (1.9%) and 14 (25.9%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 31 (57.4%) and 8 (14.8%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 5).

Table 5: Supervisees and designing grid analyses

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	14	25.9	25.9	27.8
Disagree	31	57.4	57.4	85.2
Strongly disagree	8	14.8	14.8	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result simply means that fewer SMT members teach their supervisees how to design grid analyses for questions that they set, while the majority do not teach them at all. This result is not supported by Education Facilitators (2001: 149), Scholl (2002: 1-2), DBE (2012: 1-14), Fiend (2013) and Schmeiser and Welch's (2006: 316).

E6: *Your supervisees understand the Tolerance Range (TR) concept in marking*.

Asked if their supervisees understand the tolerance range (TR) concept in marking, participants responded in the following manner: 2 (3.7%) and 11 (20.4%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively. Conversely, 32 (59.3%) and 9 (16.7%) disagreed and disagreed respectively (see Table 6).

Table 6: Tolerance range in marking

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
Agree	11	20.4	20.4	24.1
Disagree	32	59.3	59.3	83.3
Strongly disagree	9	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The simple interpretation is most participants are of the opinion that their supervisees do not understand the tolerance range concept of marking. This could be interpreted further to mean that some SMTs know this either because they have not done their duty of training their supervisees, or because they themselves do not understand the TR concept, hence the majoritarian claim that supervisees do not understand the concept. The few who claim that their supervisees understand the TR concept may be those who have trained them. The foregoing finding is not supported by Phonela (DBE 2014) and Kane (2006: 17).

E7: *Every year you do check the examination guidelines before assessing learners*.

On being asked whether they do check the examinations guidelines every year before assessing learners, participants gave the following responses: 1 (1.9%) and 1 (1.9%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively. On the other hand 24 (44.4%) and 28 (58.9%) agreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 7).

The interpretation of the above result is that only 2 participants agreed to checking examination guidelines before assessing learners, while a whopping 52 out of 54 participants answered

Table 7: Exam guidelines and learner assessment

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	1	1.9	1.9	3.7
Disagree	24	44.4	44.4	48.1
Strongly disagree	28	51.9	51.9	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

that they do not check those. It is not known if they do assess learners because curriculum ordains that, but it is equally know that the majority do not set assessment instruments to the specifications of examination guidelines. The latter are issued annually so as to guide educators on the requirements of all types of assessment to be followed, and how they should be followed during a particular academic year. This result is not supported by Education Facilitators (2001: 149), Scholl (2002:1-2), DBE (2014), Haertel (2006: 73-74), and Clauser et al. (2006: 708).

E8: *You always provide training in curriculum assessment*.

When the participants were asked whether they always provided training in curriculum assessment, this is how they responded: 18 (33.3%) participants just agreed; none strongly agreed, while 26 (48.1%) and 10 (18.5%) respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed (see Table 8).

Table 8: Providing training in curriculum assessment

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Agree	18	33.3	33.3	33.3
Disagree	26	48.1	48.1	81.5
Strongly disagree	10	18.5	18.5	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result means that 16 of the 18 participants who agreed that they do provide training in curriculum assessment do so without checking any assessment policies, especially if we remember that only 2 participants previously said they do check examination guidelines. It is also worth noting that none strongly agreed, meaning that even the few who claim they provide training may not be confident enough. It is scarcely surprising that the majority of participants attested that they do not provide any curriculum assessment training, as they equally disagreed and strongly disagreed to looking into any assessment policies in their responses before. This result is not consistent with studies by Phonela (DBE 2014), Schmeiser and Welch (2006: 308), Haertel (2006: 73-74) and Dreyer (2014: 81).

E9: *Knowing the content necessarily means knowing how to assess it*.

When participants were asked if knowing the content necessarily meant knowing how to assess it, their responses were as follows: 6 (11.1%) and 14 (25.9%) participants respectively strongly agreed and agreed, while 15 (27.8%) and 19 (35.2%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 9).

Table 9: Knowing content vis-a-vis assessing it

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	6	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	14	25.9	25.9	37.0
Disagree	15	27.8	27.8	64.8
Strongly disagree	19	35.2	35.2	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result means that 20 (6 plus 14) participants feel that knowing the content necessarily means knowing how to assess it, while 34 (15 plus 19) do not feel that way. It then becomes worrisome why most participants do not engage in activities pertaining to curriculum assessment policies (as attested by many responses above) whereas they know that even if they know the content of subjects they teach it does not necessarily mean that they know how to assess it. This result is supported by Education Facilitators (2001: 149), Data Fiend (2013), Moseley et al. DBE (2014), Clauser et al. (2006: 708) and Scholl (2002: 1-2).

E10: *Every educator, including SMT members, needs to undergo curriculum assessment training*.

Asked if everybody, including the SMT, should undergo curriculum assessment training, this is how participants answered: there were nil responses in the categories of strongly agreeing and agreeing. 11 (20.4%) and 43 (79.6%) participants respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed (see Table 10).

Table 10: Educator training in curriculum assessment

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Disagree	11	20.4	20.4	20.4
Strongly disagree	43	79.6	79.6	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The interpretation is that while all participants do not feel they need training in curriculum assessment, most of them do not adhere to any of policies pertaining to curriculum assessment, as proven by their responses in all the preceding sections of curriculum assessment training. This finding is not supported by DBE (2016: 6-7).

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between curriculum supervision and SMTs' job performance?

This section had 7 sub-questions, which were coded as F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6 and F7, and sought to elicit answers for question 5.

F1: *There is a relationship between curriculum supervision and your job as an SMT member*.

Asked if there is a relationship between curriculum supervision and their SMT job, participants gave the following answers: there were nil responses for strongly agree and agree categories. On the other hand responses were captured as 21 (38.9%) and 33 (61.1%) for disagree and strongly disagree respectively (see Table 11).

Table 11: Relationship between curriculum supervision and SMT job performance

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Disagree	21	38.9	38.9	38.9
Strongly disagree	33	61.1	61.1	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result can simply be interpreted as saying that all participants (only disagree and strongly disagree) felt that there is no relationship between curriculum supervision and their job. What is worrisome is that the SMT cohort in schools is technically referred to as school-based curriculum supervisors. This result is not supported by Killen (2000: 190), ECDOE (Undated: 25) and Wise and Bushner (2001: 124).

F2: *You do believe that your supervision duties include curriculum policy interpretation.*

Participants answered as follows when they were asked if they believe that their supervision duties include curriculum policy interpretation: there were nil responses for strongly agree and agree categories; there were 24 (44.4%) and 30 (55.6%) responses for disagree and strongly disagree respectively (see Table 12).

Table 12 : Supervision and curriculum policy interpretation

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Disagree	24	44.4	44.4	44.4
Strongly disagree	30	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

A simple interpretation for the above is that all participants do not believe that their curriculum supervision includes curriculum policy interpretation. The question is if supervision does not include interpreting the policy that participants are supposed to supervise the implementation thereof, what mechanism do they have in place to ensure that they supervise it effectively? The above result is not supported by Killen (2000: 190), who points out that the educator has to interpret the learning programmes that he is provided with correctly, and ECDOE (Undated: 29), that talks of 'ensuring curriculum policy interpretation and implementation'. On the other hand, this finding is supported by Education Facilitators (2001: 186) who posit that sometimes there are tensions between policy and practice.

F3: *You need adequate training in order to effectively supervise curriculum implementation at your school*.

Asked if they need adequate training in order to effectively supervise curriculum implementation at their schools, participants responded in the following way: 1 (1.9%) participant agreed while there were nil responses for the strongly agree category; 21 (38.9%) and 32 (59.3%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 13).

The above finding simply means that all participants, except for 1, felt that there was no need for training so as for them to effectively implement curriculum at school. Simply put, participants did not attach any importance to training

Table 13: Adequate training and effective curriculum implementation

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Agree	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
Disagree	21	38.9	38.9	40.7
Strongly disagree	32	59.3	59.3	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

in curriculum supervision. This finding is not supported by Naidu et al. (2008: 190-191) and Wise and Bushner (2001: 124).

F4: *Whenever a new curriculum has to be implemented, you always worry about how you will supervise it*.

When participants were asked whether they always worry whenever a new curriculum has to be implemented, they answered in the following way: 1 (1.9%) and 12 (22.2%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively; whereas 15 (27.8%) and 26 (48.1%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 14).

Table 14: New curriculum implementation

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Strongly agree	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
Agree	12	22.2	22.2	24.1
Disagree	15	27.8	27.8	51.9
Strongly disagree	26	48.1	48.1	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This can be interpreted to mean that the majority of participants (41), constituting a cumulative 75.9 percent, do not worry about new curricular developments while the minority (13), constituting a cumulative 24.1 percent, do worry when there are new curricular developments. We should note that a new curriculum means a new set of implementation and supervision policies which must be operationalised by all the DBE institutions – as policy is mandatory. This finding is not supported by Naidu et al. (2008: 191).

F5: *All the training you receive in curriculum supervision is always practice-related.*

Asked if all the training they receive in curriculum supervision is always practice-related, participants responded as follows: only 8 (14.8%) participants agreed, while there was nil response in the strongly agree category. Conversely, 33 (61.1%) and 13 (24.1%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 15).

Table 15: Curriculum training and practice

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Agree	8	14.8	14.8	14.8
Disagree	33	61.1	61.1	75.9
Strongly disagree	13	24.1	24.1	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This can be interpreted to say while very few participants felt that training in curriculum supervision is related to practice, an overwhelming number of participants felt that curriculum supervision theory is not related to its relevant practice. This result is supported by Education Facilitators (2001:186) who posit that sometimes there is tension between policy and practice.

F6: *You believe that you are adequately empowered to evaluate curriculum at your school*.

When participants were asked whether they believed that they are adequately empowered to evaluate curriculum at their schools, they responded in the following way: there were nil responses for strongly agree, while there were 10 (18.5%) participants who just agreed. On the other hand, there were 32 (59.3%) and 12 (22.2%) participants who disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 16).

Table 16: Empowerment and curriculum evaluation at school

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Agree	10	18.5	18.5	18.5
Disagree	32	59.3	59.3	77.8
Strongly disagree	12	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The simple interpretation of the above finding is that a resounding majority of participants, a whopping 44, believe they do not have the skills of evaluating curriculum at their schools. This, in effect, tells us that they do not have the

know-how of ascertaining that teaching and learning has effectively taken place at their schools. We should note that we get the know-how from policy (theory), which then informs how and what we should put into practice. This result is not supported by Ornstein and Huskins (2009: 267) and STP HRD Consulting (2011: 27).

F7: *As a curriculum supervisor you are able to monitor everything that is attached to curriculum.*

Asked if they are able to monitor everything that is attached to curriculum, as curriculum supervisors, participants offered the following responses: there were nil responses in the strongly agree category, while 8 (14.8%) participants just agreed. On the other hand, those participants who responded in the 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' categories respectively registered 30 (55.6%) and 16 (29.6%) (see Table 17).

Table 17: Monitoring curriculum

	Frequency	*Per cent*	*Valid per-cent*	*Cumulative per-cent*
Agree	8	14.8	14.8	14.8
Disagree	30	55.6	55.6	70.4
Strongly disagree	16	29.6	29.6	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result can simply be interpreted as saying that the majority of participants cannot monitor everything that is attached to curriculum. This means that the majority of participants do not have the capacity to monitor curriculum. The foregoing result is not supported by Ornstein and Huskins (2009: 267), STP HRD Consulting (2011: 17) and NDOE (2000: 28).

CONCLUSION

Furthermore, as attested by findings, curriculum assessment training as discussed in this study is a dearth of knowledge of the whole organisational policy, and as a result most SMTs cannot implement it. Nor is it possible for them to train supervisees in the policy that they know very little about. It can be concluded that the national paper was set by experts who understand the requirements of the CAPS syllabus together with its demands for the content-cognitive balance. It can further be concluded that the DBE either knows how to employ curriculum assessment aspects or it trains its assessment personnel adequately in order for them to assess to the assessment policy specifications.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the findings of the current study indicate that the majority of SMTs in the Eastern Cape believe they do not require training in almost all the organisational policies under discussion, the researchers still believe that SMTs still require to be trained therein, so that their job practice in those policies is informed by what they (policies) mandate. Again, the very fact that most SMTs proved not to know the ins and outs of the DBE policies that they are supposed to implement and supervise the implementation thereof, makes the researchers recommend strongly that SMTs need training therein, so as to carry out organisational (DBE) mandate as they perform their SMT job.

REFERENCES

Bush T, Middleton D 2006. *Leading and Managing People in Education*. London: SAGE Publications.

Clauser BE, Margolis MJ, Case SM 2006. Testing for licensure and certification in the professions. In: Robert L Brennan (Ed.): *Educational Measurement.* 4th Edition. Westport, CT 06881: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers, pp. 707-708.

Data Fiend 2013. Adventures in Learning and Teaching: TAG Archives: Moseley: What is the SOLO Taxonomy? From<https://datafiend.wordpress.com/tag/moseley/> (Retrieved on 1 January 2015).

Department of Basic Education (DBE) 2012. *Action Plan to 2014 – Towards the Realisation of Schooling 2025: Popular Version*. Pretoria: Government Printing Works.

Department of Basic Education (DBE) 2014. *English First Additional Language: Paper 1: Grade 12 NSC Examination*. Pretoria: Item Development Unit.

Dreyer JM (Ed.) 2014. *The Educator as Assessor.* 2nd Edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Education Facilitators 2001. *Educational Management V: Human Resource Management EMH500A The Reader*. Cresta: Azaliah College, Education Facilitators (Pty) Ltd.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2003. *Policy Handbook for Educators*. Pretoria: Universal Print Group.

English FW (Ed.) 2006. *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration, Volume 2*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Grobler P, Warnich S, Carrel MR, Elbert NF, Hatfield RD 2006. *Human Resource Management in South Africa.* 3rd Edition. London: Thomson Learning.

Guthrie WJ (Ed.) 2003. *Encyclopedia of Education*. USA: Macmillan Reference.

Haertel EH 2006. Reliability. In: Robert L Brennan (Ed.): *Educational Measurement.* 4th Edition. West-

port, CT 06881: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers, pp. 66-104.
Kane MT 2006. Validation. In: Robert L Brennan (Ed.): *Educational Measurement.* 4th Edition. Westport, CT 06881: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers, pp. 17-60.
Killen R 2000. *Teaching Strategies for Outcomes-based Education*. Lansdowne: Juta & Co.
Leboea PD, Adu EO, Adu KO 2015. Organization policy and School Management Team's (SMT's) job performance in South Africa: A literature review. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 45(2): 103-112.
Moseley D, Baumfield V, Elliott J, Gregson M, Higgins S, Miller J, Newton D 2005. *Framworks for Thinking: A Handbook for Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Naidu A, Joubert R, Mestry R, Mosoge J, Ngcobo T 2008. *Education Management and Leadership: A South African Perspective*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.
National Department of Education (NDOE) 2000. *School Management Teams: Employment, Induction and Orientation of School-based Educators*. Pretoria: CPT Book Printers.
Ornstein AC, Hunkins FP 2009. *Pearson International Edition: Curriculum Foundations, Principles and Issues.* 5th Edition. Boston: Pearson.
Schmeiser CB, Welch CJ 2006. Test Development. In: Robert L Brennan (Ed.): *Educational Measurement.* 4th Edition. Westport, CT 06881: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers, pp. 307 – 351.
STP HRD Consulting 2011. *A Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation: Making a Difference*. East London: Vincent Park.
Wise C, Bushner H 2001. The Subject Leader. In: RG Owens (Ed.): *Organisational Behaviour in Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, pp. 122-124.

Paper received for publication on June 2016
Paper accepted for publication on October 2016