

https://dspace.org/

School governing bodies: the impact on school principals

Lebethe, Mosiwa Elias Kenneth

2014-05-19
http://hdl.handle.net10539/14670

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES: THE IMPACT ON SCHOOL PRINCIPALS


Mosiwa Elias Kenneth Lebethe

"A research report submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education."

Johannesburg 1999

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Education in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any other university.



(Signature of candidate)

29 day of JULY (year) 1999

ABSTRACT

Fundamentally, the new school governance policy brought to life by the South African Schools Act of 1996, intended to transform and restructure education governance in public schools, so that through full representation and participation of all role players/stake-holders in school governance through their School Governing Bodies (SGB), effective governance of schools could be attained and enhanced. What emerges from the practice is that in exception of intended effects, this policy also yields unintended effects. These unintended effects then, tend to counteract the basic objective of the new school governance policy. Hence the aims of this study are two-fold: (a) to explore critically the impact of SGB on school principals in the Klerksdorp/Potchefstroom region, and to highlight the dynamics of relationships, and modus operandi of both SGB and school principals, and what it takes to promote partnerships that will alternatively result in effective school governance.

The critical exploration of the impact of SGB on school principals in the Klerksdorp/Potchefstroom region was conducted through a survey method. Randomly fifteen public secondary schools were selected from former education departments. Data gathering techniques comprised of structured questionnaires, unstructured, open-ended interviews, observation of formal meetings and the study and analysis of relevant documents. Analysis of data was carried out in terms of Bell's, (1993, p.127) criterion: What emerged out of this study was that the new policy yielded significant changes in terms of:- (i) power relations, (ii) decision-making processes, (iii) levels of accountability and (iv) responsibility, (v) general compliance with legal and constitutional requirements but with little or no shift in mindset (paradigm), (vi) an increase in workload of principals (especially in African schools) due to lack of capacity and finally (vii) intentional or

unintentional failure to embrace certain reforms. These outcomes constitute intended and unintended effects.

On the basis of the above-mentioned outcomes one may conclude by agreeing with Thomas (1992, p.127) assertion that: "The dilemma of school reform arises from the relationship between school governors and professionals within schools". Certainly transformation of school governance in South Africa is likely to experience this same dilemma. Secondly Mortimore and Mortimore (1991, p.128) in turn alleged that: - "Under both the 1986 Act and the Education Reform Act of 1988, School Governing Bodies have increased powers and responsibilities, the exercise of which called for a rethinking of relationships between a head teacher and his/her S.G.B." Like-wise the S.A.S.A of 1996, empower SGBs through the transference of certain roles and responsibilities to them. A review of relationships between school principals and S.G.B within every public school in South Africa is a "must", if school principals and S.G.B, aim at attaining effective governance in their schools in line with the S.A.S.A of 1996 and the Constitution of the R.S.A 1996.

Key words:- school governing bodies; school principals; roles and responsibilities; effective partnerships; governance policy; levels of accountability and responsibility; relationships; review and reconceptualisation; power relations; stakeholders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to Prof. M. Cross, my supervisor, and other staff members in the Education Department, Division of Educational Policy, Planning and Management for their constant encouragement, support and respectful guidance in carrying out this study. Special thanks to the District Managers of Klerksdorp, Potchestroom and Lichtenburg School Governing Bodies, school principals who allowed me to undertake this research in their respective schools. I am also appreciative of the contributions to this study made by my editors, the late Dr. E.H Masibi and Prof. A.L Combrink, both who provided insight, constructive criticism and consistent encouragement.

Lastly I am also greatful to my colleague, Mrs. M A T. Mosala for her assistance in the dispatch of questionnaires and letters of requests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION		**(ii)**
ABSTRACT		**(iii)**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		**(v)**
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		**(vi)**
CHAPTER		
1.	**INTRODUCTION**	1
1.1	Background of the study	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	4
1.3	Purpose of the study	5
1.4	Scope and methodology	7
2.	**METHODOLOGY**	9
2.1	The Sample	9
2.2	Data Collection Procedures	10
2.3	Reliability and Validity	12
2.4	Data Analysis Procedures	13
2.5	Limitations	14
3.	**THE LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAME WORK**	16
3.1	Challenges, change dynamics and relationships that partner education reform	17
3.2	Responses of school principals to their roles in relation to that of School Governing Bodies	21
3.3	The impact of changing roles and responsibilities of School Governing Bodies on school principals	24
3.4	Theoretical Framework for the Study	26
4.	**SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL CONTEXT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS**	30

5.	**THEORETICAL REVIEW OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE POLICY AND THE ROLE OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**	33
5.1	School Governance Policy before January 1997 and the role of school principals	33
5.2	Change in role of school principals with the establishment of School Governing Bodies	37
6.	**IMPACT OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES ON SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**	
6.1	Profiles of Public Schools selected	41
6.2	Compliance with legal and constitutional requirements	44
6.3	Levels of accountability and responsibility	52
6.4	Coping with workload	63
6.5	Decision-making processes	65
6.6	Power relations emerging	69
7.	Intentional and unintentional failure to embrace certain reforms	73
7.	**SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**	
7.1	Summary of results	75
7.2	Conclusions	77
7.3	Recommendations	78

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Letters of request for permission	82
Appendix B:	Permission letters	85
Appendix C:	Map of suggested educational regions	88
Appendix D:	Survey Questionaire	89
Appendix E:	Observation of meetings checklist	108
Appendix F:	Interview schedules	111
Appendix G:	Analysis and study of relevant documents checklist	132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 135

LIST OF ABREVIATIONS

(i)	SASA of 1996	=	South African Schools Act of 1996.
(ii)	SGB	=	School Governing Body
(iii)	EX-TED	=	Former Transvaal Education Department (Responsible for White Education in the Transvaal)
(iv)	EX-DET	=	Former Department of Education and Training. (Responsible for Black Education Outside Homelands)
(v)	NEPI	=	National Education Policy Investigation
(vi)	ERS	=	Educational Renewal Strategy
(vii)	ANC	=	African National Congress
(viii)	DDG	=	Deputy Director General
(ix)	RSA	=	Republic of South Africa

CHAPTER 1

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Generally acknowledged as a radical break with the past, the passing of the South African Schools Act of 1996, indicated both a restructuring and transformation of education governance in South Africa. These reforms brought about by the Act, intended to address the issue of school governance, which had been a bone of contention between the state, civil society and all parties with vested interest in education since 1910 (Buckland and Hofmeyer, 1992, p.1). When the National Party came into power in 1948, it further consolidated and entrenched its apartheid policies, which ensured the legal existence of a racially and ethnically based system of education governance. Education control was centralised to ensure compliance with the apartheid policies. This policy brought about non-consultative, opaque and top down style bureaucracies, which restricted wider participation in policy formulation, and ensured political control by the top echelons (ANC, A Policy Framework, Education and Training, 1994, p.21). This management and leadership style characterised all levels of education control, including at school / institutional level. All this was done in the interest of Afrikanerdom (NEPI, 1992, p.6).

This policy was impenetrable until 1976 (Hofmeyer and Buckland, 1992, p.11). However repression of all opposition to this policy failed to defeat individuals and organisations that challenged it. State action fuelled and intensified opposition to its education governance policy. It was no surprise when in 1976 the entire education system and policies were violently challenged. The uprisings of 1976 brought the

glaring problems of education system policies to public attention (Buckland and Hofmeyer, 1992, p.10). Deregulation increasingly happened after 1976 in practice and legislation. This was perceived as being too little and too late. The entire country was plagued by national stayaways, defiance campaigns, formation of organisations opposed to state policies, boycotts by both learners, and educators. Finally this led to the collapse in the culture of learning and teaching, as well as in the management and governance of schools, especially in former disadvantaged schools.

All these campaigns by learners and educators, and which were also supported by the civil society undermined and crippled state control of education. Carrim and Sayed (1997, p.1), allege that:- "The demand for democracy and participation in the South African Education system led to the intense and bitter student protest of the 1980's." Central to this key issues were:-

- that decision-making in schools and governance structures should include all sectors / role-players / stakeholders.
- that greater participation would ensure accountability, legitimacy and democracy.

The Management Councils as governance structures did not embrace these key issues. Alternative structures to the Management Councils were established by communities and parties opposed to school governance policies. According to them, PTSAs were seen as community structures, which gave political voice to the disenfranchised. However these structures could not effectively take over functions of Management Councils, due to blatant frustration, illegitimisation and repression of the PTSAs by the apartheid state (Carrim and Sayed, 1997, p.2). This did not dampen communities'

desire to participate in school governance, thus the struggle intensified and continued. Therefore the country experienced sporadic violent confrontation with the state security, which at times ended with destruction of property and loss of life.

As the political settlement was imminent after the unbanning of liberation movements, and the release of political prisoners, transformation and restructuring of education governance in all levels of control started to take shape, with intense debates, meetings, conferences, and seminars. What emerged out of these gatherings were the following policy documents: ERS, NEPI, ANC, Education and the Training Framework Document. The installation and establishment of a legitimate, non-racial and democratic Ministry of Education paved the way for the enactment of official policy (Carrim and Sayed, 1992, p.2). With the implementation of the SASA in 1997, efforts have been made to redress past injustices in education provisioning, effecting uniform form of governance, organisation and management. The Act outlines its aim in the following way in relation to the latter statement.

> To provide for a uniform system of organisation, governance and funding of schools, to amend and repeal certain laws relating to schools, and to provide for matters connected therewith (1996, p.2)

After the enactment of the SASA in 1997 by parliament, all public schools had to replace all governance structures with democratically elected and representative structures, which were legally known as school governing bodies. Immediately thereafter these SGBs took over the governance of their schools, as prescribed by the SASA of 1996. This Act transferred all governance roles and responsibilities from the school principals, which were assigned to them by the Head of Department (DDG), to the SGB. This implied that school principals were to relinquish certain

powers and responsibilities to the SGB. The relinquishing of governance powers and responsibility was certainly going to have an impact on relationships between school principals and SGBs. This research study in turn intends determining what impact the SGB have on school principals, with their newly assumed roles and responsibilities.

1.2 Aim of the Study

Certainly school-governing bodies are, and will continue to exert considerable impact on education professionals, especially school principals in terms of changes in:- (i) power relations, (ii) decision-making process, (iii) levels of accountability and (iv) responsibility. It is important to establish how school principals and SGBs in schools that used to be differently governed and managed (former Model C-TED, Urban Black School – DET; Coloured schools House of Representatives; and Indian Schools House of Delegates) and presently managed by same Education Department (North West) review, and reconceptualise each others role.

Furthermore, it is also vital to establish how school principals and SBGs from different and often conflicting backgrounds, work side by side in the transformation of their school governance and management in line with the SASA of 1996 and the Constitution of RSA of 1996. This process will demand of all stakeholders, in all environments to shift the mind set (paradigm shift). It will be worth exploring how stakeholders intend to change their cultures, ethos, values, attitudes and norms in the process.

The questions which the study will attempt to answer include the following:-

(i) How did the Management Councils / PTSAs, where applicable, impact on the role of school principals?

(ii) What is the legacy of the past roles and responsibilities of school principals and school governance policy?

(iii) How did the role of school principals change with the establishment of new school governing bodies?

(iv) What new challenges in the dynamics of relationships has governance policy introduced in this respect?

(v) What possible impact will the changing roles and responsibilities of SGBs have on school principals?

(vi) How have the school principals responded to their new roles and responsibilities in relation to that of SGBs?

The successful governance at school / institutional level will depend on how the SGB and school principal relate to each other, and how both view and experience change. This concept of the SGB, as mentioned earlier, may also yield unintended effects like hardened attitudes and poor work relationships. These unintended effects if ignored, will definitely hamper the forging of partnerships between school principals and SGBs, the partnership that is ideal in enhancing and promoting teamwork and that may bring about effective governance of schools.

1.3 Purpose of the study

By looking at the dynamics of relationships and modus operandi of both the school principal and the SGB, this study will highlight what it takes to promote partnerships that will alternatively result in effective school governance. Forged partnerships

without teamwork may not necessarily result in effective governance of schools, thus teamwork should characterise all forged partnerships. Governor Lamor (in Swanson, 1989, p.269) also reiterates the importance of teamwork with this claim; "Governors don't create excellent schools; communities – local leaders, teachers, parent and citizens do". Therefore all stakeholders will have to commit themselves to the jointly determined and agreed objectives, if their school is to succeed.

Without the evaluation, conceptualisation and contextualisation of the impact of new roles and responsibilities of SGBs on school principals, policy-makers, administrators, and all who aspire to transform education governance, will be failing in their efforts to effect and sustain reform in school governance. This study in carrying out this task, will attempt to provide a reliable information base to decision-makers, policy-makers, education officials and to every person with vested interest in education governance. Data should be available to inform judgements in matters pertaining to:-

(i) success / failures / problems experienced with the implementation of SASA of 1996,

(ii) the extent of compliance with constitutional principles within the region chosen,

(iii) the impact of a capacity building program,

(iv) general problems encountered and possible remedies,

(v) emerging relationships, and

(vi) a review of the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.

The information gathered from this research study will assist all the parties i.e. (SGBs, school principals, educational officials, policy makers, administrators and

communities) gain a better insight of the extent of success or failure in the implementation of the concept of the SGB.

1.4 Scope of the Study

Fundamentally, the new school governance policy brought to life by the SASA of 1996 intended to transform and restructure education governance in public schools, so that through full representation and participation of all role-players / stakeholders in school governance through their SGB, effective governance of schools could be attained and enhanced. What emerges from the practice in exception of intended effects is that this policy also yields unintended effects like:- (power-struggles, racial conflicts, hardened attitudes, intentional and unintentional failure to embrace reforms and conflicting perceptions) to mention few These unintended effects then, tend to counteract the basic objective of the new school governing policy. Hence the aims of this study are two-fold:- (a) to explore critically the impact of SGBs on school principals of public secondary schools in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region (b) and to highlight the dynamics of relationships, and what it takes to promote partnerships that will alternatively result in effective school governance.

The evaluation of the impact of SGBs on school principals can be determined in terms of changes in:- (i) power relations (ii) decision-making processes (iii) levels of accountability (iv) responsibility (v) compliance with legal / constitutional requirements (vi) coping with workloads and (vii) effectiveness of partnerships between school management, especially school principals and SGB. This selection was done on the strength and belief that changes in terms of these themes is certainly going to have an impact on all role-players especially school principals.

This study concentrated only in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region, an education region emanating out of the latest demarcation in the North West Province. Only five governors per school governing body of public secondary schools from selected schools participated in the study including the school principal. Only one representative per stakeholder was engaged as respondents per school. A total of seventy-five governors and fifteen school principals were requested to complete structured questionnaires, whilst only thirty were interviewed.

This study is divided into seven chapters. Chapter one as an introductory part, outlines the evolution of education governance in South Africa until the implementation of the new policy, as well as aims, purpose and scope of the study. Chapter two provides the methodology to be applied and limitations of the study. Bell's (1993, p.127) analysis criteria which comprise of similarities, contrasts, groupings and items of particular significance will be applied. Chapter three provides literature review and theoretical framework of the study. Much is drawn from the British and Welsh experience of reform in education governance. Chapter four outlines the socio-economic and cultural context of the schools selected. Chapter five in turn provides theoretical review of school governance policy and the role of school principals. Chapter six mainly provides the results of the study i.e. the impact on school principals of public secondary schools in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region. Chapter seven provides the summary / conclusion and highlights recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

Methodology

The critical exploration of the impact of SGBs on school principals in Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom was conducted through a survey method. Fifteen public secondary schools were selected randomly from former education departments (see table below). Data gathering techniques comprised structured questionnaires, unstructured open-ended interviews, observation of formal meetings and the study and analysis of relevant documents.

2.1 The Sample

This study focused on only one region out of the five regions emanating from the latest demarcation of education regions in the North West Province (see Appendix C). Fifteen public secondary schools from former education departments, out of a total of fifty-two were selected. The following stakeholders per school, and also serving as members of SGBs were selected as respondents:- parent, educator, learner, non-teaching staff, co-opted member if available plus the school principal. Random sampling selection of schools was done as follows:-

Former Department	**Total No. of Public Secondary Schools**	**Selection Criteria**	**No. Selected**
(i) Ex-DET	29	Every 5th school chosen from alphabetically arranged list	6
(ii) Ex-TED	18	Every 4th school from alphabetically arranged list	4
(iii) Ex-House of Reps	3	All selected	3
(iv) House of Delegates	2	All selected	2
TOTAL	52		15

All together ninety respondents participated in the study i.e. fifteen school principals and seventy-five other governors.

The reason for this selection was manageability and affordability to enable the researcher to undertake a detailed and thorough investigation. This helped to gather honest and reliable data. Verification was easily done. This deepened and enriched the new data. The selection captured the diverse demographic representation of public secondary schools population in the region. In the case of former House of Delegates and House of Representatives, all schools in the region participated in the study.

2.2 Data Collection Procedure

Structured questionnaires were administered to ninety respondents (fifteen school principals and seventy-five governors). These questionnaires were very direct and formulated mainly in English (see appendix D). They were used to gather specific information on specific issues like:-

(i) structural composition of SGBs

(ii) knowledge of practical and legal responsibilities of SGBs

(iii) approaches in coping with the much increased work load

(iv) perceptions and relationships emerging.

This survey technique was a cheap and quick way to obtain information. Personal contact was preferred during the distribution of questionnaires. Permission letters were obtained from Education District Managers, to use selected schools in my study (see Appendix C). To verify information gathered and claims made permission was

also sought and granted to study and analyse relevant documents like SGB records of meetings, agendas and notice of meetings.

Unstructured interviewing was the predominant form of inquiry in this study. Only thirty respondents were interviewed, school principals and parent or educator governors. Questions were largely open-ended and fairly indirect (see Appendix F). Respondents were seen as participants in the process of gathering information, to give effect to the process, which Lather (1986, p.54) refers to as:- "constantly constructing meaning through negotiation with research participants". According to Cohen and Manion (1981, p.273) open-ended schedule will give the researcher the flexibility to probe into participants' responses. Afrikaans and Tswana were frequently used when appropriate and necessary to clarify issues, since the interviewer had good command of all three official languages in the region. Respondents were also allowed to respond in languages they found themselves to be comfortable with. Questions focused mainly on the following issues:-

(i) power relations

(ii) decision-making processes

(iii) emerging relationships between school principals and SGBs

(iv) perceptions, tendencies and attitudes

(v) effectiveness of SGBs as partners with school management, especially the school principals.

As further primary source of information formal committees and sub committees meetings were observed, records of relevant documents and minutes of meetings scrutinised and analysed (see Appendix F+G). This observation instrument helped to

reveal characteristics of groups that would have been impossible to discover by other means (Bell, 1993, p.109). This also helped to bring into light issues like attitudes that has much bearing on relationships. Permission to attend such meetings was sought in advance. During observation focus was mainly on:-

(i) content and process of meetings

(ii) interaction between members

(iii) nature of contribution.

This was done to reinforce and validate data that was gathered by interviews, and questionnaires. Data emanating from interviews and questionnaires was recorded and later transcribed. Recording was done by tape-recording with the participant's permission. Another source of information was state publications and policy documents. Among publications relevant to my study were SASA of 1996 and White Paper on Education and Training (1995).

2.3 Reliability and Validity

As Cohen and Manion (1994, p.281) pointed out, one major problem with interviewing as a technique of gathering information is validity. Every attempt was made to adopt "vigorous reflexivity" as proposed by Lather (1986, p.58). Crosschecks were imposed on participants' responses. Feedback loops were deliberately introduced at regular intervals, in order to ensure that meaning was mutually understood. There was a continuous contact with respondents telephonically. This afforded an opportunity to verify their responses and my interpretation of their responses.

Another factor which might have compromised the validity and reliability of information was the extent of development of languages that were occasionally used to clarify certain issues, that is Afrikaans and Tswana. Clarity of meaning of concepts received a high priority. Respondents were allowed to provide their responses in the language of their choice. As mentioned earlier the researcher has a good command of all official languages in the region, thus translation of responses into English posed no problem.

2.4 Data Analysis Procedure

Data was retrieved from transcribed notes as well as recorded cassettes. Having managed to eliminate bias in any form, I applied Bell's (1993, p.127) data categorisation and analysis strategy which comprises of similarities, contrasts, groupings and items of particular significance in the tabulation of data. This criterion for data categorisation and analysis was very helpful, namely:-

(i) similarities

(ii) differences / contrasts

(iii) grouping

(iv) pattern and

(v) items of particular significance.

Data from institutions / schools from same ex-department responding to a particular theme was grouped, based on criteria and type of data available. Analytic comparison was made as well as findings. Findings provided tendencies, situational experiences in schools from an ex-department, e.g. ex-DET, or ex-Model C or ex-House of Representatives and ex-House of Delegates. Simple mathematical devices, i.e. percentages, were used to quantify data.

Secondly categorisation was done by grouping findings from former departments, based on criteria applicable and data available. After analytic comparison, findings were again made. This provided tendencies and situational experiences in former education departments in the region. Telephonic contact was also made to clear potential misunderstandings. This also provided an ideal opportunity for respondents and researcher to verify and validate findings made. Finally all findings were grouped according to Bell's (1993, p.127) criteria, in response to research themes mentioned earlier. Conclusions were then made purely in terms of Bell's (1993, p.127) criterion.

2.5 Limitations

The major deficiency of this study is the unlikelihood to make generalisations due to its sample size, especially relating to ex-DET and ex-Model C schools. As regards ex-House of Delegates and ex-House of Representatives it has been possible to make generalisations since all schools in the region, i.e. Potchefstroom / Klerksdorp, have been selected to participate in the study. However its value in informing, and providing basis to make well-informed policy decisions within schools and externally should not be underrated.

Only one governor per SGB was interviewed as well as the school principal. The views of the governors interviewed, may not necessarily represent views of others. It was also not possible to attend all SGB meetings in all fifteen schools due to time and distance. None-the-less, in schools that it was possible to attend meetings this opportunity was fully seized and fruitfully utilised. Co-operation of SGBs that

allowed me to observe their meetings was praiseworthy and worth mentioning. Far-away lying schools did mail documents requested.

Finally, in some schools principals were sceptical in participating in this study. However after persuasion by Education District officials and myself they fully co-operated. Owing to this earlier attitude one may be inclined to believe that their response / views may not necessarily give exact state of affairs in their schools. All SGBs co-operated fully except in two schools where interviews could not be conducted. These schools advanced time and other professional commitments as reasons for their non-co-operation. In case of school principals only one did not avail her for interviews. Again in case of former DET and House of Representatives there were no responses from co-opted members. The SGBs in these schools have not yet co-opted members of their communities. Little could be said about the external perception of the school by the communities due to their non-representation in the SGB i.e. co-opted members.

CHAPTER 3

Review of related literature and theoretical frame work

The new governance policy places enormous legal and practical responsibilities on school principals and their SGBs. The success or failure of these new reforms will depend entirely upon how SGBs and school principals lead their school communities in their endeavor to achieve the fundamental objectives of new policy. Furthermore reforms of such nature and magnitude pose challenges to implementers and those who will be affected, and also affect existing relationships.

The Education Reform Acts of 1986 and 1988 introduced reforms in education governance in Britain and Wales. These reforms spearheaded the transfer of governance responsibilities from education professionals to lay persons / consumers. This impacted positively, (as intended) and negatively (not-intended) on relationships between school principals and their SGB in Britain and Wales.

The intended and unintended effects which were brought about by this policy provide a valuable experience to South Africans. In an attempt to evaluate the impact of this new governance policy on school principals, the experience of the British and Welsh was used as a basis. Much is drawn from the vast literature that emerged after the implementation of the above-mentioned Acts.

This chapter explores the following topics:- (i) challenges, change dynamics and relationships which partner education reforms (ii) responses of school principals to their new roles in relation to that of school governing bodies, (British and Welsh experience) and (iii) the impact of changing roles and responsibilities of school

governing bodies on school principals (British and Welsh experience) and (iv) the theoretical framework.

3.1 Challenges, change dynamics and relationships in education reform

Compared to the British and Welsh education governance policy, the new governance policy expects also of the SGB and school principal to play a key role in the transformation of their school community. Therefore, if the school governing bodies intend to assist to transform the South African society, they must start by transforming themselves and their school communities. With his classic work "The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change". Seymour S. (1994, p.4) alleged that:-

> "one cannot understand the failure of efforts to change and improve schools, unless one deals with school community relationships and their largely implicit character – implicit that is, until the tradition cultured features are pushed into the fore front by conflict and controversy".

He maintains that unless reformers build constituencies for change both within schools and within communities most reform efforts will fail. School governing bodies and school principals in their bid to comply with the SASA of 1996 and the Constitution of RSA of 1996, will have to change their ethos, values, cultures and norms of the past. However existing routines, norms and expectations are often solidly entrenched, and efforts to reform or eliminate them are often confronted by resistance (passive or active), bitterness and conflict. To avoid conflicts, a plan will have to be drawn up by all stakeholders, to facilitate the implementation of change process. The prescriptions of the Act as well as the Constitutions demand of all school communities to commit themselves to the change process, if they aim at

attaining the objectives of the new governance policy. School principals and SGBs will have to occupy a leading role in this regard.

Secondly, innovation or change means different things to different people, thus effecting change calls for open-mindedness and readiness to understand the feelings of others. According to Everard and Morris (1986, p.170) implementing change is a process of interaction, dialogue, feedback, modifying objectives, recycling plans, coping with mixed feelings and values, micro-politics, frustration, patience and muddle. This calls upon the school principals and school governing bodies to introduce and manage the change process with all care it deserves. It will do them good if they can involve everyone whom this change is likely to impact upon from the inception phase until at implementation phase. Feedback should be regularly given to all stakeholders.

Fullan (1992, p.169) in turn had this to say:- "Serious reform is not a single innovation, it is changing the culture and structure of an organisation". School principals and SGBs have to know that restructuring the composition of their school governing bodies alone is inadequate. Both will have to alter values, norms, and attitudes that governed and characterised all past practices.

When dealing with dynamics of change, I will draw mainly from the works of Murphy and Louis (1994, p.39). They emphasised concerns of school principals as they struggle to redefine their jobs. They analysed the dynamics of change under the following headings:- complexity dilemma, the search dilemma, the dilemma of self,

and accountability dilemma. Only key points will be mentioned under the following headings:-

(i) The complexity dilemma

They identified the following challenges:-

- overwhelming workload
- difficult working conditions
- conflicting expectations

(ii) The search dilemma

- An absence of roadmap
- Inadequate development opportunities

(iii) The dilemma self

- Process of abondment
- Frustrations

(iv) Accountability dilemma

- Participants make decisions
- But school principal is officially and legally accountable

From this point, it is clear that there are many major challenges and possibilities confronting the school principals and SGBs as the transformation of school governance takes place. It is a daunting task that will require commitment, willingness to work hard, and a lot of pain and sacrifice, from both school principals and school governing bodies. Their inability to deal with these possibilities and major challenges may harm their relations and the governance of their schools will in turn be adversely affected.

One of the legacies of the old policy was the conflicting nature of relationships between school principals and head of departments, educators and learners. As Chisholm and Vally (1995, p.30) put it:- "Quite often the frustration and dissatisfaction experienced by one component of the school body are blamed on other constituencies". Another important aspect of the Schools Act is the principle of partnership or co-operative governance by all stakeholders who have interest in education. These are the state, parents, learners, educators and members of the community (Potgieter et al., 1995, p.7). The ideal relationship as envisaged by the Act should be characterised by:-

(i) mutual trust and respect

(ii) shared decision-making

(iii) shared goals and values

(iv) common vision

(v) open communication

(vi) promotion of interest of partnership rather than of the individual

(vii) respect for roles of different partners.

The successful carrying out of tasks as demanded by the Act, will depend on the extent at which school principals and SGBs change their attitudes and relationships. School principals as "valued participants" will have to adopt to new notions of leadership – changing from implementers to initiators, from compliance officers to entrepreneurial risk takers, from bureaucratic managers to collaborative colleagues. Murphy and Louis (1994, p.10) summed this up in the following way:- "They must learn to lead, not from the apex of the organisational pyramid, but from the centre of a

web of personal relationship. Their base of influence must be professional expertise and moral imperative rather than line authority".

3.2 Responses of school principals to their new roles in relation to that of school governing bodies (British and Welsh experience)

At this stage preference will be given to the British and Welsh experience. This is prompted by the fact that the South African Education system was inherited from the British style of administration. Some features of the British Education system may well be noticed in other Commonwealth countries. However other international experience of reform in school governance will be utilised.

Secondly, the latest Education Reform Acts of 1986 and 1988 have much in common with the SASA of 1996 in relation to categories like; aims and objectives, composition of SGB and certain roles and responsibilities. Their experience may be of great help to us, especially when we attempt to evaluate the impact of the present reforms in school governance.

3.2.1 The view of head teachers

Through the 1986 and 1988 Education Reform Acts powers, i.e. those related to school governance, were wrested from head teachers and given to school governing bodies in Britain and Wales. Intention was to give consumers considerable say in the governance of schools by terminating the dominance of producers (education professionals). According to Kogan et al. (1984, p.14), before the passing of the Acts, head teachers viewed SGBs with disdain or as part of a necessary but relatively unimportant ritual in the past. Even after the passing of the first Education Reform in

1986, some still saw them as necessary evil to be humoured, and when necessary to be manipulated, (Jones, 1987; Preedy 1993, ed).

However focus here will be mainly on perceptions and attitudes that emerged after the passing and implementation of the Acts. (Hall, Mackay and Morgan; Preedy, 1993, ed) in their intensive study, discovered a variety of approaches to head / governors relationships:- (i) one head teacher was always at odds with them (ii) another saw them a lot, and tried to get their approval for his decisions (iii) a third only used them to express his opposition to aspect of LEA policy and (iv) the fourth had a very good rapport with the governing body and encouraged their involvement.

A further review in the "School Governor" (March 1998, p.10), noted with dismay some of the comments made by some heads in the survey. Two examples were:- "I detest justifying my work to ignorant governors", and "I dislike writing governors reports and attending governor's meetings".

In the study conducted by Deem and Wilkins (1992, p.23) mention is made of such a claim by school principals:- "At the end of the day there is no area of the school I expect governors to run without me". Variety of evidence drawn from case studies between 1998 – 1992 revealed the same attitude. (Deem and Wilkins, 1992; Mortimore and Mortimore, 1991a, 1991b) echoed the same sentiments.

Mortimore and Mortimore (1991, p.37) alleged that lately some school principals started to alter their negative perception of school governing bodies. He cited the following comment by a head teacher to support his assertion:-

> Now the Education Acts of 1986 and 1988 make it imperative for head teachers to ensure that they have the right kind of working relationship – particularly with the governing body, whereas prior to that the relationship – could best be described as having to be no better than that of a vicar hosting his own party.

All the above comments which have been made by various school principals, strengthen and acknowledge as true the assertion that the Act is likely to bring about intended and unintended effects. It is thus indisputable that the relationship between school principals and the school governing bodies is crucial in determining how governors will execute their tasks.

3.2.2 The view from school governing bodies

Some governors voiced their concerns through:- "The Times Educational Supplement", about the power of heads to make decisions without consulting them. In Sallis (1991b, p.15) one governor's comment was:-

> I am not the only one on my governing body ready to work hard for the school, but many of us are frustrated. Our agendas come from the town hall. We have a delegated budget but all we do is to approve it when everything has been decided. The head writes the annual report to parents, and runs the meeting once or twice, we have tried to establish our right to opinion, but we were told by the head and local authority that teachers would strike if we intervened.

This indicates that governors were aware of the obstructionist attitude by school principals which hampered their full participation in school governance. Governors were also aware that the nature of the governing task itself began to undergo a sea of change. In "Governors Action", Sallis (1991a, p.14) it is revealed that governors viewed the Acts as giving them considerable powers not just over their schools, but principally and significantly over head teachers. Another perception is that governors viewed themselves as central to schools as organisations rather than as bit-part actors.

From the above perception and views, certainly there were governors who wished to challenge the distinction between governing and managing. These conflicting perceptions and attitudes further strengthened and acknowledged as truth assertion made by Thomas (1992, p.237).

It is thus ideal that conflicting parties which have to play important roles in the life of their schools, review and reconceptualise each other's roles. They should also strive to understand and accept both parties' important roles in school governance. Accepting and understanding each other's role should not be seen in relationship only, but also in the content of what each party had to do. Furthermore acknowledgment and commitment to respect each other's role will lay a sound foundation for forging partnership.

3.3 The impact of changing roles and responsibilities of school governing bodies on school principals (British and Welsh experience)

At this stage it is clear from the outcomes and impressions from studies undertaken that school principals need to acknowledge and accept the critical role to be played by school governing bodies in the life of the schools. It is well known that the traditional role and responsibilities that school principals fulfilled granted them more powers. The Education Reform Acts of 1986 and 1988 reduced those powers considerably by transferring them to the school governing bodies.

As Flude and Hammer (1990, p.2) put it:- "The changes encompassed in the 1986(b) and 1988 Education Acts have had very significant effects in the contests in which

maintained schools in England and Wales operate". These Acts also brought about a shift of emphasis by school principals, from traditional political science and educational management notions of governing bodies, as one component in a much wider system of educational government, to a perspective which recognises that governors now play a major role in the running of schools. Another significant impact was that the importance of Local Education Authorities and heads was reduced, parents and members of local community and those from industry assumed a key role (Deem and Wilkins, 1992; Sallis, 1991b; Flude and Hammer, 1990). With the increase in powers of SGB, the distinction between powers of heads and those of SGB became more blurred then before (Wilkins, 1990).

Conceptualisation of school governing bodies as organisations standing at the external boundary may no longer is as useful or appropriate as previously (Preedy, 1993, ed). It also became difficult for heads to police the boundaries between their job and responsibilities of governors. A new breed of governors, typically a co-opted businessperson with financial skills, legal knowledge and management expertise questioned and occasionally needed briefing regarding results, finances and management (Brehony and Hemmings, 1992). Some with personal philosophy of Education formed alliance with other governors and challenged the decisions of head teachers.

Insights that have been offered here are, I believe, capable of application to other societies both inside and outside Europe, e.g. South Africa where parents and communities have a formal role in schools. Information derived has something valuable to offer to the school principals and the SGBs in coming to terms with

changes in the way public education is to be governed and managed. Finally, school principals need to review their own perspective on the functions and roles of school governing bodies, if they are to continue to work successfully with their newly empowered governors.

3.4 Theoretical Framework for the Study

As it has already been mentioned, the implementation of the Act brought about intended and unintended effects. The study of experiences of countries that implemented similar reforms may be helpful. The Education Reform Acts of 1986 and 1988 in Britain and Wales provided much needed assistance in their disrespect. The development of this research study rests on a conceptual framework of:- Mortimore, and Mortimore and Thomas.

According to Mortimore and Mortimore (1991, p.128) "Under both the 1986 Act and the Education Reform Act of 1988, school governors have increased powers and responsibilities, the exercise of which called for a rethinking of relationships between a head teacher and his or her SGB". In the current South African situation where we are embarking upon the transformation of our governance at school level, their assertion is particularly upposite. As a way of enhancing good relationships they have made the following proposals:-

(a) An honest and open relationship has to be established through a process of team building and parameter exploring by both SGBs and school principals.

(b) A supportive relationship between school governors, staff, and parents, will in many ways determine the success of the school.

(c) It is essential that governors are informed people, aware of realities of the school. Such information will not come by osmosis. It is only through the establishment of honest and open relationship between head teachers and governors that information can be exchanged, and governors welcomed in the school community, for they are part of it, not an add-on.

(d) Trust and understanding can come only through the process of working together.

(e) The quality of information given to governors will by large determine their response. Heads have only themselves to blame if governors acting in ignorance, make ignorant decisions.

(f) Our newly evolving relationship, i.e. working relationship between SGBs and school principals, is an area that needs to be handled with sympathy and understanding by both heads and governors.

(g) There is bound to be some degree of tension as various interested parties try to define their responsibilities under the Act. It is a situation that demands patience, courtesy and understanding, with the paramount concern of everyone being the quality of educational experience offered to the children.

In turn Thomas (1992, p.237) maintains that: "The dilemma of school reforms arises from the relationship between school governors and professionals within school". He alleges that in assessing how governors discharge their responsibilities, emphasis "must" inevitably be with the head teacher, and maintains that:-

(a) Typically, the head teacher will be the principal source of advice and guidance to governors.

(b) A governing body may become a proper decision-making forum, only if the head is prepared to sponsor the development.

(c) Giving assistance should imply increasing their knowledge and competence, in order to be able to make their own well-informed decisions and

(d) Finally their (i.e. head teachers) sponsorship will rely upon them (head teachers) having sets of values, which cherish community participation in social institutions, and school governing bodies themselves acting with altruism.

If acknowledged, accepted and adhered to by both parties (school principals and SGBs), these proposals may enhance and sustain healthy relationships between them. With such relationships existing, effective partnerships may be forged which may contribute maximally to effective governance of schools. Effective partnership if fully realised, promotes involvement, commitment and is generally characterised by:-

(i) mutual trust and respect

(ii) shared decision-making

(iii) shared goals and values

(iv) common vision

(v) open ommunication

(vi) good teamwork

(vii) promotion of interest of partnership rather than of the individual, and

(viii) respect for roles and responsibilities of different partners. (Dept. of Education, 1997, p.7).

Above all the object of participatory government in schools is to produce more effective schools, rather than providing fulfillment for those who govern them, (Sallis, 1987, p.15).

The experience of the British and Welsh may shed valuable insight to the South African population in pioneering and championing their education reform. School governing bodies and school principals may learn a lot from this experience. Problems experienced by the Welsh and British may be avoided by joint co-operation and commitment to the ideal of the new policy. Before outlining the impact of the new policy through SGBs on school principals, it may be worth while to outline the socio-economic and cultural context in which schools selected operated.

The next chapter will focus mainly on the socio-economic and cultural context of public schools in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region in which these schools operated before January 1997.

CHAPTER 4

Socio-Economic and Cultural context of public schools in Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region

The Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region is a product of the latest demarcation of the North West Province into five education regions (see Appendix A). Prior to April 1994 these selected public secondary schools fell under the authority of four different education departments. The form of governance in these schools could be more usefully described as a "system of systems", differentiated on the basis of the racial, ethnic and regional divisions of South African Society (NEPI, 1992, p.6). This racially and ethnically based system of governance has been at the heart of apartheid education. Major criticism of this policy is that it has not facilitated the participation of parents, students and teachers in decision-making processes. The outcome – and indeed underlying motivation – has been to ensure unequal education and strong political control over education, (ANC, Policy Document of Education and Training, 1992, p.21).

Enrolment in these schools was determined by race, colour creed as well as specific departmental regulations which ensured existence of racially, segregated and unequally resourced schools. Hence these schools were generally differentiated and classified in terms of race (e.g. White schools – former TED and Black schools – former DET), and lately in terms of their economic standing, e.g. ex-Model C – advantaged schools and ex-DET – disadvantaged schools. The learner enrolment depicted the locality and the community the school was serving. Staffing was also racially based. The school governing bodies or Management Councils depicted the

racial demography. Each public school in the region selected served a particular community, thus these schools were also custodians of the community's cultures, values, norms and philosophy of life. School governing bodies (especially in white and Indian schools) and school principals were also expected to endorse and promote those ethos, norms, values and life view, as cherished by different school communities. Hence these schools were also seen as the extension of apartheid policies. These cultures, norms, values and life view were also enough to determine who was to be enrolled and employed.

With the ushering in of the new dispensation in 1994, all racially based legislation was scrapped in the Statute Book, e.g. Group Areas Act, Separate Amenities Act etc. All public amenities including public schools were opened to other racial groups. One national education department and nine provincial education departments were established to integrate all formerly racially based education departments into a single one. This was made possible by the enactment of the SASA of 1996. Deraciallisation of schools took place under the auspices of the provincial education departments. This led to mass exodus of learners from less disadvantaged schools to advantaged schools. Former Model C and Indian schools experienced an increase in the enrolment of other population groups. These schools (former Model C and former House of Delegates) became multiracial in terms of learner enrolment and parent community. In former DET and House of Representatives, learner and parent composition did not change. Owing to change in school communities' demography, it became inevitable that SGBs also had to depict the multi-racial composition of their communities.

This new governance policy introduced by the SASA of 1996, altered socio-political economical and cultural context in which these schools separated. This policy intended to bring to an end a governance policy that was practiced for more than half a decade. Therefore it will be worth exploring what nature of effects (intended or unintended) this policy will bring about. Furthermore it will be worth exploring how school governing bodies and school principals, who used to work in different and conflicting background and presently administered by same education department, review and reconceptualise each other's role. Change of ethos, attitudes, norms and values of the past is necessary if SGB and school principals are to successfully govern their schools in line with the new Act and the Constitution of RSA of 1996. As mentioned earlier, it will be interesting to evaluate how stakeholders intend shifting the paradigm.

The evaluation of the impact of SGBs on school principals of public secondary schools will shed more light on the nature of effects the policy has brought about. With the knowledge of the effects, the extent of success or failure in efforts to effect reforms in school governance will be determined. Corrective measures will then be appropriately applied or success attained be sustained and improved. However, due to contrasting socio-economic and cultural contexts in which these schools operated, the impact of the new governance policy is likely to differ considerably. Before highlighting the impact of SGBs on school principals it will be appropriate first to outline the differentiated governance policy prior to 1994, its legacy, and the role of school principals. Furthermore mention will be made of the new roles and responsibilities of school principals. Chapter 5 will address the above intentions.

CHAPTER 5

School governance policy and the role of school principals

5.1 School Governance Policy before January 1997 and the role of school principals

The differentiated system of governance influenced the way schools were governed and managed. Each system had its own particular characteristics, impulses and inertia (NEPI, 1992, 1993). This could be seen in governance structures, which were responsible for governance in former education departments. The difference was also characterised by differences in terms of representation of parents, teachers, students and other stakeholders, as well as in power and responsibilities. According to the (ANC, Policy Document on Education and Training, 1992, p.21-17), governance structures in the former education department differed in the following way:-

5.1.1 Model C schools / Ex-TED schools

This system gave parents considerable management powers. These powers included:- prescribing compulsory school fees, determining admission policies, selecting staff and appointing additional staff, paid from school funds, and the selecting and purchasing of resources. Bureaucratic tasks were well supported by administrative and clerical staff. Teachers and students had no formal powers in school governance. This did not create any tension as teachers and students were more concerned about learning and teaching than governance. Existing policy enhanced full parental participation in school governance.

5.1.2 Ex-House of Delegates and House of Representatives schools

Parents elected committees which had little say over substantive and educational maters, functioned as advisory bodies in matters such as school uniforms and collection of compulsory school funds. In some cases, PTSAs functioned. The impact of these committees was thus very minimal. School principals took decision in most instances without consulting other stakeholders. They were more answerable to state policy than parents.

5.1.3 Ex-DET schools

There was provision for Management Councils, comprised of elected parents and school principals. These committees had no say over policy matters. They were often discredited, and in the majority of cases they hardly functioned. Exercised little contact between parents and teachers. However, students and teacher participation in decision-making in the school has been a focus of intense contestation. Many communities struggled to establish and maintain PTSAs as democratic structures in the face of official hostility.

The policy which was applicable to Model C schools gave parents considerable say in the governance and management of schools through the school governing bodies. This parental involvement contributed to the stability and effectiveness that Model C schools enjoyed during the period 1976 -1990. This parental involvement and full support by the state impacted positively on their governance and management. Therefore relationships between SGBs and school principals were generally cordial.

The (NEPI, (1992, p.10) report, claimed that:- "In African schools there was a network of discredited and largely powerless bodies at the school level". Principals

were expected to carry out substantial teaching loads in addition to a range of bureaucratic functions with little or no clerical support. As such the impact of School Management Councils on school principals was highly insignificant. Principals performed management and governance tasks exclusively. Consequently they were often caught up in adversial relationships. Their role corresponded with the role of African education in general, their purpose was to control. Management styles encouraged under DET were authoritarian, hierarchical and top-down (Chisholm and Vally, 1996, p.24). Chisolm and Vally (1996, p.25) further alleged that:- "In the course of exercising their duties, school principals often became victims of the wider resistance against apartheid education, even as they saw themselves as opponents of it". This was largely due to their management styles which were arbitrary, exclusive and at times inhumane.

Owing to various styles of management and governance in schools, conditions also differed considerably. Suronsky (1996, p.5) also alleged that :- "In African schools, schools were steeped in authoritarian culture". Characteristics thereof were firmly upheld by school principals and such served as a breed of conflicts, animosity, hatred and mistrust. He further claimed that this caused a climate of distrust, that took on various forms in different contexts. Hartshorne (1991, p.10) in turn asserted that it was in this period that the fundamental disintegration of learning environment and breakdown of authority and discipline in the school system happened.

Generally, in no former disadvantaged schools, were relationships entirely conflict free. In some schools, this conflict has led to complete subordination of principals to the staff, whilst in others to a more democratic and equal forms of authority in which

there was mutual respect (Chisholm and Vally, 1997, p.25). Many problems were laid at the door of principals and their managements. Many of them lacked authority and skills to deal with these problems. Therefore control and management of schools collapsed.

The collapse in the control and management of schools was further exacerbated by the renewal of protests in the school during 1984 – 1986. Protest in this period was more intense than before and had a strong political tone than had been the case from 1976 – 1980 (Hartshorne, 1991, p.3). No one wanted to take responsibility for crisis in schools. This possible total collapse of the education system for Africans was never to be allowed. Fundamental changes were necessary and had to be effected, in the interest of the children and the young people it is supposed to serve. This state of affairs could not be allowed to continue unchallenged. It became the responsibility of all South Africans who had a stake in education and training to help build a just, equitable and democrative system for all the citizen. Metcalfe (in Wits, EPU, 1996, p.1) said:- "Our task is to finally overcome the destructive history of apartheid education and build a solid base that will take us into the 21st century".

The new democratically elected government took a lead in this regard with the publication of the White Paper on Education and Training (1995), and which was finally followed by the SASA. With the enactment of the SASA in January 1997, the transformation of the entire education system became a reality. Transformation of governance of education at all levels was also legalised and effected. At school level, legally constituted school governing bodies took over governance functions, and school principals were left only with the professional management of schools.

However, school principals remained members of the school governing body in an ex officio capacity. This new Act altered roles and responsibilities of school principals considerably.

5.2 Change in role of school principals with the establishment of school governing bodies

> "The traditional role of school principals and other educators in schools are changing and will continue to be reshaped, redefined and renegotiated as restructuring occurs", Bredeson (1991, p.1).

Just like the Education Reform Acts of 1986 and 1988, the SASA altered and redefined the roles of school principals in the management and governance of public schools. According to the SASA, Section 16(3), the professional management of a public school, must be undertaken by the school principal under authority of the Head of Department. Professional management of a public school entails:-

(i) day to day administration and organisation of teaching and learning at the school

(ii) perform departmental responsibilities prescribed by the law

(iii) organisation of all activities which support teaching and learning

(iv) personnel and financial management

(v) decisions on intra-mural curriculum, that is all the activities to assist with teaching and learning during school hours

(vi) decisions on textbooks, educational materials and equipment to be bought. (Potgieter et al., 1996, p.7).

In sharp contrast to the old policy, governance functions were exclusively vested upon. School governing bodies were made up of the following stakeholders:-

(i) parents

(ii) educators

(iii) learners

(iv) school principal as "ex-officio'

(v) non-teaching staff

(vi) co-opted members

As a member of the school governing body, the principal participated as a "team-member". He / she is allowed to participate in governance matters but may not vote. According to the Act, the school principal may also not occupy any executive position within the SGB. Irrespective of all these limitations the school principal is still a "valued participant" due to the advisory, guidance role that she / he has to play within the SGB and the life of the school in general.

Secondly in terms of the SASA, Section 19(2d):- "The Head of the Department must ensure that school principals and other officers of the education department render all necessary assistance to school governing bodies in the performance of their functions". This implies that school principals should empower their SGBs, by acting as guides, providers of quality information, facilitators of change, rather than as bosses. As Prestine(1991a, p.11) puts it:- "This assistance should be grounded not so much on line authority, but must be based on mutual respect and equality of contribution and commitment. This will boost the confidence and capacity of SGBs, and assist them to make quality and well-informed decisions".

However, the role of school principals and SGBs has to complement each other. It is thus essential that both parties support each other in their endeavour to improve the quality of their schools. This partnership may only be attained if they support one

another. The school principal as a "valued participant" is expected to play a leading role in cultivating a network of relationships. Prestine (1991b, p.16) further summed up this specific role of the school principal in the following way:- "The school principal is a key player in developing this network of relationships, that allow restructuring schools to weather the inevitable storms they will face". Finally he should lead and advice the SGB in the task prescribed by the Constitution to help transform the South African society by adhering and complying with the following constitutional principles:- and values and which must always be taken into account in the governance of the schools, namely:-

(i) respect for human dignity, the achievement of equality and the advancement of human rights and freedoms.

(ii) non-racialism

(iii) the rule of law

(iv) the principle that all adults must be able to vote, and there must be regular elections, a multi party system of democratic government, accountability and openness (Potgieter et al., 1995, p.7).

This reallocation of the roles and responsibilities constituted a major shift in the practices of the past. As such, the legacy of the past may be eliminated by re-inventing the culture of co-operation, collaboration, democratic decision-making and political accountability. Finally, it will be interesting to know the nature of impact of SGBs on school principals in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region. The next chapter will critically evaluate the impact on school principals of region chosen.

CHAPTER 6

The impact of school governing bodies on school principals

Fundamentally, the new school governance policy brought to life by the SASA, intended to transform and restructure education governance in public schools, so that through full representation and participation of all roleplayers in school governance, effective governance of schools could be attained and enhanced. What emerges from the practice is that in exclusion of intended effects, this policy also yields unintended effects like:- power struggles, racial conflicts, hardened attitudes, intentional and unintentional failure to embrace certain reforms, to mention a few. These unintended effects, then, tend to counter act the basic objective of the policy.

What emerged from the study which has been conducted in the Klerksdorp/Potchefstroom region is that the impact of SGB on school principal brought about significant impact in terms of changes in:- (i) power relations (ii) decision-making processes (iii) levels of accountability and (iv) responsibility (v) general compliance with legal and constitutional requirements but with little or no shift in mindset (paradigm) (vi) an increase in workload of school principals, especially in African schools, due to lack of capacity and finally (vii) intentional and unintentional failure to embrace certain reforms.

However due to the conflicting socio-economic and cultural backgrounds in which these schools operated, impact on school principals differed considerably from ex-department to ex-departments, i.e. Former Model C, DET, House of Representatives and House of

Delegates and even from school to school within same former department. This further suggests that unintended and intended effects will also vary from former department to former departments. The extent at which the unintended effects counter act basic objective of the new governance policy also varies greatly.

Before providing an analysis of these outcomes it may be necessary to give summarised profiles of schools that participated in the study. These schools will be grouped according to their former controlling authority, (i.e. former department). Roman numbers will be solely used to name schools. This is done as a fulfillment of an earlier agreement with schools that their identity will be kept confidential (not disclosed). Following alphabets will be exclusively used to denote race or stake-holder, i.e. W = White; B = Black; I = Indian; C = Coloured whilst P = Parent; E = Educator; L = Learner and Pr - Principal.

6.1 Profiles of Public Schools selected

Table 6.1.1 Former Model C Schools

Name	Grade	Medium of Instruction	Former Governance Structure	Learner Enrol-ment	Population in Terms of Race					
					Before 1994			Presently		
					Pr	E	L	Pr	E	L
I	8-12	Afrikaans	School Governing Body	230	W	W	W	W	W	W
II	8-12	English	School Governing Body	474	W	W	W	W	W	W B IC
III	8-12	English	School Governing Body	520	W	W	W	W	W	W BI C
IV	8-12	Dual	School Governing Body	600	W	W	W	W	W	W C

Learners enrolment changed dramatically in English speaking schools. Change in admission policy was influenced then by political transformation that was taking place.

Staff component remain unchanged in all schools. The political transformation did not impact much on educator component.

Table 6.1.2 Former House of Delegates Schools

Name	Grade	Medium of Instruction	Former Governance Structure	Learner Enrolment	Population in Terms of Race					
					Before 1994			Presently		
					Pr	E	L	Pr	E	L
V	1-12	English	PTSA	702	I	W I	I	W	W BI	ICB
VI	1-2	English	PTSA	659	I	W I	I	I	W BI	ICB

Learner enrolment changed. These schools admitted other race groups except whites.

Educator enrolment has also changed. Blacks form part of the staff.

Table 6.1.3 Former House of Representatives Schools

Name	Grade	Medium of Instruction	Former Governance Structure	Learner Enrolment	Population in Terms of Race					
					Before 1994			Presently		
					Pr	E	L	Pr	E	L
VII	1-12	Afrikaans	Management Council	582	C	C	C	C	C	C
VIII	6-12	Dual	Management Council	850	C	C	C	C	C	CB
IX	6-12	Dual	Management Council	1200	C	C	C	C	C	CB

Learners enrolment has change in schools VIII and IX

Table 6.1.4 Former DET Schools

Name	Grade	Medium of Instruction	Former Governance Structure	Learner Enrolment	Population in Terms of Race					
					Before 1994			Presently		
					Pr	E	L	Pr	E	L
X	6-12	English	School Management Council / PTSA	2000	B	B	B	I	B	B
XI	6-12	English	School Management Council / PTSA	1250	B	B	B	B	B	B
XII	6-12	English	School Management Council / PTSA	1200	B	B	B	B	B	B
XIII	6-12	English	School Management Council / PTSA	1045	B	B	B	B	B	B
XIV	6-12	English	School Management Council / PTSA	1099	B	B	B	B	B	B
XV	6-12	English	School Management Council / PTSA	1350	B	B	B	B	B	B

Learner population is predominantly Black. Mass exodus to advantaged schools has not affected the numbers considerably. It may have relieved overcrowding.

Educator component is also predominantly Black except school principal change in school X.

These profiles denote a very particular trend, movement of learners from predominantly former disadvantaged schools to formerly advantaged schools. There is no movement from formerly advantaged schools to formerly disadvantaged schools. This one-way direction movement certainly influenced the parental component of SGB In former Model C schools and House of Delegates schools parental component became multiracial

whilst in Coloured and Black schools remained Black or Coloured. The majority are illiterate, semi-illiterate and economically poor. This impacted negatively on the composition and performance of their SGB. Whilst in Model C schools and House of Delegates the impact is positive, since new parents are from middle-class groups, literate, professionals and economically sound. Following are the results of the study which will be dealt with theme by theme.

6.2 Compliance with legal and constitutional requirements

According to the new school governing policy, and spelt out by Section 23(i) of SASA an SGB of a public secondary school shall comprise of the following elected member or members of each of the following categories:-

a) parents of learners at the school,

b) educators at the school,

c) non-teaching staff,

d) learner in eighth grade or higher in the school,

e) school principal as ex-officio and,

f) co-opted members,

Secondly in terms of Section 18(2) a constitution as contemplated in Section 18(1) must provide for:-

a) a meeting of SGB at least one every term.

b) meeting of SGB with parents, learners and educators and other staff at least once a year

c) recording and keeping of minutes of SGB meetings

d) making of such minutes available for inspection by Head of Department

Compliance with Section 23 (1) and (2) 18(2) of SASA will ensure and facilitate restructuring in the composition and functioning of the SGB. Following data has been gathered in schools selected in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region.

Table 6.2.1 Former Model C Schools

S.G.B	Degree of compliance with Section 18(2) and 23(1) and (2) of S.A.S.A of 1996			Perceptions of S.G.B			Perception of School Principal		
	Full Compli-ance	Partial Compli-ance	Non-Compli-ance	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral
I	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
II	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
III	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
IV	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
Total	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)

Compliance by S.G.B (Full) = 4 (100%)

Perception of S.G.B:

- Positive:- 0 (0%)
- Negative:- 3 (75%)
- Neutral:- 1 (25%)

Perception by school principal

- Positive:- 0 (0%)
- Negative:- 3 (75%)
- Neutral:- 1 (25%)

All SGB comply fully with Sections 18(2) and 23(1) and (2), but 3(75%) do not believe that this restructuring will bring about effective governance of schools whilst 1 (25%) is unsure. However 3 (75%) of school principals also do not foresee any change as far as school governance is concerned whilst 1 (25%) is unsure. This may be due to the stability that these school enjoyed, whilst their counterparts mainly in Black and Coloureds schools were experiencing unrests, boycotts, stay-aways that emanated out of dissatisfaction with

the school governance policy. Secondly this policy of school governance which allows parents to play a prominent role in the governance of their schools has long been in place in White schools. Furthermore, the main concern was the involvement of learners in decision-making processes.

Table 6.2.2 Former House of Delegates Schools

S.G.B	Degree of compliance with Section 18(2) and 23(1) and (2) of S.A.S.A of 1996			Perception of S.G.B			Perception of School Principal		
	Full Compli-ance	Partial Compli-ance	Non-Compli-ance	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral
V	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
VI	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Total	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)

Full compliance = 2 (100%)

Perception by SGB

- Positive:- 1 (50)
- Negative:- 0 (0%)
- Neutral:- 1 (50%)

Perception by school principals

- Positive:- 0 (0%)
- Negative:- 0 (0%)
- Neutral:- 2 (100%)

All schools comply with Section 23(1) and (2) as well as 18(1) of SASA. However 1 (50%) of SGB are fully hopeful that the new restructuring will bring about change in school governance, whilst 1 (50%) are unsure about the results. However 2 (100%) of school principal hold some reservation about the ultimate impact of the new policy.

Table 6.2.3 Former House of Representative Schools

S.G.B	Degree of compliance with Section 18(2) and 23(1) and (2) of S.A.S.A of 1996			Perception of S.G.B			Perception of School Principal		
	Full Compli-ance	Partial Compli-ance	Non-Compli-ance	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral
VII	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0	0
VII	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0
IX	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0
Total	1 (33,3%)	2 (66,6%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	2 (66,6%)	0 (0%)

Full compliance = 1 ($33^{1}/_{3}$)

Partial compliance = 2 ($66^{2}/_{3}$%)

Partial compliance is brought about by lack of co-operation between SGB members and school principals, as well as resignations or withdrawal by governors in SGB activities.

Perception of SGB

Positive 3 (100%). All agree that new policy will be capable of bringing about school governance effectiveness. This is the perception of the few who remained with their SGB.

Perception by school principals.

Only 1 ($33^{1}/_{3}$%) is very optimistic that new policy will improve schools. However 2 ($66^{2}/_{3}$%) sees the involvement of educators and learners as the worsening of the problems. Schools VIII and XI have been rocked by disputes and conflicts in the past between school management teams and educators, learners as well as parents. School VII has a relatively calm and stable environment. It is situated in the politically dormant of North West Province.

Table 6.2.4 Former D.E.T Schools

S.G.B	Degree of compliance with Section 18(2) and 23(1) and (2) of S.A.S.A of 1996			Perception of S.G.B			Perception of School Principal		
	Full Compli-ance	Partial Compli-ance	Non-Compli-ance	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral
X	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)
XI	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)
XII	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)
XIII	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)
XIV	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)
XV	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16,6%)
Total	6(100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6(100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6(100%)

Full compliance = 6 (100%)

Perception of SGB

All 6 (100%) are fully optimistic that the new school governance policy which bring about effectiveness in school governance through it's involvement of all role players in the decision-making processes. This is due to the conflictual nature in which these schools found themselves in the past because of non-representation of other stake-holders in decision-making processes.

Perception of school principals

All 6 (100%) are not sure whether the new school governance policy will improve governance in Black schools.

Table 6.2.5 Former Education Departments in the region

Former Education Depart-ment	Degree of compliance with Section 18(2) and 23(1) and (2) of S.A.S.A of 1996			Perception of S.G.B			Perception of School Principal		
	Full Compli-ance	Partial Compli-ance	Non-Compli-ance	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Former Model C (4)	4 (26,1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	1 (6,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)
Former House of Delegates (2)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)
Former House of Represen-tatives (3)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)
Former D.E.T. (6)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)
Total	13 (85,23%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	10 (66%)	3 (20%)	2 (12,2%)	1 (6,1%)	4 (26%)	10 (66%)

Perception and attitude of S.G.B

- Positive:- 10 (66,6%)
- Negative:- 3 (20%)
- Neutral:- 2 (13,03%)

A higher percentage of SGB members predominantly from African schools, i.e. 6 (66,6%) believe that the new governance policy will bring about effective school governance whilst 3 (20%) disagree and 2 (13,03%) do not want to commit themselves.

Perception and attitude of school principals

- Positive:- 1 (6,1%)
- Negative:- 4 (26,1)
- Neutral:- 10 (66,6%)

Many principal prefer not to commit themselves as many are still sceptic, i.e. 10 (66,6%) whilst 4 (26,1%) are negative and 1 (6,1%) are fully positive that things may change for the best.

6.3 Levels of accountability and responsibility

All governors have been elected by the different constituencies to serve in their SGB As micro-politicians they have to be accountable for their actions or activities. They are also expected to promote the interests of their constituencies as well as that of the SGB Furthermore the new governance policy spells out clearly what their functions are in relation to that of school management.

In the of the SASA of 1996, Section 16(1) and subject to this Act, the governance of every public school is rested in its governing body, whilst Section 16(3) proclaims that the professional management of a public school must be undertaken by a principal. A clear demarcation of functions and responsibilities is essential if the SGB and the school principal are to work harmoniously side by side in the promotion and development of their schools.

Table 6.3.1 Former Model C Schools

Name	Racial Com-posi-tion of S.G.B	Perception of S.G.B. on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility								Perception of principals on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility							
		H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U
I	W	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
II	W	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	W	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
IV	W	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	W	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Remember that, H.S. = Highly Satisfactory

S = Satisfactory

H.U. = Highly Unsatisfactory

U = Unsatisfactory

Perception of SGB

Levels of Accountability and Responsibility of SGB

- Highly satisfactory:- 4 (100%) Highly satisfactory:- 4(100%)
- Satisfactory:- 0 (%) Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%) High Unsatisfactory 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%) Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)

Perception of school principal

- Highly satisfactory:- 3 (75%)
- 1 (25%) did not participate in the interview
- Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)

A clear demarcation is maintained between functions and roles of school management and the SGB. The SGB are functional and effective. Racial composition of SGB is white dominant. Concept of SGB is not new to these schools. SGB does not reflect the racial demography of schools.

Table 6.3.2 Former House of Delegates Schools

Name	Racial Com-posi-tion of S.G.B.	Perception of S.G.B. on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility								Perception of S.G.B. on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility							
		H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U
V	Multi racial	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
VI	Multi racial	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total		0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Remember that H.S. = Highly Satisfactory

S. = Satisfactory

H.U. = Highly Unsatisfactory

U = Unsatisfactory

Perception of SGB

Levels of Accountability and Responsibility of SGB

- Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%) Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Satisfactory:- 2 (100%) Satisfactory:- 2 (100%)
- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%) High Unsatisfactory 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%) Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)

The composition of SGB is representative of new racial demography. New enrolment is mostly from middle class, literate Coloureds and Blacks. Owing to their socio-economic status their impact on SGB is positive. However development of a new culture presents a problem as the former owners of these schools tend to preserve their Indian culture and even promote it at expense of others.

Principals perception.

Levels of Accountability and Responsibility

- Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%) Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Satisfactory:- 2 (100 %) Satisfactory:- 2 (100%)

- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)

High Unsatisfactory 0 (0%)

Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)

There is a clear demarcation between roles and functions of SGB and school management. In school V, the school principal is white, whose main concern is to protect interest of all racial groups. Tension looms between SGB and school principal due the desire of SGB especially chairperson to promote Indian culture at expense of others. The SGBs are functional and effective.

Table 6.3.3 Former House of Representative Schools

Name	Racial Com-posi-tion of S.G.B.	Perception of S.G.B on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility								Perception of principals on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility							
		H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U
VII	Col-oureds	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)
VIII	Multi racial	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)
IX	Multi racial	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)
Total		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33,3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)

Perception of SGB

Levels of Accountability and Responsibility

- Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)	Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)	Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 1 (33,3%)	High Unsatisfactory 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 2 (66,6%)	Unsatisfactory:- 3 (100%)

These SGB are characterised by consistent obsenteism, withdrawals and resignations. This problem compels the school principal to execute other functions of SGB. These S.G.Bs. lack capacity.

Perception of school principal

These S.G.B. are dysfunctional thus school principal carry out other functions related to governance. Parent component constitutes of semi-illiterate or illiterate parents - middle class and literate parents had moved with their children to former advantaged schools

Table 6.3.4 Former D. E.T. Schools

Name	Racial Composi-tion of S.G.B.	Perception of S.G.B on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility								Perception of principals on Levels of Accountability and Responsibility							
		H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U	H.S	S	H.U	U
X	Black	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)
XI	Black	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)
XII	Black	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)
XIV	Black	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)
XV	Black	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,16%)
Total	Black	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)

Perception of SGB

Levels of Accountability and Responsibility

- Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 6 (100%)

Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
High Unsatisfactory 0 (0%)
Unsatisfactory:- 6 (100%)

SGB acknowledges that they are incapable of carrying out their tasks. They are further unable to make a distinction between their roles and that of school management. Encroachment in other's work parameter occur regularly.

Principal's perception

Levels of Accountability and Responsibility

- Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Highly Unsatisfactory:- 0 (0%)
- Unsatisfactory:- 6 (100%)

Highly satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
Satisfactory:- 0 (0%)
High Unsatisfactory 0 (0%)
Unsatisfactory:- 6 (100%)

School principals are fully aware that SGB are unable to carry out their responsibilities and as such may not be able to account for their activities. Principals are thus compelled to intervene and carry out responsibilities of the SGB. This make it more difficult for the school principals to maintain that division of governance and management functions.

6.4 Coping with workload

Further-more in terms of Section 19(2) of the SASA, the Head of Department must ensure that school principals and other officers of the education department render all the necessary assistance to the SGB in the performance of their functions in terms of the Act.

It has been discovered that in all schools visited, none has implemented the stipulations of Section 19(2). Training that has been offered so far by the Districts. This training is only given to few selected members of SGB. From workshops no feedback or training is given to those who did not manage to attend.

Furthermore in terms of Section 30(1), a governing body may establish committees, including an executive committee. These committees or committee may then be delegated certain functions to perform on behalf of SGB. This would then reduce workload or SGB. This will also enable SGB to nominate experts within their communities to assist where necessary.

Table 6.4.1 Former Education Departments

Former Educational Department	Compliance with Section 19(2) of S.A.S.A of 1996			Compliance with Section 30(1)		Principal's perception	
	Full Compliance	Partial Compliance	Non - Compliance	Established	Not Established	Still Copes	Can't Cope
Former Model C Schools	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	(26,1 %)	4 (26,1%)	0 (0%)	4 (26,1%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Delegates	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	(13,03%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	1 (6,1%)
Former House of Reps	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	(20%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)
Former D.E.T.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	(40%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)
Total	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	(100%)	6 (40%)	9 (60%)	5 (33,3%)	10 (66,6%)

Compliance with Section 19(2) of S.A.S.A of 1996 by school principals

- Full compliance:- 0 (0%)
- Partial compliance:- 0 (0%)
- Non-compliance:- 15 (100%)

Compliance with Section 30(1) by S.G.B.

- Established:- 6 (40%)
- Not established:- 9 (60%)

Owing to non-compliance with Section 19(2) of SASA, SGB especially in African schools are unable to cope with their work load, whilst in Former Model C and House of Delegates schools who SGB are less affected. This further burden the school principal in African schools who will have to act on behalf of their SGB. This in turn contravene the Act and the Constitution which requires that all decisions be democratically made. In some quarters, the school principal may be perceived as manipulating the SGB. Compliance with Section 30(1) in Former Model C and House of Delegates increases the efficiency of their SGB. In African schools, the failure to exploit this opportunity further hamper and impact negatively on the performance of their SGB.

6.5 Decision-making processes

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996 requires that all public educational institutions be democratically governed. Democratic governance implies that all decision should made include all role-players in legally constituted meetings. These meetings grant the opportunity to all stake-holders to contribute maximally in the

governance of their schools. Decision taken in such meetings will enjoy the support of the majority. Prior notice of meetings accompanied by an agenda is essential if such meetings are to succeed.

Table 6.5.1 Decision-making processes in all former Education departments

Name	Meeting Attendance			S.G.B. Participation			Democratic-decision making					
	Good	Fair	Bad	Highly Satisfac-tory	Satis-factory	Unsa-tisfacto ry	S.G.B. perception			Principal's perception		
							Always	Seldom	Not at all	Always	Seldon	Not at all
Former Model C	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Delegates	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Reps	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13,03 %)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13,03%)
Former D.E.T schools	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	4 (2,61%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	4 (2,61%)
Total	4 (2,61%)	5 (33,3%)	6 (40%)	4 (26,1%)	5 (33,3%)	6 (40%)	4 (26,1%)	5 (33,3%)	6 (40%)	4 (26,1%)	5 (33,3%)	6 (40%)

Decision-making processes

Meeting Attendance	Participation
- Good:- 4(26,1%)	Highly Satisfactory:- 4(26,1%)
- Fair:- 5 (33,3%)	Satisfactory:- 5(33,3%)
- Bad:- 6 (40%)	Unsatisfactory:- 6 (40%)

Perception of SGB of occasion when decisions taken were democratic

- Always:- 4 (26,1%)
- Seldom:- 5 (33,3)
- Not at all:- 6 (40%)

Principals perception of occasion when decision taken were democratic

- Always:- 4 (26,1%)
- Seldom:- 5 (33,3%)
- Not at all:- 6 (40%)

Looking at meeting attendance and degree of participation in Model C and House of Delegates schools decisions can be taken to be democratic. Whilst in African schools democratic decisions are rarely taken due to absenteeism at meetings and poor participation. Principals are then obliged to make unilateral decisions which are also a recipe for tensions and conflicts.

This state of affairs in African schools may be as the result of non-compliance with Section 19(2) as well as the mass exodus of literate and middle class African learners and parents to former advantaged schools. The impact of the legacy of previous school governance policy also played a major role in the creation of this state of affairs. SGB in former disadvantaged schools struggle to cope with their [illegible] and responsibilities.

6.6 Power relations emerging

In the past prior to 1994, school principals could make decisions without consulting with other stake-holders. Such powers were granted to them by the Head of Department of the relevant former education department. This placed the school principals in a significant powerful position. Such powers could also be easily abused. With the enactment of the S.A.S.A of 1996, all these powers were legally transferred to the SGB

This re-allocation of functions and powers as spelt out by Section 16(1) and 20(1) denoted significant reallocation of powers to the SGB. The powers which the principals used to have were then curtailed. This will undoubtedly impact significantly on the relationship between education professionals especially the school principal and his/her SGB. In the Potchefstroom/Klerksdorp region the principals are impacted in the following way:-

Table 6.6.1 Perception in former education departments after re-allocation of powers

Name	Governance Structure	Prior to 1994 Perception of S.G.B			Prior to 1994 Perception of School principal		
		More	Adequate	Less	More	Adequate	Less
Former Model C	S G.B	0 (0%)	4 (26,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Delegates	School Management Council P.T.S.A.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Reps.	School Management Council P.T.S.A.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
Former D.E.T.	School Management Council P.T.S.A.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)
Total		0 (0%)	4 (26,1%)	11 (73,3%)	2 (13,03%)	10 (66,6%)	3 (20%)

Name	Governance Structure	After implementation of S.A.S.A of 1996 Perception of S.G.B			After implementation of S.A.S.A of 1996 Perception of School principal		
		More	Adequate	Less	More	Adequate	Less
Former Model C	S.G.B	2 (13,03%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	1 (6,1%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Delegates	S.G.B	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	2 (13,03%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Former House of Reps.	S.G.B	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Former D.E.T.	S.G.B	2 (13,03%)	4 (26,1)%	0 (0%)	5 (33,3%)	1 (6,1%)	0 (0%)
Total		4 (26,1%)	11 (73,3%)	0 (0%)	11 (73,3%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)

Perception of SGB after implementation of SASA of 1996

- More (over empowered):- 2 (13,03%)
- Adequate (empowered):- 13 (86,1%)
- Less empowered:- 0 (0%)

Perception of school principal after implementation of SASA of 1996

- More (overempowered):- 11 (73,3%)
- Adequate (empowered):- 3 (20%)
- Less empowered:- 0 (0%)
- Absent:- 1 (6,1%)

Only 13 (86,1%) of SGB believe that they have been adequately empowered to carry out their tasks effectively, whilst 2 (13,03%) see this as over empowerment. Furthermore 11 (73,3%) of school principals perceive this as an over-empowerment of the SGB 3 (20%) say they are adequately empowered whilst 1 (6,1%) did not take part in the interview.

In African schools, this feeling of over-empowerment created friction and conflict between school management and SGB. Many wielded phases of policy-making at all phasis i.e. policy formulation, adoption and implementation. Failed at times to make distinction between governance and management functions.

In former Model C schools there is less conflict as demarcation of tasks are clear. Furthermore educators and learners are more concerned about teaching and learning that governance.

7. Intentional and unintentional failure to embrace certain reforms

Basically the new school governance policy's intention is to transform and restructure education governance in public schools. At institutional level these enormous tasks are to be pursued by the SGB and school management especially school principal.

The SASA of 1996 has spelt it out clearly what is expected of the SGB as well as school principal in order to attain this objective. It is thus expected of the SGB and school principals to comply with every Section of the Act with a view of realising the fundamental objective of the new school governance policy. It has become clear that certain SGB and school principals intentionally or unintentionally fail to comply with certain Sections of the SASA eg. Section 19(1). See tables 6.2.1 - 6.2.5 and Table 6.4.

The intentional and even unintentional failure to implement certain reforms certainly impact negatively on the performance of the SGB of schools concerned. However the impact differ considerably. Finally, even the extend at which these unintended effects counter act the basic objective vary greatly. African schools which are experiencing with the new policy for the first time are to be affected more.

CHAPTER 7

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This study was designed to explore critically the impact of school governing bodies on school principals of public secondary schools in the Klerksdorp / Potchefstroom region, and to highlight the dynamics of relationships and what it takes to promote partnerships that will contribute maximally to the effective governance of schools.

7.1 Summary of results

School governing bodies in general complied with legal and constitutional requirements, but with little or no attitudinal change. This lack of attitudinal change by both SGBs and school principals is cause of serious concern since the success of the new governance policy rests much on the leadership and guidance of the school principal as the professional manager and a member of the SGB. None the less the situation differed from ex-department to ex-department, and even from school to school within same former department.

The distinction between powers, roles and responsibilities of school governing bodies and school principals became more blurred than before. A situation that bred conflict and misunderstandings. This endangered working relationships between school principals and SGBs, especially in former disadvantaged schools.

In former Model C and House of Delegates schools, clear demarcation between functions of management and governors was acknowledged and maintained. As such working relationship remained cordial. School management and SGB worked

harmoniously side by side in the development of their schools. School governing bodies in former DET and House of Representatives were not ready or capable to carry out their tasks, thus this increased workload of school principals. In former Model C schools and House of Delegates, SGBs were functional and effective. School principals were less burdened by governance functions, and were involved in governance only as it is demanded by the Acts.

Lack of capacity was the main cause why SGBs in African schools were not ready or were incapable of carrying out their tasks. Non-compliance also with Section 19(2) and 30(1) by SGBs and school principals, further exacerbated the situation.

Concept of school governing bodies, if effectively implemented, will usher a new era of full representation in decision-making processes. Joint control and management of schools will enhance stability. This view was generally held in ex-DET, ex House of Representatives, and House of Delegates, mainly by SGBs and some school principals. It was difficult to attain this competency in African schools because the SGBs lack capacity, which is essential in enhancing full participation and the making of a well-informed decision. In former Model C schools democracy was long entrenched. This may be a temporary prevalent situation since the SGBs in these schools are still white dominated. It was easy to maintain the status quo. Involvement of other racial groups in governance structure is certainly going to disturb the prevailing stability.

The re-allocation of certain powers, roles and responsibilities from school principals to SGBs was interpreted and perceived by some school principals as empowerment

and even over-empowerment of SGBs over and above them. Some SGBs also interpreted this as their upliftment to a powerful position within school control structures. This was a catalyst for conflict and strife especially in African schools. Schools became centres of conflict rather than of learning. However, the significance of such an impact differed from ex-department to ex-department and even from school to school within same ex-department.

There is general failure by SGBs and school principals to embrace certain reforms through their non-compliance with certain sections of the Act, e.g. section 19(2) of SASA. This unintentional failure to embrace certain reforms may be apportioned to the impact of following dilemmas:- Accountability dilemma, Dilemma of self, Complexity dilemma, and the Search dilemma.

Intentional failure to embrace certain reforms may be due to resistance e.g. purposeful exclusion of other racial groups in the governance structure. This may stem out of the desire to maintain the status quo.

7.2 Conclusions

The findings of this study further support the assertion made by Thomas (1992, p.327) that:- "The dilemma of school reform arises from the relationship between school governors and education professionals within schools". Certainly transformation and restructuring of school governance in South Africa is likely to experience the same dilemma.

Secondly, Mortimore and Mortimore (1991, p.128) in turn alleged that:- "Under both the 1986 Act and the Education Reform Act of 1988, school governing bodies have increased powers and responsibilities, the exercise of which called for a rethinking of relationships between a head teacher and SGB". Like-wise the SASA of 1996, empowers the SGB through the re-allocation of governance powers to them. A review of relationship between school principals and SGB is a "must" if school principals and SGBs aim at attaining effective governance of their schools in line with the SASA of 1996 and the Constitution of RSA of 1996.

7.3 Recommendations

The ability of an educational institution to transform themselves, to grow in strength, or to have effective sense of purpose and commitment, is to a great extent dependent on the quality of leadership in the school. The leadership role in this regard is to be fulfilled by the SGB and the school principal if the new school governance policy is to succeed. As mentioned earlier their working relationship will have to be revisited and reviewed. The harmonious working relationships between these two partners is a catalyst for the success of this new policy. On the basis of the key role they have to play, mention is made of the key ideas they have to acknowledge in the execution of their tasks; viz.:-

(a) As Fullan (1992, p.169) puts it:- "Serious reform is not implementing a single innovation. It is changing the structure and culture of an organisation". Restructuring through compliance with legal and constitutional requirements alone is inadequate. In their endeavour to transform their schools they will have to alter values, norms and attitude

that governed old practices. As Robbins (1994, p.381) has indicated:- "In reality that the business of change is cultural transformation".

(b) Clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities may be difficult to be attained at the beginning of a working relationship. As a point of departure in enhancing good partnerships:- "An honest and open relationship has to be established through a process of teambuilding and parameter exploring by both SGB and school principal," (Mortimore and Mortimore, (1991, p.14). As Mortimore and Mortimore (1991, p.14) further put it:- "This newly evolving relationship (working relationship) between SGB and school principal is an area that needs to be handled with sympathy and understanding by both head and SGB".

(c) Furthermore, in reforms of such magnitude, there is likely to be some degree of tension as various parties try to define their responsibilities under the Act. It is a situation that demands patience, courtesy and understanding with one paramount concern being the quality of educational experience offered to the children. Acknowledgement and adherence to this will go a long way in solving conflicts and misunderstandings that may arise.

(d) For governors to be able to carry out their tasks effectively:- "It is essential that governors are informed people, aware of realities of the school. Such information will not come by osmosis". It is only through establishment of an honest and open relationship between head teachers

and school governors that information can be exchanged and governors welcomed in the school for they are part of it, not an add-on (Mortimore and Mortimore, 1991, p.14). This can be achieved by honestly implementing Section 19(2) of SASA of 1996.

(e) Typically, the head teacher will be the principal source of advice and guidance to governors. A governing body may become a proper decision-making forum only if the head is prepared to sponsor that development. This will increase their competence which will enable them to make well-informed decisions. However, school principals should guard against the manipulation of the decision-making processes.

(f) As the Constitution requires, all public schools should be governed democratically. SGBs and school principals should note that the relationship between educational change and democracy is not simply one of preparation for future participation in a democratic society. This is about consensus and participatory management. Consensus will enhance supportive relationships between governors, staff and parents which will in many determine the success of the school.

Finally these recommendations if acknowledged, accepted and adhered to by both parties, SGBs and school principals may enhance and sustain healthy relationships. With such relationships existing, effective partnerships may be forged which may contribute maximally to the effective governance of schools. Effective partnership if fully realised, promotes involvement, commitment and is generally characterised by:-

(i) mutual respect and trust

(ii) shared decision making

(iii) shared goals and values

(iv) common vision

(v) open communication

(vi) good teamwork

(vii) promotion of interest of partnership rather than the individual

(viii) respect for roles and responsibilities of different parties (Potgieter et. al., 1997, p.7)

Above all the object of participatory government in schools is to produce more effective school, rather than fulfillment for those who govern them (Sallis 1987, p.15).

APPENDIX A.1

143 Meadow STreet
POTCHEFSTROOM
2531

REF: MR M.E.K LEBETHE
TEL:- 018 2950200 (B)
018 2948841 (H)

20 AUGUST 1998

THE DISTRICT MANAGER

_____

_____

_____

_____

Sir/Madam

I hereby request your office to permit me to undertake an educational research in selected public Secondary Schools in your district, selected through a random sample , from 01 September until the completion of the project.

The research instruments that I intend employing in gathering the data are the following:-

i) interviews
ii) completion of questionaires.
iii) analysis of relevant documents and
iv) observation of S.G.B meetings and workgroups meetings.

My research topic is as follows:-

"SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES: THE IMPACT ON SCHOOL PRINCIPALS".

Respondents will be governors and principals in schools selected. Attached is a certificate of registration from my university and a list of selected schools in your district.

Your quick response to this request will enable me to make appropiate arrangements with schools selected. I hope that my request will be favourably attended to, and promise to abide and observe conditions that may be put forth.

Thanking you in advance

Yours Faithfully

mr Lebethe

(PROSPECTIVE M.Ed FINALIST)

M.E.K LEBETHE

for verification and validation before submission.


Lastly it is my believe that your positive response may assist me to finally acquire my MEd degree, but above all the results emanating from this research will reveal successes and failures achieved so far.

With sustainment and further improvement of successes achieved as well as remedying of failures our joint effort will contribute in the better governance of our schools.

Hoping for a positive response.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours Faithfully



(MEd Finalist)

M.E.K LEBETHE (MR)

APPENDIX A.2

143 Meadow Street
Potchefstroom
2531

REF: MR M.E.K LEBETHE
TEL NO: 018 2950200(W)
018 2948841(H)
FAX NO: 018 2950200

08 September 1998

The Chairperson/School Principal

_____

_____

_____

Sir/Madam

I hereby request your school Governing Body/School to permit me to conduct an educational research project in your institution which will be conducted in two phases in the following languages (English/Tswana/Afrikaans).

PROGRAMME	ACTION/ACTIVITY	TARGETED DATE
a) Phase I	Completion of questionaires	16/09/98 - 23/09/98
b) Phase II	Interviews and observations at meetings	15/10/98 - 15/11/98

The title of my educational research project is: "School Governing Bodies: The Impact on School Principals".

My respondents per school will be the following:-

(i) School Principal

(ii) S.G.B members (i.e)
- 1 parent governer (preferably chairperson)
- 1 educator governer.
- 1 non-educator governer.
- 1 learner governer

The respondents will be free to choose communication media most conducive to them.

Attached to this letter of request are the following documents:-

(i) permission from relevant district office/circuit office.

(ii) certificate of registration from my university

In case you grant me permission to pursue my project in your institution I promise to respect the intergrity of your school and adhere to the following:-

(i) Not to mention the name of your school, or reveal the identity of respondents in my project from your school without your permission if need be and

(ii) to abide by conditions that you or your institution/S.G.B may put forward

(iii) any data collected from your institution will be made available to you

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NORTH WEST PROVINCE

LICHTENBURG DISTRICT OFFICE
PRIVATE BAG X12005, LICHTENBURG,2740 -CNR MELVILL & BANTJIES STREET, FORMO BUILDING. PHONE(018) 632-7070/43/44/79 FAX (018) 632-4288

Enquiries: Mrs C.M. Motlhabane

1998-09-03

The Principal
Ipelegeng High School
P.O. Box 249
SCHWEIZER RENEKE
2780

ATTENTION: MR D. BAIJNATH

SUBJECT: M. Ed RESEARCH - MR K. LEBETHE - IPELEGENG HIGH SCHOOL

Permission has been granted to Mr K. Lebethe to conduct his research in the District.

We appeal to everybody to give him necessary support in his endeavour, in line with our support given to every individual who improves his/her qualifications.

C.M. MOTLHABANE
DISTRICT MANAGER

APPENDIX B.2

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION / NORTH WEST PROVINCE
DEPARTEMENT VAN ONDERWYS / NOORDWES PROVINSIE

POTCHEFSTROOM DISTRICT OFFICE / POTCHEFSTROOM DISTRIKKANTOOR

P/Bag X919, Teemane Building, Greyling Street, Potchefstroom 2520 -
P/Sak X919, Teemane Gebou, Greylingstraat. Tel. (018) 2973810, Faks. (018) 2977439

TO: THE PRINCIPAL
CHAIRMAN S.G.B.

31 August 1998

PERSMISSION FOR AN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Permission has been granted to Mr M.E.K. LEBETHE to conduct an Educational research in the selected Public schools in our District.

Please give him the assistance that he requires from your school.

Yours faithfully

S.N.H. KOMANE : CIRCUIT MANAGER

DEPT. OF EDUCATION ART, CULTURE SPORT AND RECREATION
CIRCUIT MANAGER / KRINGBESTUURDER
PRIVATE BAG / PRIVAATSAK X 1266
2520 POTCHEFSTROOM
1998-08-03
POTCHEFSTROOM KRINGKANTOOR
POTCHEFSTROOM 0025
DEPT ONDERWYS KUNS KULTUUR SPORT EN REKREASIE

APPENDIX B.3

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NORTH WEST PROVINCE

PRIVATE BAG X2044, MMABATHO, 2735 - DR. JAMES MOROKA DRIVE,
GARONA BUILDING PHONE (0140) 87 3428 FAX (0140) 87 3775

Ref. no.
Enquiries : J.C. MOTAUNG
Tel. No. : 018-4627523
Fax. No. : 018-4627529

Klerksdorp District
Private Bag A23
KLERKSDORP.
2570

TO : MR. M.E.K. LEBETHE

FROM : DISTRICT MANAGER
KLERKSDORP DISTRICT

DATE : 07 SEPTEMBER 1998

SUBJECT : PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH


Permission is hereby given to conduct an educational research on "School Governing Body : The impact on principals" at the following educational institutions as requested :-

Are-Fadimeheng
Thuto-Thebe
Tshedimosetso
Klerksdorp Secondary School
Hoërskol Schoonspruit
Alabama Secondary
Gekombineerdeskool Vaaloewer

Your research should however, not disrupt the programmes of the schools and arrangements should be made with the principal of the school concerned before the school is visited.

J.C. MOTAUNG
DISTRICT MANAGER
KLERKSDORP DISTRICT

Figure 3 : *PUPIL TEACHER DATA ACCORDING TO THE FIVE REGIONS PROPOSED BY PROF H S GEYSER*



Educational Research Questionaire (Phase I)

Topic:- "School Governance Bodies: The impact on school principals".

I Bibliographical detail on school principals

a	NAME (IN FULL)				
b	GENDER	MALE		FEMALE	
c	QUALIFICATIONS	ACADEMIC:-			
		PROFESSIONAL:-			
d	DATE				
e	YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION				
f	RACIAL GROUP	WHITE	BLACK	COLOURED	INDIAN

II School's Information

a	TYPE	PUBLIC		PRIVATE	
b	NO. OF LEARNERS				
c	NO. OF EDUCATORS				
d	MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	ENGLISH ONLY	AFRIKAANS ONLY	DUAL (ENGLISH & AFRIKAANS)	
e	PRINCIPAL'S RACE				
f	FORMER CONTROLLING AUTHORITY	EX MODEL C. FORMER T.E.D	EX D.E.T	HOUSE OF DELEGATES	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
g	FORMER EDUC. DEPARTMENT	SCHOOL MANAGE-MENT COUNCIL	P.T.S.A	GOVERNING BODY	NON-EXISTANCE

III SECTION A

NB:- Mark a cross (x) next to the correct answer

1) Does your school have a legally constituted S.G.B, established in terms of S.A.S.A of 1997?

❑ Yes ❑ No

2) If Yes! Which stake holders are represented in the S.G.B

(i) parents
(ii) educators
(iii) learners
(iv) non-educators
(v) community through co-opted members
(vi) ex-officio/school principal

❑ (i), (ii), (iii) and (v)
❑ (i), (ii), (iii) and (v)
❑ (i), (ii), (iii) and (v)
❑ (i), (ii) and (v)
❑ all of the above

3) Are governors in the S.G.B democratically elected?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Uncertain

4) If No! How did they obtain membership of the S.G.B?

❑ through co-option ❑ volunteering ❑ uncertain

5) Mark subcommittees established within the S.G.B, if available

❑ financial ❑ executive ❑ interviewing
❑ fundraising ❑ projects ❑ none of the above

6) (i) What role do you play within the SGB / subcommittees?

❑ chairperson ❑ secretary ❑ treasurer ❑ ex-officio

(ii) Playing the above-mentioned role, do you think you can contribute effectively in the governance of your school?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No
- ❑ Uncertain

(iii) If Yes! Why?_____

_____

_____

(iv) If No! Why? _____

_____

_____

7) (i) Whose responsible for the governance in your school?

- ❑ Chairperson of S.G.B
- ❑ School Governing Body
- ❑ Chairperson of S.G.B school principal
- ❑ Dept. of Education

(ii) Does the SGB as presently constituted, have the capacity to govern your institution effectively?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

(iii) If Yes! Why? _____

_____

_____

(iv) If No! Why? _____

_____

_____

8) What are roles and responsibilities of S.G.B? (Mark 6 out of 10)

- ❑ meet at least once a month
- ❑ manage assets and school funds
- ❑ determine school policies
- ❑ organize all activities which support teaching and learning
- ❑ develop goals and objectives for the school
- ❑ perform and carry out professional (management) functions
- ❑ day to day administration and organisation of teaching and learning

- ❑ ensure financial records are audited
- ❑ administer and control school facilities
- ❑ convene an annual general meeting of parents

9) Whose responsible for professional management of the school?

- ❑ S.G.B
- ❑ School principal
- ❑ Dept. of Education
- ❑ Chairperson of S.G.B

10) What constitute professional management of a school? (Mark 5 out of 7)

- ❑ perform and carry out professional (management) functions
- ❑ decides on textbooks and educational materials to be bought
- ❑ develop school policies
- ❑ organize all activities which supports teaching and learning
- ❑ manage personnel and finances
- ❑ adopt a constitution
- ❑ day to day administration and organisation of teaching and learning

11) Mark constitutional principles embodied in the S.A.S.A of 1997, and which are to be fully acknowledged by S.G.B and school management. (Mark any 4)

- ❑ The right to an education
- ❑ The rule of law will apply
- ❑ Partnership
- ❑ Achievement of equality and advancement of human rights
- ❑ Freedom of religion
- ❑ Language and culture
- ❑ Admission policy

12) Mark 4 main values that the new constitution upholds, and which must be taken into account also in the governance of your school?

- ❑ achievement of equality and advancement of human rights and freedom
- ❑ regular S.G.B meetings
- ❑ democratic government, accountability and openness
- ❑ non-racialism and high non-sexism
- ❑ rule of law applies

13) How often are S.G.B meetings held per quarter in your school?

- ❑ twice
- ❑ once
- ❑ very often
- ❑ seldom
- ❑ less seldom

14) (i) What role do you play in the preperation of the meeting?

_____
_____
_____

(ii) Why do you play the specific role identified?

_____
_____
_____

15) Who draws up the agenda of the S.G.B meetings?

- ❑ secretary
- ❑ chairperson + school principal
- ❑ school governors
- ❑ school principal

16) (i) Who chairs the meeting of the S.G.B?

- ❑ chairperson
- ❑ secretary
- ❑ treasurer
- ❑ school principal

(ii) In yur opinion is the chairperson effective enough to chair the meetings?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

(iii) If Yes! Why? _____
_____
_____

(iv) If No! Why? And what can be done? _____
_____
_____

17) Who/what dictates issues to be discussed in the meeting?

- ❑ agenda
- ❑ chairperson
- ❑ school principal
- ❑ S.G.B

18) (i) When is the agenda drawn and sent to governors?

- ❑ 14 days before
- ❑ 7 days before
- ❑ uncertain
- ❑ day prior to meeting

(ii) What role do you play in these respect?

_____

_____

_____

19) In order to enhance effectiveness through compliance with meeting requirements. What role do you play in their respect?

- ❑ supportive
- ❑ guide / advice
- ❑ dorminate
- ❑ dictate
- ❑ passive
- ❑ (i) and (ii)

20) Subcommittees established within the S.G.B are accountable to whom?

- ❑ parents
- ❑ S.G.B
- ❑ chairperson of S.G.B
- ❑ school principal
- ❑ none of the above

21) Are you a member of any subcommittee?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

22) If Yes! In which committee do you participate?

- ❑ Finance committe
- ❑ Executive committee
- ❑ Interviewing committee
- ❑ Projects committee
- ❑ All of the above

23) If Yes! to the above. What role do you play?

- ❑ supportive
- ❑ dominant
- ❑ guidance/advice
- ❑ passive
- ❑ (i) and (iii)

24) (i) Whatever role you play does it enable you to contribute effectively in the governance of your school?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

(ii) If Yes! Why? _____

_____

_____

(iii) If No! Why? _____

_____

_____

25) (i) Are minutes of meetings held, well documented and well kept?

- ❑ No
- ❑ Yes
- ❑ Uncertain

(ii) If Yes! Whose responsible for documentation and safekeeping?

- ❑ secretary
- ❑ school principal
- ❑ chairperson
- ❑ S.G.B

26) (i) Are duties of office-bearers in the SGB, well spelt out in School's Constitution and School Policy?

- ❑ No
- ❑ Yes

(ii) If Yes! Are all governors adhering to this arrangement, and how?

_____
_____
_____

(iii) If No! Why? _____
_____
_____

(iv) If No! What do you intend doing to ensure adherence with School's Constitution and School Policy?

_____
_____
_____

27) (i) Do all participants ensure that decision been made are democratic?

- ❑ strongly certain
- ❑ certain
- ❑ uncertain
- ❑ strongly uncertain

(ii) When are decisions made? and by whom?

a) _____
_____

b) _____
_____

28) (i) In your opinion is participation by all stake-holders allowed and promoted?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

(ii) If Yes! How is this been done? (Mark with x - the most appropiate answers/s)

- ❑ promotion of objectives of entire S.G.B rather than particular group
- ❑ open and honest relationship
- ❑ through concensus
- ❑ use of common language
- ❑ all of the above

(iii) If No! Why is this not the case? (Mark with x - the most appropiate answer/s)

- ❑ promotion of group objective rather than organisational objective
- ❑ abuse of majority representation
- ❑ abuse of academic and professional know-how
- ❑ language
- ❑ all of the above

29) Is there any working relationship/or any other relationship established with other S.G.B in other schools / even these from former depts?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

30) (i) If Yes! With what schools, and in what area?

_____

_____

_____

(ii) If No! Why is there no working relationship with other S.G.B?

_____

_____

_____

(iii) In your opinion, is the relationship if established, effective enough to promote values and principle of the constitution?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

(iv) If Yes! How? _____

_____

(v) If No? Why? _____

_____

31) What have you done/intend doing in the light of your professional expertise, academic competence, obligation, do to develop the capacity of your S.G.B?

- ❑ regular workshopping of governors
- ❑ has jointly designed a development programme
- ❑ support and practice participatory democracy
- ❑ see governors as important partners in school governors
- ❑ all of the above

32) (i) Do you think that the present S.G.B are capable/will be capable of carrying out their tasks effectively?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

(ii) If No! Why and what can be done? _____

_____

_____

(iii) If Yes! Why? _____

_____

_____

33) In your opinion, what/who holds the key to the success of S.G.B?

_____

_____

_____

34) How may that success be achieved and sustained?

_____

_____

_____

35) Who stands to benefit when the S.G.B manages to govern effectively, and how?

_____

_____

_____

Educational Research Questionaire (Phase I)

Topic:- School Governing Bodies: The Impact on School Principals.

I Bibliographical detail of governors

a	Name (in full)			
b	GENDER	MALE	FEMALE	
c	SCHOOL			
d	TYPE OF STAKE HOLDER	PARENT	LEARNER	NON-EDUCATOR
		EDUCATORS	CO-OPTED MEMBER	
e	ECONOMIC-ACTIVITY	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	SCHOLAR
f	TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT (STATE)			

II School Information

a	TYPE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
b	NO. OF PUPILS				
c	NO. OF TEACHERS				
d	MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	ENGLISH	AFRIKAANS	DUAL (ENGLISH & AFRIKAANS)	
e	PRINCIPALS RACE				
f	FORMER EDUC. DEPT.	EX. T.ED MODEL C	EX. D.ET	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	HOUSE OF DELIGATES
g	FORMER CONTROLLING AUTHORITY	P.T.S.A	MANAGEMENT COUNCIL	GOVERNING BODY	
		NON-EXISTANT	OTHER:-		

SECTION A

Make a cross (x) next to the correct answer.

1) Does the school have a legally constituted SGB, established in terms of the S.A.S.A of 1997?

❑ Yes ❑ No

2) If Yes! Which stakeholder are represented in the S.G.B?

(i) parents
(ii) educators
(iii) non-educators
(iv) learners
(v) community through co-opted members.

❑ (i), (ii), (iii) and (v)
❑ (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv)
❑ (i) - (iii)
❑ (i), (ii) and (v)
❑ all of these above

3) Are governors in the SGB democratically elected?

❑ Yes ❑ No

4) If No! How did they obtain membership of SGB?

❑ through co-option ❑ volunteering ❑ uncertain

5) Mark/Indicate subcommittees established within the S.G.B., if available?

❑ Financial committee
❑ Executive committee
❑ Interviewing committee
❑ Fundraising committee
❑ Projects committee
❑ None of the above

6) (i) If established, are they functional and effective?

❑ Yes ❑ No

(ii) If Yes! Why? _____

_____

_____

(iii) If No! Why? And what can be done? _____

_____

_____

7) What role does the principal play within the SGB / subcommittees?

❑ Chairperson
❑ Secretary
❑ Treasurer
❑ Ex-officio

8) (i) In your opinion is the role being played by the school principal, allowing the SGB to carry out its tasks successfully?

❑ Yes ❑ Uncertain ❑ No

(ii) If Yes! How? _____

_____

_____

_____

(iii) If No! Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

9) Whose responsible for the governance of the school?

❑ Chairperson of S.G.B
❑ School Governing Body
❑ Chairperson of S.G.B ans school principal
❑ Dept. of Education

10) What are roles and responsibilities of S.G.B? (Mark 6 out of 10)

- ❑ meet at least once every term.
- ❑ manage assets and school fund
- ❑ determine school policies
- ❑ organize all activities which supports teaching and learning
- ❑ develop goals and objectives
- ❑ perform and carry out professional (management) functions
- ❑ day to day administration and organisation of teaching and learning
- ❑ ensure financial records are audited
- ❑ administer and control school facilities
- ❑ convene an annual general meeting of parents

11) Whose resonsible for professional management of the school?

- ❑ S.G.B
- ❑ School principal
- ❑ Dept. of Education
- ❑ Chairperson of S.G.B .

12) What constitute professional management of a school? (mark 5 out of 7)

- ❑ peform and carry out professional (management) functions
- ❑ decides on textbooks and educational materials to be bought
- ❑ develop school policies
- ❑ organize all activities which supports teaching and learning
- ❑ manage personnel and finances
- ❑ adopt a constitution
- ❑ day to day administration and organisation of teaching and learning

13) Mark constitutional principles embodied in the S.A.S.A of 1997, which are bo be fully acknowledged by S.G.B and school management

- ❑ The right to an education
- ❑ The rule of law will apply
- ❑ Achievement of equality and advancement of human rights
- ❑ Freedom of religion
- ❑ Language and culture
- ❑ Admission policy

14) Mark/Indicate 4 main values which the new Constitution upholds, and which must be taken into account also, in the governance of the school?

- ❑ achievement of equiality and advancement of human rights and freedoms
- ❑ regular S.G.B meetings
- ❑ democratic government, accountability and openness
- ❑ non-racialism and non-sexism
- ❑ rule of law applies

SECTION B

15) How often are S.G.B. meetings held?

- ❑ twice
- ❑ three
- ❑ once
- ❑ very often
- ❑ seldom

16) Who draws up the agenda of S.G.B meeting?

❑ Secretary ❑ Chairperson & School Principal ❑ Chairperson ❑ School Principal

17) Is the school principal a member of any subcommittee?

❑ Yes ❑ No

18) If Yes! In which committee does he participate?

- ❑ Financial committee
- ❑ Executive committee
- ❑ Interviewing committee
- ❑ Projects committee
- ❑ All of the above

19) If Yes to the above, what roles does he/she play?

- ❑ supportive
- ❑ dominant
- ❑ guidance / advice
- ❑ passive
- ❑ (i) and (iii)

20) Are minutes of meetings held well documented and well kept?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Uncertain

21) If Yes! Whose responsible for documentation and safe-keeping?

- ❑ secretary
- ❑ school principal
- ❑ chairperson
- ❑ S.G.B

22) Are duties of office-bearers in the S.G.B well spelt out in the School's Constitution and school policy?

❑ No ❑ Yes ❑ Uncertain

23) (i) If Yes! Are all governors adhering to this arrangement / division of tasks?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Uncertain

(ii) If Yes! How? _____

_____

_____

(iii) If No ! Why? _____

_____

_____

24) Who chairs the meeting of the S.G.B?

- ❑ chairperson
- ❑ secretary
- ❑ treasurer
- ❑ school principal

25) What/who dictates issues to be discussed in the meeting?

- ❑ agenda
- ❑ chairperson
- ❑ school principal
- ❑ S.G.B

26) When is the agenda drawn and sent to other governors?

- ❑ 14 days before
- ❑ 7 days before the meeting
- ❑ uncertain
- ❑ 1 day prior to the meeting

27) In order to enhance effectiveness of meetings, through compliance with meeting requirements (procedures) what role does the principal play?

- ❑ supportive
- ❑ guide/advice
- ❑ dorminate
- ❑ passive
- ❑ (i) and (ii)

28) Do all participants ensure that decisions taken are democratic?

- ❑ strongly agree
- ❑ agree
- ❑ disagree
- ❑ strongly disagree

29) If you (disagree / strongly disagree) how are decisions been made?

_____

_____

_____

_____

30) (i) In your opinion, is participation by all stake holders allowed and promoted?

❑ Yes ❑ No

(ii) If Yes! How is this beirg done? Mark correct answer/s

❑ promotion of objectives of entire S.G.B rather than particular group
❑ open and honest relationship
❑ through consensus
❑ use of common language
❑ all of the above

(iii) If No! Why is this not the case? Mark correct answer/s

❑ promotion of individual/group objective rather organisational objective
❑ abuse of majority representation
❑ abuse of academic and professional know-how
❑ language barrier
❑ all of the above

31) What does the school principal, in the light of his professinal expertise, academic comptetence, do to develop the capacit of the S.G.B?
(Mark correct answer/s)

❑ regular workshopping of school governors
❑ has designed a Development Programme for school governors jointly with S.G.B
❑ supports and practices participatory democracy
❑ sees governors as important partners in school governance
❑ none of the above
❑ all of the above

32) How does the S.G.B cope with increased roles and responsibilities?

❑ through delegation of some roles and responsibilities
❑ subcommittees
❑ uncertain
❑ frequent meetings

33) (i) Do you think that the present S.G.B are/will be capable of carrying out their tasks effectively?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Uncertain

(ii) If No! Why? What can be done?

_____

_____

_____

(iii) If Yes! Why?

_____

_____

_____

34) (i) What/who holds the key to the success of S.G.B?

_____

_____

_____

(ii) How may that success be achieved and sustained?

_____

_____

_____

35) Who stands to benefit when the S.G.B manages to govern effectively? and How?

_____

_____

_____

Educational Research (Phase III)

Observation Checklist of Formal Meetings

Topic:- "School Governance Bodies: The impact on school Principals"

A School Details

1. Name of school			
2. Type	Public		Private
3. Former Controlling Body			
4. Date			
5. Medium of Instruction	English	Afrikaans	Dual
6. School Learner Population (Majority)			

B. Process of Meeting?

1) Who conducts the meeting?

❑ Chairperson ❑ School Principal ❑ Secretary

2) Role played by school principal

❑ Ex-officio ❑ Deput Chairperson ❑ Chairperson

3)

❑ Equal ❑ Unequal ❑ Not clear

4) Does the meeting have an agenda?

❑ Yes ❑ No

5) Does every member have a written agenda?

❑ Yes ❑ No

6) Are discussions based on the agenda?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little

7) Do member indicate a prior knowledge of agenda or meeting?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little

Remarks:- _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

C. Interaction between members

8. Is the chairperson able to conduct the meeting?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little

9) Does his/her conduct of meeting allowing full participation by all stake-holder

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little

10) If the interaction between members free and open?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little

11) Does the interaction promote good relationship between different stakeholders'

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little ❑ Very much

Remarks:- _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

D. Nature of Contribution

12) How relevant is the contribution of members to the agenda and governance-related issues?

❑ Very relevant ❑ Relevant ❑ Irrelevant ❑ Very irrelevant

13) Does their different contribution also promote good relationships between all stake-holders?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Very little ❑ Not at all

14) Who draws up the agenda of the S.G.B meetings?

❑ None ❑ School Principal
❑ Chairperson ❑ Parents

15) Are decision taken democratic i.e. enjoying the approval of the majority

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Not much ❑ Not at all

16) Are issues discussed well comprehended by all participants?

❑ Not at all ❑ Very little ❑ No ❑ Yes

17) Are issues earnest and thoroughly discussed before conclusions taken?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Not at all

18) Are decision taken minuted and recorded?

❑ Yes ❑ No ❑ Not clear

Remarks:- _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

END / FINISH

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (PHASE 2)

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Topic:- "School Governing Bodies:- The impact on school principals".

A. School Details

1	Name of School			
2	Type	Public	Private	
3	No of teachers			
4	Learners Enrollment			
5	Medium of Instruction	Afrikaans	English	Dual
6	Principal's Name			
7	Former Controlling authority			
8	Date of interview			
9	Former Education Dept.			

B. Theme One:- New Governance Policy, Requirements and Stipulations

1. In your opinion is the new school governance policy brought to life by the S.A.S.A of 1997, ideal for the transformation and restructuring of education governance in South Africa?

   (i) ☐ Yes

   (ii) ☐ No

   If Yes! How and Why?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   If No! Why?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. How does the Act itself (i.e. S.A.S.A of 1997) affect you as a school manager / leader, in terms of traditional role, that school principals to fulfill?

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Does the restructuring and transformation that the S.A.S.A of (1997) aim to bring about, likely to bring about effective school governance?

(i) If Yes! How?

_____

_____

_____

(ii) If No! Why?

_____

_____

_____

4. The Act requires that, parents, educators, the community, non-teaching staff be fully represented in the S.G.B. What is your opinion regarding the representation of stake-holders mentioned above?

(a) parents:- _____

_____

_____

(b) educators:- _____

_____

_____

(c) community:- _____

_____

_____

(d) non-teaching staff:- _____

_____

_____

5. Properly constituted S.G.B, are expected to meet this requirement. In your view are stake-holders mentioned above important in the life of each school? Briefly detail importance of each stake-holders?

(a) Parents:- _____

_____

_____

(b) Educators:- _____

_____

_____

(c) Non-teaching staff:- _____

_____

_____

(d) Community:- _____

_____

_____

6. Does your role and responsibility as defined/prescribed by the title "Ex-officio" within the S.G.B, place you, in a better position to contribute effectively in the governance of your school? Explain:

_____

_____

_____

7. Irrespective of unequal numerical representation, vested authority, professional expertise, the S.A.S.A of 1997 and the constitutional principles expect equal participation by all stakeholders within the S.G.B. Do you foresee any problem in this regard?

_____

_____

_____

8. This requirement if not carefully handled, may create problems in the management (day to day) of a school. How do you handle this dilemma? Explain:

_____

_____

_____

9. Traditional relationships are bound to be influenced. Outline scenario emerging:-

(a) School principal v/s parents:-

_____

_____

(b) School principal v/s educators:-

_____

_____

(c) School principal v/s non-teaching staff:-

_____

_____

(d) School principal v/s learners:-

_____

_____

10. (i). The S.A.S.A of 1997, aims to restructure and transformation educational governance in South Africa. In your opinion what has the Act accomplish so far in your school? Explain:

(ii). The accomplishment (negative or positive) how does it impact on your school governance?

(iii) (Negative or positive) how does it impact on your relationship with governors.

C Theme Two:- Decision-making processes

1. The S.A.S.A of 1997 delegated certain roles and responsibilities to S.G.B. Do your governors know and understand their roles and responsibilities, as outlined by the Act.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Uncertain

1.1 If Yes! How where they informed? and by whom?

1.2 If No! Why?

2. Through representation on the S.G.B all the stake-holders can share in the decisions of such a body. This imply that the school principal may not decide alone on governance matters. How does this impact upon your management?

_____
_____
_____

3. How do you ensure that decision made are well-informed and democratic?

_____
_____
_____

4. The Act deprives you the voting rights within the S.G.B. This does not mean that you may not participate in the deliberations. Does this not undermine your authority as the educational manager in your school? Explain:

_____
_____
_____

5. It is expected of you to supply the governors with quality information, that will help them to make quality decisions. How do you ensure that your participation is not perceived as been manipulation of S.G.B?

_____
_____
_____

6. Meetings provide an appropriate platform to make democratic decisions. Poor attendance or non-attendance may prolong the processes through postponement of meetings. How do you adress this mishap?

_____
_____
_____

7. The inability by the S.G.B to make decision may hamper effective governance of an institution. As a school principal what do you do to ensure that they have the capacity to make quality decisions?

_____
_____
_____

8. In your opinion are the decision-making processes in your school in line with the stipulation of the Act? Yes / No
Elaborate:

_____
_____

9. Is unequal numerical representation of stake-holders within SGB not been abused? If Yes, by whom and why?

10. Educators, learners, etc. should also endorse decisions made? Your opinion in this regard:

D Theme three: Levels of responsibility and accountability

1. According to S.A.S.A 1997, the SGB is responsible for school governance and the school principal for the management of the school. This imply that the responsibility and accountability should be shared. (joint responsibility) Do the governors in the SGB acknowledge and accept that?

☐ Yes . ☐ No

1.1 If Yes! How do you acknowledge that?

1.2 If No! Why?

1.3 If No! What are you doing to make them acknowledge and accept that?

2. Acceptance and acknowledgment of certain levels of responsibilities and accountability may be viewed as over-empowerment or disempowerment by any sector. What is the position in your school?

2.1 Whatever the perception existing due to influence of above statement. What impact does this perception have on you as the educational manager?

3. A likelihood exists that separation of roles and responsibilities may become a problem. If this exist in your school, how does it impact upon your performance?

4. If it exists/existed, what do you do/have you done to end it?

5. Acknowledging and accepting their responsibility and accountability, do they comply and foster good partnership between them and school principal?

5.1 If Yes! How?

5.2 If No! What do you do to remedy that?

6. At this stage what is the situation in your school?

7. What is its impact on your performance as educational manager?

E. Theme Four:- Power Relations Emerging

1. Prior to 1994, the school governance policy placed governance matters in the hands of the school principal. Consequently this placed school principals in a very powerful positions. The S.A.S.A. of 1997 has subsequently removed all governance related responsibilities from school principals to S.G.B. What is your opinion in this regard ?

2. How do different stake holders within the S.G.B view this significant change ?

a. Parents : _____

_____

_____

b. Educators : _____

_____

_____

c. Learners : _____

_____

_____

d. Non - educators : _____

_____

_____

e. Community : _____

_____

_____

_____

3. Does their conflicting if not same view of such change, have impact on your performance as educational manager ?

Yes ☐ or No ☐

a. If Yes ! How ? _____

_____

_____

_____

4. Unequal numeral representation, academic superiority, vested authority may divide the S.G.B. into powerful groups. What is the position in your school ?

_____

_____

_____

5. In response to question 4, does the existing situation have an impact in your performance as an educational manager ? Explain

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. As an educational manager / leader you have to guard against emergence of such unhealthy groups. How do you envisage dealing pro-actively with such a problem within your school?

7. If such a dilemma already exists within your SGB, how does it impact upon your performance?

F. Theme five:- Coping with new responsibilities

1. In addition to roles and responsibilities that SGB have to fulfill, there are four basic principles of the constitution that the SGB have to consider in their governance of their school, i.e. (right to basic education, transformation and democratization of education, no discrimination on basis of colour, creed, sex or race and right to further education). How does the compliance with these principles impact upon your school?

2. If the above has an impact on your school, how does this further impact upon your performance?

3. What committees have been established to help us your SGB cope with new roles and responsibilities?

4. If no subcommittees have been established? Why and when will they be established?

5. If there are committees within the SGB in your school, how do they impact on your performance and that of SGB?

6. Is there training offered to SGB?, by whom and when?

7. Does this training have any impact on performance of SGB?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(a) If Yes! How?

(b) If No! Why?

8. According to S.A.S.A of 1997, the school principal is expected to assist in the capacity building of SCB. What have you done in this respect?

9. If Yes! What is the impact of your training / workshops?

10. If No! When are you going to start?

11. Schools may benefit from each other in matters related to governance, management etc. SGB from various communities may co-orporate and share their skills and expertise. Has your school / SGB develop any relationship with other SGB from other schools in other communities? If yes, what impact does that have on your school?, and on your performance?

G. Theme Six:- Attitudes and existing relationships

1. Attitudes and prevalent relationships including your own, may threaten or hamper effective governance in your school. How do you intend influencing other stake-holders to change their attitudes and relationships? Explain:

2. Not only the other stake-holder are expected to change. As an educational leader you are expected to occupy the drivers seat in this respect. How do you intend accomplishing this objective?

3. In addition to attitudes and relationships, cultures, ethos, values and norms that characterised old governance policies will have to change. What is the position in your school in this respect? Explain:

4. How does the existing situation in terms of the above-mentioned impact on your performance?, and that of SGB in general?

5.1 If the impact is negative how do you intend to influence it to become positive? Explain:

_____
_____
_____

5.2 If the impact is positive. How do you intend sustaining and improving it? Explain:

_____
_____
_____

6. Finally in your opinion will the present governance policy in general, contribute towards the restructuring and transformation of education governance in South Africa?

6.1 If Yes! Explain:

_____
_____
_____
_____

6.2 If No! Explain:

_____
_____
_____
_____

THE END

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (PHASE 2)

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR GOVERNORS

Topic:- "School Governing Bodies: The impact on School Principals"

A. School Details

1	Name of School			
2	Type	Private	Public	
3	No. of teachers			
4	Learner Enrollment			
5	Medium Instruction	English	Dual	Afrikaans
6	Type of Stake holder			
7	Former controlling authority			
8	Date of interview			
9	Former Educ. Dept.			

B. Theme one:- New Governance Policy, requirements and stipulations

1. In your opinion, is the new school governance policy brought to life by the S.A.S.A of 1997, ideal for the transformation and restructuring of education governance in South Africa?

(i) ☐ Yes

(ii) ☐ No

If Yes! How and Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

If No! Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Does the restructuring and transformation that the S.A.S.A of 1997 aim to bring about, likely to bring out effective school governance?

(i) If Yes! How?

_____
_____
_____
_____

(ii) If No! How?

_____
_____
_____
_____

3. The Act requires that parents, educators, the community, non-teaching staff be fully represented in the SGB. What is your opinion / or of the SGB regarding the representation of stakeholders mentioned above.

(a) parents:-

_____
_____
_____

(b) educators:-

_____
_____
_____

(c) community:-

_____
_____
_____

(d) non-teaching staff:-

_____
_____
_____

4. Is the role and responsibility of the principal as defined / prescribed by the title "Ex-officio" within SGB allowing him / her to contribute effectively in the governance of the school? Explain:-

_____
_____
_____
_____

5. Irrespective of unequal numerical representation, vested authority, professional expertise, the S.A.S.A of 1997 and the constitutional principles expect equal participation by all stake-holders within the S.G.B. What is the situation within your S.G.B?

6. This requirement if not carefully handled may create problems in the management i.e. (day to day) of a school. How does the S.G.B handle this possible dilemma? Explain:-

7. Traditional relationships are bound to be influenced. Outline scenarios emerging

(a) school principal v/s parents:-

(b) school principal v/s educators:-

(c) school principal v/s non-teaching staff:-

(d) school principal v/s learners:-

8. The S.A.S.A 1997 aims to restructure and transform education governance in South Africa. In your opinion what has the Act accomplished so far in your school? Explain:-

C. Theme two: Decision making process

1. The S.A.S.A of 1997 delegated certain roles and responsibilities to S.G.B. Does the S.G.B. know and understand their roles and responsibilities as outlined by the Act?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Uncertain

1.1 If Yes! How ere they informed? and by whom?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Through representation on the S.G.B, all the stake-holders can share in the decisions of such a body. This imply that the school principal may not decide alone on governance matters. What is the situation in your S.G.B in relation to the above matter? Explain:-

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. How does the S.G.B. ensure that decision made are well informed and democratic? Explain:-

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. The Act does not allow the school principal to vote, non-the-less that does not exclude him/her in the deliberations of the S.G.B. How is this handled by your school's S.G.B.? Explain:-

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. It is expected of the school principal to supply the S.G.B with quality information, that will help the S.G.B to make quality decisions. How does the S.G.B ensure that the principal satisfies this requirement without manipulating the S.G.B? Explain:-

6. Meetings provide an opportunity to make democratic decisions. Poor attendance or non-attendance may prolong the process through postponement. How does the S.G.B adress this mishap? Explain:-

7. In your opinion are decision-making processes in your S.G.B in line with the stipulations of the Act? Elaborate:-

D. Theme three:- Levels of responsibility and accountability

1. According he S.A.S.A of 1997, the S.G.B is responsible for school governance and the school principal for the professional management of the school. This imply that the responsibility and accountability for overall. Control of the school should be shared. Does the S.G.B accept and acknowledge this responsibility?

1.1 If Yes! How do they acknowledge that?

1.2 If No! Why?

2. Acceptance and acknowledgment of certain levels of responsibilities and accountability may be viewed as over-empowerment or disempowerment by any sector. What is the position in your S.G.B?

3. A likelihood exists that separation of roles and responsibilities may become a problem. (i.e. between school principal and S.G.B) What is the position in your school?

4. If it exists / existed what do you do / have you done to end it?

Theme four:- Power Relation Emerging

1. Prior to 1994, the school governance policy, placed governance matters in the hands of the school principal. Consequently this placed school principals in a very powerful positions. The S.A.S.A of 1997 has subsequently removed all governance related responsibilities from school principals to S.G.B. This may be viewed as disempowerment of school principal and empowerment / over-empowerment of S.G.B. What is the opinion of the S.G.B in this regard.

2. Does the conflicting, if not same view of such a change / shift have impact upon the performance of S.G.B? Elaborate:-

3. According to the Act, the S.G.B and principal must support each other. What is the position in your S.G.B?

4. Unequal numerical representation, academic superiority, vested authority may divide the S.G.B into powerful groups. What is your experience in your S.G.B?

5. The S.G.B has to guard against the emergence of such groups. How does your S.G.B intend dealing with such possibilities?

6. Is such a dilemma already exists within your S.G.B, how does it impact upon performance of the S.G.B?

F. Theme five:- Coping with new responsibilities

1. In addition to roles and responsibilities that S.G.B have to fulfill there are four basic principles of the Constitution that the S.G.B have to consider their governance of their school (right to basic education, transformation and democratisation of education, no discrimination on the basis of colour creed, sex and race right to further education)? How does your SGB comply with this principles?

2. What committees have been established to help your S.G.B cope with new roles and responsibilities?

3. If no subcommittees have been established? Why and when will they be established?

4. If there are committees within the S.G.B in your school, how do they impact upon performance of S.G.B?

5. Is there training offered to the S.G.B?, by whom and when?

6. Is the training appropriate and does it have impact upon performance of S.G.B? Elaborate:-

7. According to the S.A.S.A of 1997, the school principal is expected to assist in the capacity building of the S.G.B is position in this respect?

8. If training is done, what impact does it have on the performance of the S.G.B?

9. Schools may benefit from each other in matters related to governance, management etc. S.G.B from various communities may co-operate and share their skills and expertise. Has your school / S.G.B develop any relationship with other S.G.B from other schools in other communities? If yes, what impact does this have on your S.G.B?

G. Theme six:- Attitudes and existing relationship

1. Attitudes and prevalent relationships including that of individual governors in the S.G.B may threaten or hamper effective governance by the S.G.B. What is the experience of your S.G.B? Elaborate:-

2. In addition to attitudes and relationship, ethos, cultures, values and norms that characterised old governance policies will have to change. What is the position in your S.G.B?

3. Finally, in your opinion will the present governance policy in general, contribute towards the restructuring and transformation of education governance in South Africa.? Elaborate:-

FINISH / END

Educational Research (Phase 4)

Schedule for analysis of relevant school documents

Topic:- "School Governing Bodies:- The impact on School Principals"

A. School Details

1	Name of School			
2	Type	Public	Private	
3	Former controlling body			
4	Date			
5	Medium of instruction	English	Afrikaans	Dual
6	School's learner population (majority)			

B. Notice of Meeting of S.G.B

1. Medium of issue:

   ☐ Press ☐ Post ☐ Hand Post (Learner) ☐ Telephone

2. Language of issue:

   ☐ English ☐ Afrikaans ☐ African Language ☐ All three

3. Contents of medium of issue (Language used)

   ☐ English ☐ Afrikaans ☐ African Language ☐ All three

4. Details / Contents clear

   ☐ Well spelt out ☐ Spelt out ☐ Could improve ☐ Hot spelt out

5. Agenda of meeting available

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Issued by whom?

   ☐ Secretary ☐ Chairperson ☐ Principal ☐ Uncertain

7. Comments:-

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Agenda of Meeting (Day of Meeting)

1. Is another agenda supplied?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does it correspond with one in notice of meeting (If answers is Yes)

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Language of issue

☐ English ☐ Afrikaans ☐ African Language ☐ All three

4. Are contents to be discussed relevant (Governance issues)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain

5. Does the Agenda itself facilitate participation of all stake-holders?

☐ Full participation ☐ Partly ☐ Not at all

6. Comments:-

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Minutes of meetings

1. Are minutes of meeting held available?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain

2. Language of recording

☐ English ☐ Afrikaans ☐ African Language ☐ All three

3. Is the correlation between Agenda and minutes

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Are minutes self-explanatory and well documented?

☐ Highly satisfactory ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐ High unsatisfactory

5. Are matters discussed and issues raised properly concluded?

☐ Yes ☐ Uncertain ☐ No

6. Are minutes signed at end to validate the contents?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. By whom?

☐ Principal ☐ Secretary ☐ Chairperson ☐ Chairperson & secretary

8. Comment:-

_____

_____

_____

_____

FINISH / END

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, J. (1993) Doing Your Research Project - A Guide for First Time Research in Education and Social Science, Milton Keynes, University Press.

Bennett, A.L. et al (1992) Charting Reform: The Principal's Perspective, Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Bredson, P.V. (1985), an Analysis of metaphorical Perspectives on School Principals, Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 21, pp.29-59.

Brehony, K.J. and Hemmings, S. (1992) Social Justice, Social Divisions and the Governing of Schools, In: G. II, D. Mayor, B. and Blair, M. (eds), Racism and Education, Structures and Strategies, London, pp.208-225

Buckland, P. and Hofmeyer, J. (1992) The Governance of Education in South Africa: Historical and International Perspective on System Chane, A paper presented at the Annual Conference of the South African Comparative and History of Education Society held at Broederstroom, EDUPOL.

Burgers, R.G. (1985a) (ed), Field Methods in the Study of Education, London, Falmer Press.

Burgers, R.G. (1985b) (ed), Strategies in Educational Research, Barcome, Falmer Press.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1991) (3rd ed) Research Methods in Education, London, Routledge.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) (4th ed.) Research Methods in Education, London, Routledge.

Davey, C.R. (1992) Management in Education, Pretoria, Vista University.

Deem, R. and Wilkins, J.A. (1992), Governing and Managing after the Reform Act the L.E.A. experience and G.M.S. Alternatives In: Ellision, L. Griffiths, T. and Simkins, T. (eds), Implementing Educational Reform Act: The Early Lessons, London; Longman BEMAS.

Department of Educaiton, (1995) A.N.C. Policy Document of Education and Training, Manzini, MacMillan Boleswa Publishers.

Department of Education, (1997) First Steps, A Resource of School Governing Body members, Pretoria, Government Printers.

Department of Education, (1995) White Paper on Education and Training, Cape Town, Government Printers.

Evan, R. (1996) The Human Side of School Change, Jossey Bass Inc. Publishers, San Fransisco, California.

Everard, K.B. and Morris, G. (1986) Effective School Management, London, Harper and Row.

Flude, M. and Hammer, M. (1990) The Education Reform Act 1988, It's Origins and Implications, London, The Falmer Press.

Fullar M. (1992) The New Meaning of Educational Change, Toronto, OISE Press.

Hall, V. Morgan, C and Mackay, H. (1984), Head Teachers at work, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Hartshorne, K. 91991) Taming the Young Lions, The Indicator, no 3, pp.19

Jones, A. (1987) Leadership for Tomorrow's Schools, Blackwell, Oxford.

Kogan, M., Johnson, D., Packwood, T., and Whittaker, T., (1984) School Governing Bodies, London, Heinemann.

Lather, P. (1986) Research and Praxis, Harvard Educational Review, vol. 56, no. 6, August 1996, pp.214-220.

Mortimore, P. and Mortimore, J. (1991a) (eds) The Head: Roles, Responsibilities and Reflections, London, Paul Chapman.

Mortimore, P. and Mortimore, J. (1991b) (eds) The Secondary Head: Roles, Responsibilities and Reflections, London, Paul Chapman.

Murphy, J. and Louis, S.K. (1992) (ed) Reshaping the Principalship: Insights from Transformational Reform Efforts, Corwin Press Inc., California

N.E.P.I (1992) Governance and Administration, Oxford University Press, N.E.C.C.

Potgieter, J.M., Visser, P.J., Van der Bank, A.J., Mothata, M.S., Squelch, J.M. (1997) Understanding the Schools Act, Pretoria, Department of Education.

Preedy, M. (1993) (ed) Managing The Effective School, London, Paul Chapman.

Prestine, N.A. (1991d) (ed) Completing the Essential School Metaphor: Principal as Enabler, Paper presented at the Annual Research Association, Chicago.

Prestine, N.A. (1991b) Shared Decision-making in Restructuring essential schools, Paper presented at the annual conference of the University for Educational Administration, Baltimore.

Republic of South Africa Government Gazette, (1996) South African Schools Act, November 1996, Vol 377, No 17579, Government Printers, Pretoria.

Robbins, S.P. (1994) Management (4th Ed) Englewood Cliffs N.J., Prentice Hall.

Sallis, J. (1991b) Agenda: Joan Sallis Answers Governors Questions, The Times Educational Supplement, 27 December pp.15

Sallis, J. (1987) School Managers and Governors, Taylor and After, London, Latimer Trend and Co. Ltd.

Sayed, F. and Carrim, N. (1996) Democratising Educational Governance in South Africa Policy Problems and Prospects, Johannesburg, Wits, E.P.U.

Swanson, A.D. (1989) Restructuring Educational Governance, A Challenge of the 1990's Educational Administration Quarterly, vol. 25, no. 3, August 1989, pp.268-293

Tuckman, B.W. (1994) (4th Ed) Conducting Educational Research, New York, Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

University of Witwatersrand, Education Policy Unit, (1996) The Culture of Learning and Teaching in Gauteng school's Report, Johannesburg.

Wilkins, J.A. (1990), Restructuring Education After the Reform Act and the Role of School Governors: A Head Teacher's Perspective, Open University Education Reform Study Group, Occasional Paper no. 1, Milton Keynes.

Author Lebethe M E K
Name of thesis School Governing Bodies: The Impact On School Principals Lebethe M E K 1999

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.