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ABSTRACT

The National Development Plan (NDP) highlights the need for a capable and developmental state. This capable and developmental state will be enabled by, inter alia, a professional public service that has internalised the developmental state agenda, and the development of technical and specialist skills. Section 195 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996 outlines 10 principles governing public administration. These principles from the Constitution are largely linked to the development of a professional public service.

The literature consulted by this study has raised a need for the training of administrators, and the role that can be played by the training initiatives in realising the envisaged NDP priorities and Constitutional mandates. The research had consulted numerous pieces of legislation at national and provincial levels that echoed the NDP and the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996.

The National School of Government (NSG) has the national mandate to provide training to the public service, and the Office of the Premier, KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) has the provincial mandate to provide this training to public servants. The PPSTA has been exceeding annual performance targets in terms of the number of public servants trained in the province over a number of financial years. This study explores the need for a subsequent phase, to measure whether the training provided by PPSTA has an impact to the trainees (public servants) and to the provincial departments.

According to the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation of 2007 (M&E Framework of 2007) that informed the study, the outcomes assessment precedes impact assessment. The study hence conducted outcomes assessment and not impact assessment of training programmes provided by the PPSTA. The term ‘impact assessment’ has been “borrowed” by the study for ease of reference. It transpired in the literature and during the interactions with the respondents that the term ‘outcomes assessment’ was predominantly understood by established Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practitioners and aspiring M&E practitioners. The respondents were familiar with the term ‘impact assessment’.

In conducting the impact (outcomes) assessment, the study randomly sampled 7 out of the population of 14 provincial departments that had received training in the 4 chosen training programmes during the 2013/14 financial year. The 2013/14 financial year was chosen for the study, given the assumption that the department would have gained sufficient time to monitor and evaluate the impact (outcomes) of training in accordance with M&E Framework of 2007
outcomes assessment and the Framework for Managing Performance Information of 2007 guidelines. A pragmatism paradigm was chosen by the study to allow for triangulation of quantitative and qualitative techniques through a mixed methods approach.

The study discovered that the training programmes conducted by PPSTA could be generalised to have had a positive impact (outcome) to the trainee individual’s professional growth, and mainly impacted at the provincial department’s sub-directorate level. The study revealed that the impact (outcome) of training programmes were less impactful at the higher echelons of provincial departments such as the directorate, branch and organisational levels.

The findings raised the need for discussions on further research projects on the alignment of training to the strategic objectives of the departments as stated by the Human Resource Development Strategic Framework for the Public Service Vision 2015 (Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015). The stance taken by the Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 was that in order for an organisation to realise its strategic objectives, human capital must be trained and developed. Further, the organisations should be focussed on training and development investments than cutting or managing costs in order to attain organisational effectiveness.

The narrative presented in this study raises the significance of training and development, the alignment of training to organisational strategic goals as well as measuring the effects of training and development programmes. The frameworks that inform the development of tools of measurement for the effects of training and development programmes are also highlighted.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>Annual Performance Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTD Benchmarking Services</td>
<td>Association for Training Development Benchmarking Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR</td>
<td>Annual Training Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Compulsory Induction Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHOD</td>
<td>Committee of Heads of Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA&amp;C</td>
<td>Department of Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARD</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEG</td>
<td>Digital Era-Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHET</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Human Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoT</td>
<td>Department of Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPME</td>
<td>Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPME: Presidency</td>
<td>Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation: Office of the Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSA</td>
<td>Department of Public Service and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Department of Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPMDS</td>
<td>Employee Performance Management and System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETD</td>
<td>Education Training and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCO</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVA</td>
<td>Fair Value Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWM&amp;ES</td>
<td>Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA</td>
<td>Historical Cost Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIs</td>
<td>Higher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRDS</td>
<td>Human Resource Development System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTPTND</td>
<td>High Trainee Participation: Training Needs Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>Learner Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPTND</td>
<td>Low Trainee Participation Training Need Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANCO</td>
<td>Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>17 Millennium Developmental Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFOs</td>
<td>Municipal Finance Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium-Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSF</td>
<td>Medium-Term Strategic Framework Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSF</td>
<td>Medium-Term Strategic Framework 2014-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMES</td>
<td>National Monitoring and Evaluation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>New Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG</td>
<td>National School of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS</td>
<td>National Statistics System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPTND</td>
<td>Norm Trainee Participation: Training Needs Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Organisational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTP</td>
<td>Office of the Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTP HRD</td>
<td>Office of the Premier Human Resource Development Chief Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTP M&amp;E</td>
<td>Office of the Premier Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>Personal Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDP</td>
<td>Provincial Growth and Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRDF</td>
<td>Provincial Human Resource Development Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMDS</td>
<td>Performance Management Development System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post NPM</td>
<td>Post New Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-NPM</td>
<td>Post- New Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>KZN Provincial Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>Programme Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA &amp; PD M&amp;E SOPS</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy and Provincial Departments Monitoring and Evaluation Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA M&amp;E Policy</td>
<td>Draft KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy Monitoring and Evaluation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAS</td>
<td>Public Sector Administration Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>The Office of the Public Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>Public Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPR</td>
<td>Quarterly Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASQAF</td>
<td>South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASQAF</td>
<td>South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework of 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDFs</td>
<td>Skills Development Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETA</td>
<td>Sector Education and Training Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Senior Management Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCHD Cluster</td>
<td>Social Protection, Community and Human Development Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATS SA</td>
<td>Statistics South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;D</td>
<td>Training and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TND</td>
<td>Training Needs Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNE</td>
<td>Training Needs Extrapolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNI</td>
<td>Training Needs Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Transformative Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Workplace Skills Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE
SYNOPSIS OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION
The dawn of democracy in 1994 resulted in South Africa undergoing major reforms in the public service. The introduction of the White Paper on the Transformation of the Public Service (1995), White Paper on New Employment Policy (1997) and the White Paper on Public Service Training and Education (1997) were amongst the significant public service transformations that were linked to training and development. At the core of these legislation and reforms, was the transformation agenda from the pre- to the post-1994 era of the public service, which involved, *inter alia*, viewing the public as the client, being sensitive to the needs of the client, accountability and transparency. These were national reforms but they have implementation implications for the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (KZN). The implications were discussed in detail in this study.

With reference to the training and development transformation agenda in the public service, the study noted other reforms highlighted by the Republic of South Africa (2011: ii): the development of the Human Resource Development Strategy for the Public Service (2002-2006), which was later further reformed to become the Human Resource Development for the Public Service: Strategic Framework Vision 2015 (Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015). The Public Service Commission (2011: ii) argued that Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 was developed in 2007, subsequent to the review of the initial Human Resource Development Strategy for the Public Service (2002-2006). The DPSA Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 was aimed at bridging the gap in the Human Resource Strategy for the Public Service (2002-2006), and it was focused on building the capacity of the state through building the capacity of its employees.

The study noted recent reforms that have added impetus to the training and development context: The Revised HRD Strategy towards 2030 approved by the Cabinet on the 21st of June 2017, as well as the National Skills Development Plan (NSDP) gazetted by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) on 15 December 2017 in response to the White Paper on Public Service Training and Education (1997), stated earlier as being among the first
training and development reforms. The DPSA had communicated gravitation towards the review of the HRD Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015.

The Province of KZN derives its training and development mandate from among others, the DPSA Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 (2008: 81), which mandates provinces through their provincial academies to support provincial departments, provide training, monitor and provide leadership in relation to the implementation of the DPSA Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 and other Human Resource Development related policies. The provincial academy in KZN is the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) placed in the administration office of the Office of the Premier (OTP) in KZN. The mandate from the Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 serves as a mandate from national to the provincial government.

The study noted other public service training and development reforms and mandates from national government to the KZN Province, and to the PPSTA as an implementing agent. The role of monitoring, evaluating and building the capacity of the state was raised in the Medium-Term Strategic Framework 2014-2019 (MTSF) Outcome 5, that was focused on building a skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path and the MTSF Outcome 12 that was concentrated on the promotion of an efficient, effective and development-oriented public service.

These reforms and mandates stated in the preceding paragraphs placed the PPSTA at the centre of building the capacity of the public service through training and development programmes and other means in the Province. In the context of the study, the focus was on the training and development programmes relating to building and capacity of the state.

In understanding the PPSTA’s role of providing training and development in the Province, the study was informed by the argument that is brought forward by Wexley and Latham (2002: ix) that, “any training and development effort can have one or more of the following three goals: (i) to improve the individual’s level of self-awareness; (ii) to increase an individual’s skill in one or more areas of expertise; and /or (iii) to increase an individual’s motivation to perform his or her job well”. These sentiments were echoed by Erasmus, Loedolff, Mda and Nel (2010: 3-4), that training and development provides employees with better decision-making opportunities, efficacy in problem-solving, change in the attitudes and job satisfaction amongst
other provisions. The organisation benefits from the following training initiatives were: improved profitability, enhanced service delivery, improved labour and management relations, growth environment, enhanced corporate image and other benefits.

The study noted the significance of the Human Resource Development (HRD) practitioners to determine whether the three goals raised by Wexley and Latham (2002:2) have been fully achieved. Further, was the realisation that the provision of training and development programmes was significant for the study; however, there was a need to assess whether the three goals were met and to assess the change in the trainees’ behaviour subsequent to training. Wexley and Latham (2002: 137-138) argued that “it is possible for trainees to do well on performance tests administered during training, yet not be able or willing to exhibit these same skills on their jobs”. This argument by Wexley and Latham (2002: 137-138) raised the need for training to take place, but more significantly, the argument advocated for the evaluation of training consequences and conclusions to be made as to whether there was a change in the trainee’s work behaviour and to the organisation that can be linked to the training programme.

There was a link found by the research between the argument made by Wexley and Latham (2002: 137-138) and the concept of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) that had an ability as a tool to measure whether trainees were able or willing to exhibit the acquired training. According to the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4), M&E focuses on the importance of monitoring and evaluation of the efficacy of the state in the utilisation of the resources as inputs and as activities to achieve the desired outputs. Further, the outputs achieved need to be evaluated as to whether desired outcomes and impacts have been achieved. In the M&E context, the argument by Wexley and Latham (2002: 137-138) earlier can be interpreted as measuring the outcomes or the impact of training and development programmes. According to the Republic of South Africa (2007: 4), the implementation of the M&E tools, systems and policies is the statutory requirement of any government office. The stance taken by the Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E System of 2007 is further explored in the subsequent chapters.

Based on this discussion, it is expected that as a training and development standard practice, there should be development of an outcome or impact assessment tool prior or subsequent to the provision of training as informed by the Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E System of 2007. These tools assist to determine whether there is a significant change in relation
to the training provided, and determine the value of the training provided to the employees and in the workplace. The study examines this perspective. The research wanted to ascertain if there are systems and policies in the PPSTA, and in provincial departments that provided proper monitoring and evaluation for the three: *before (pre)*, *during* and *after (post) training* as the groundwork to determine the outcomes of training and development programmes provided by the PPSTA.

In the main, the purpose of the research was to establish whether there is a significant effect or impact in the performance of provincial departments’ trainees and in their workplace that can be linked to the training conducted by the PPSTA. The purpose of the research can thus be viewed as the outcome or impact determination factor in the lenses of the M&E practitioner. The term ‘impact’ is used in this study to refer to the results and for ease of reference, it is further explored in Chapter Three to establish its meaning within the context of the M&E Framework of 2007. In short, the M&E Framework of 2007 stipulated that the outcomes evaluation should precede the impact evaluation. The research focused largely on *post*-training M&E mechanisms to determine the outcome of training conducted, and in the study the term ‘impact assessment’ was predominantly used as most participants were familiar with the term as compared to ‘outcomes assessment’.

The study sampled four training and development programmes, namely, Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers, Public Sector Administration Skills, Course on Facilitating Learning and Chairing of Meetings Effectively, all of which were analysed to reach conclusions on the outcomes of training programmes offered by the PPSTA.

The hypothesis in the research was that *Embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminate in the efficacy of evaluating the outcome of training programmes*. The study is of the view that the existence of M&E policies and establishment of M&E systems and processes is a statutory public office requirement as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 1-4), hence the entrenched M&E policies, systems and processes by the public office culminate in the efficiency and effectiveness of the evaluations of the training programmes. These policies serve as the blueprint that guides the implementation of M&E systems and processes in the training and development intervention. In proving the hypothesis, the alignment of M&E policies between PPSTA and provincial departments was important for the study, the alignment of M&E policies between the PPSTA and the provincial departments
was viewed as a critical factor in proving that M&E policies, processes and systems were implemented in a coherent and standardised manner.

It can be noted that during the course of the study, concepts such as learning and development opportunities, capacity development, skills development, training or capacitation were used depicting the same meaning as training and development programmes.

1.2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY
The Province of KZN is committed to provide high quality services to its citizens using dedicated and capable public servants. To achieve this commitment, public servants would need to be provided with opportunities of learning and development in order to improve individual capabilities and capacity, as mentioned in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2013: 2). It is critical that the training programmes delivered to the public servants are needs-directed, competency-based and aligned to the Medium-Term Strategic Framework Outcome 5 (2014 – 2019) focusing on a skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path. Emphasis is also on the MTSF Outcome 12, which is focused on efficient and effective development in the public service, as outlined in the Republic of South Africa (2015).

In keeping with the MTSF Outcome 12, the KZN Provincial Public Service Training Academy – Training Directory (2013: 2-5) states that the Province needs to have competent, dedicated and capable public servants in order to improve performance and the quality of services rendered to the people. The benefits of having competent, dedicated and capable public officials are amongst others, inspired confidence in the official and the public, common purpose including principled values and traditions. These aspiration and benefits are towards the vision of the PPSTA as the centre of excellence in learning and development. The sentiments in the PPSTA’s training directory were found to be in agreement with the views of Tshukudu and Nel (2015: 190-191) that called for strong capacity that plans, develops, motivates and manages training and more significantly, determines the efficacy of employees’ performance after training. PPSTA should at the same time, align its performance to the MTSF 2014-2019, DPSA Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 and other related mandates.

The research acknowledges the work that has been done by the civil societies, sector education and training authorities (SETAs), higher education institutions (HEIs), private sector and other stakeholders in providing opportunities of learning and development in the public service, but
the focus of this study was on the learning and development opportunities or training provided by the PPSTA to fourteen (14) provincial departments, which are listed below.

In the context of the PPSTA providing training to the provincial departments, the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2013/14) reports from the Office of the Premier’s Monitoring and Evaluation (OTP M&E) unit have reference. The reports stated that during 2013/14 financial year, 7 914 public servants were trained in transversal and generic fields. The 7 914 public servants trained included 1 314 managers (Level 9 to Level 13) trained on management related courses and 6 600 (Level 1 to Level 8) that were trained on relevant courses. The figure (7 914) exceeds the PPSTA Annual Performance Plan (APP) target of 6 500 by 1 414 public officials that were trained during 2013/14 financial year. The figure reported above excludes specific or technical training provided by the individual provincial departments e.g. bursaries offered by the department of Health to their internal staff (nurses or doctors) to study further. PPSTA has been exceeding APP targets for the past three financial years. During the financial year 2012/13 and 2014/15, the annual APP targets were also surpassed by PPSTA as stated in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2012/13 and 2014/15). The public officials that received the training from PPSTA are from the 14 provincial departments in KwaZulu-Natal: Agriculture and Rural Development, Arts and Culture, Corporate Governance and Traditional Affairs, Community Safety and Liaison, Education, Economic Development, Tourism and Environmental Affairs, Health, Human Settlements, Office of the Premier, Public Works, Social Development, Sports and Recreation, Transport and Treasury. In the 14 provincial departments, seven departments took part in the study which are the Transport, Health, Agriculture and Rural Development, Arts and Culture, Human Settlements, Social Developments as well as Community Safety and Liaison.

The research noted that PPSTA had been exceeding the APP output targets for 3 financial years, and for that reason, the need to assess whether there is any change brought about by the training provided or attended to by the trainee and to the provincial departments became crucial. The assessment need was informed by the significant argument made earlier by Wexley and Nathan (2002), that it is possible for the trainee to attend training and perform well during training, but not be able or willing to exhibit the training skills obtained into the workplace. This argument raised the need for evaluating trainee and departmental change that can be attributed to the training attended by the staff. These sentiments were echoed by Kirkpatrick (2016) that training evaluations have often taken a “back seat”, even though there is a great
need for measuring the effectiveness of training. Measuring effects of training has always come at the end in the training process. There is an urgency to evaluate training to determine and maximise training programmes’ organisational value. Tshukudu (2009: 200-202) also argued for a holistic training evaluation approach as most organisations are focused on the “production approach”. The production approach is based on counting the numbers of employees trained and not focused on the change brought by the training to the organisation and the trainee. The study concluded that these authors were all raising the need for the organisations to strengthen the focus on evaluating training. This process is often referred to as “impact assessment” in most organisations. The argument presented by these authors justified the need for impact assessment study.

In pursuit of the study to determine the impact of training programmes that were provided by the PPSTA as the provincial public service institution, it was equally important for the research to be guided by the scientific framework. The Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System was chosen by the study to be the guiding framework for training impact determination process. The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 2-4) states that “it is a statutory requirement that the accounting officer of a department or municipality, or the chief executive officer of a public entity, is required to establish a Monitoring and Evaluation system for the institution”. The Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System of 2007 has a process to be followed when a state institution needed to conduct impact assessment or measure performance against a government intervention. This process involves key-performance information concepts namely Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2007b: 7). The process will be covered in detail in the progression of study guided by the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System of 2007 including the Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information. The two documents categorised the study within the Outcomes key-performance information concept. Fundamentally, the term ‘impact assessment’ had been used by the study throughout to refer to outcomes assessment. The study used the term ‘impact assessment’ as it was commonly used in the training and development (T&D) fraternity and for the respondents’ ease of reference.

The necessity to conduct the study and give scientific evidence on the outcomes of training provided by the PPSTA to the provincial departments cannot be overemphasised. The research aimed to assist the PPSTA to fulfil its expected role as the public institution stated in the
Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System of 2007. The training conducted needed to be measured and evaluated and the findings tabled. Given that the PPSTA plays a leading role in capacity building in the public sphere, these findings may assist the PPSTA to be informed when planning other training and development programmes in the future.

The study was found to be in alignment with the Executive Committee Lekgotla (EXCO) resolutions of February 2017. One of the EXCO resolutions found in the Provincial Growth and Development Plan Action Work Group 7 Quarter 2 reporting template was that the “impact of Human Resource Development and Education programmes must be measured for impact assessment”.

The study aimed for PPSTA to have an overall picture in relation to the outcomes of training and development, as discussed in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4). Monitoring and Evaluation of the training conducted could assist in checking the alignment of the courses that were conducted to the vision, objectives and strategies of the PPSTA and provincial departments. The intention is to promote an integrated approach to needs analysis, assessment and evaluation, as argued by Opperman and Meyer (2008: 4). This process was going to be amongst the mechanisms for PPSTA to ensure that it adhered to the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) policy mandates. The DPME Guideline No 3.1.4 for the Offices of the Premier raised the necessity of the public service to produce M&E work of high quality, and tabling of findings or reports that assist in influencing decision-making processes regarding policy formulation, refinement, alignment across the 3 spheres of government. The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 5) speaks about the clear sequence of facilitation mechanisms by managers using M&E policies and systems from the inputs deployment to transformation of inputs to outputs until it reaches the outcomes and impact stage. The M&E stages will be discussed in detail in Chapter Three within the key-performance information concepts discussion, as part of the conceptual framework that informed the study.

The study noted another validation for its existence in the Republic of South Africa (2012: 1) that stated that “The office of the Premier needs to strive to promote a culture of M&E, learning and continuous improvement, including a common understanding of what M&E aims to achieve”.
It was important to define the following concepts for the enhancement of the context.

1.2.1 Training
Fitzgerald (2003: 81) defined training as the tool that helps individuals’ contributions to the organisation, skills acquisition and knowledge to perform the current tasks and as a means to an end. Erasmus et al. (2010: 2) viewed the concept of training as “…the way in which an organisation uses a systematic process to modify the knowledge, skills, and behaviour of employees that will enable it to achieve its objectives”. Tshukudu and Nel (2015: 191) stated that it is futile and useless for training not to be accompanied by the motivation to implement effectively the knowledge gained from the training received. These sentiments shared by Tshukudu and Nel (2015) corroborate with the argument raised earlier in the study by Wexley and Latham (2002) with regard to the willingness and the ability of the trainee to exhibit the change on himself or herself and the organisation that can be attributed to the training attended.

Erasmus, Leodolff, Mda and Nel (2012: 21) viewed training as task-oriented and focused on the work performed in an organisation. The aim of training is to improve trainee or employee performance in an organisation. Wexley and Latham (2002: 2) interpret training and development as the efforts planned by the organisation for the facilitation of learning the job-related behaviour expected by the organisation from the employees. The term ‘behaviour’ was used broadly by Wexley and Latham (2002: 2) to include any skills and knowledge acquired through practice by the employee.

1.2.2 Development
Meyer and Orpen (2011: 5) defined development as an ongoing learning opportunity created for the employer to improve or maintain high level of performance. Erasmus et al. (2010:3) looked at development within the context of developing employees to achieve objectives and outcomes. Rao (1982: 33) viewed development as new capability or capabilities acquisition to perform the existing task/s or new assignment/s in the organisation. The matter of managers assisting and support the development of the employees was important to Rao. Another development perspective was from Wexley and Latham (2002: 2-3) that talks about “self-awareness”. This perspective looks at learning and development from an individual level focusing on “oneself”. The two authors are of the view that one of the three goals of training and development is the improvement of an individual’s level of self-awareness.
The view presented by Wexley and Latham (2002) of measuring the trainee was found to be vital by the study, as most of the authors were focused on organisation development than individual development. Meyer and Orpen (2011: 5) looked at the concept of development as a group of employees within the organisation rather than individual development. These perspectives by the authors informed the study to examine two sides of training impact (outcomes): firstly, the impact of training to the trainee as an individual, and secondly, the impact of training to the organisation.

1.2.3 Human Resource Development
Phillips (1997: 13) referred to Human Resource Development (HRD) as the combined function of education, training and development. Recent authors have argued that HRD had moved beyond providing education, training and development. The new concept in HRD was introduced by Rao (1982: 29) called human resource development system (HRDS). The HRDS involves sub-systems such as performance appraisal, feedback and counselling, data storage, system development, training, organisational development, potential appraisal for development decisions. Erasmus et al. (2012: 21) were found to be in agreement with Rao that Human Resource Development has evolved from being an operational matter where it involved organising of learning experience by the employer for a specific period in order to bring about the performance improvements and/or personal growth possibility to a more strategic level that attached career development, organisational development and training development components to the concept of HRD. It is important that the three main components (training development, career development and organisational development) be linked to the overall strategy and the plan of the organisation. The views expressed by these authors of strategically positioning HRD echoed the sentiments that were brought to the fore earlier to the discourse by the Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015.

The discussion in the previous paragraphs highlighted the importance and the value and the role played by HRD, which is to inform strategic decisions of the organisation and to demonstrate the alignment of training to strategic objectives. The concept of HRD has been elevated from the operational level to the strategic level. The elevation signifies the transformation of HRD from what it has been understood to represent in the past. This argument is evidenced by Opperman and Meyer (2008: ix) when they present that identification of basic needs, higher-level goals and performance opportunities can be used by the
organisation to deal with the skills gap and assessment is an invaluable tool that assists in the process of identifying competence and highlights areas for further development.

The implementation of HRDS and alignment of training to organisational strategic goal were viewed as the vital sub-concepts within HRD, and as the building blocks towards the desired vision of the Republic of South Africa (1997) that argues for public servants to demonstrate high or positive service delivery impact, high service standards, value-for-money, and accountability for the services rendered. The arguments presented within the HRD concept contributed to the need for this study to be conducted. There is a need to gauge whether HRD practitioners provide training and development programmes in a systematic manner as part of the HRDS stance, and whether there is alignment of HRD training and development strategic policies, that leads to training that is aligned to the strategic goals of the organisation.

1.2.4 Integrated Approach

According to Meyer and Orpen (2011: 5), there is a direct relationship between education and training. An important element within the integrated approach concept is Education, Training and Development (ETD). Meyer and Orpen viewed ETD practitioners as being directly and indirectly involved in the endeavours that promote and support learning. Erasmus et al. (2010: 3) highlighted that training, development and education cannot be easily separated in one way or the other for the reason that these concepts are interrelated. Further, these authors stated that “human resource development could be viewed as a term used to include training, development, and education described as an integrated and holistic, conscious, and proactive approach to changing work-related knowledge and behaviour, using the range of learning strategies techniques”. Erasmus et al. (2012: 21) further explained the integrated approach concept through the interrelationships that occur when an employee is attending training for a specific intention (training) but other elements (education and development) of the integrated approach simultaneously get embedded within the specific intention, for instance, when an employee is in training also the development takes place and the elements of education can be found during the training.

The study found the views of Erasmus et al. (2012: 13) on training and development aligned to organisational objectives and their support for an integrated approach to be relevant to the HRDS view, as was raised earlier by Rao (1982), as well Opperman and Meyer (2008).
1.2.5 Monitoring
Monitoring is a process that involves the establishment of indicators to measure the efficacy of impact. It involves setting up of systems in the quest of collecting information against the set indicators. The information is analysed to inform day-to-day operations of an organisation as stated by Smanjak (2011). The sentiments by Smanjak (2011) were echoed by the Republic of South Africa (2007: 1-3), that monitoring focuses on the collection of inputs, processes, activities, outputs and outcomes against the indicators, and the modification of these processes and activities as and when necessary. Monitoring normally precedes evaluation or may form the bases of evaluation. Monitoring tools, systems and processes are important as the study aims to use the monitoring and evaluation systems, tools and processes to measure the outcomes of training.

1.2.6 Evaluation
Mertens and Wilson (2015: 5) define the concept of evaluation as follows: “Evaluation is a profession that uses formal methodologies to provide useful empirical evidence about public entities (such as programmes, products and performance) in the decision-making context that are inherently political and involve multiple and often-conflicting stakeholders, where resources are seldom sufficient and where time pressures are salient”. Evaluation also involves examinations of underlying theories, validity and efficacy. All the M&E components needs to be evaluated: inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluation is a decision-making tool that needs to be incorporated into the planning cycle and to the government’s performance management systems, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 1-5).

The concept of evaluation was found to be relevant to the study as the research is centred on the first part of evaluation called outcomes. It has been stated earlier, that monitoring processes often serves as the basis for evaluation processes, hence in the study monitoring processes have been incorporated as the basis that informs outcomes assessment.

1.2.7 Transfer of Learning
Learning has been defined earlier as a process of exhibiting an outcome of what has been learned through the change in the behaviour and knowledge as a form of evidence. The indicators of having learned something are observable when the learner’s performance resembles learning obtained to the tasks and circumstances. Transfer of learning is referred to
as the ability of application of what has been learnt into new circumstances, as stated by Botma, Van Rensburg, Heyns and Coetzee (2013: 33).

These concepts that have been defined were found to be precise in contextualising the trajectory of the study. The study is based on using the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of 2007 to monitor and evaluate the training and development programmes (which is regarded as one of the Human Resource Development System segments) that were implemented using an integrated approach. One of the critical indicators identified by the study in measuring the outcomes of training and development programmes was going to be the exhibition of transfer of learning by the trainees. The quest for outcomes empirical measurement (using M&E Framework of 2007) of training and development programmes led the study into the realisation of the research problem statement to be discussed.

1.3. PROBLEM STATEMENT
The PPSTA provides training and development programmes to fourteen (14) provincial departments, as highlighted in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2013: 5). Since the inception of the PPSTA in 2007, there is little evidence to demonstrate that an empirical study has been conducted to monitor and evaluate the National Qualification Framework (NQF) – aligned training and development programmes guided by the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System of 2007.

PPSTA provides NQF and non-NQF- aligned training programmes but the research chose to focus on the NQF-aligned courses because of the possibility provided by these training programmes to lead the employee to a qualification. Chisolm (2007: 297) argues that the intention of the National Qualification Framework is to integrate the world of training and education using a comprehensive qualification framework.

The PPSTA has developed the draft Monitoring and Evaluation PPSTA (M&E) Policy and draft Guidelines for the Monitoring and Evaluation Process in 2011 as the monitoring and evaluation groundwork for training and development and other HRD processes. The draft KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy M&E (PPSTA M&E) policy was largely influenced by the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System of 2007 (GWM&ES) during its development process. The alignment of the draft PPSTA M&E policy to the GWM&ES gave an impetus for the study of this calibre to be
conducted, and as the commencement to deal with matters raised by both policies regarding monitoring and evaluation of training. The need for the study is further noted through the Operational Plan Management Committee meeting held on the 30th of January 2014 where the PPSTA Chief Director highlighted the importance of all the units within PPSTA to incorporate and align their operations into national, provincial and the draft PPSTA M&E policies and systems.

The research was informed by all of the above developments, and other reasons sourced from literature. The need to conduct a scientific study on the monitoring and evaluation processes of training and development programmes provided by PPSTA became inevitable. According to the Quarterly Performance Reports (Province of KwaZulu-Natal 2012/13, Province of KwaZulu-Natal 2013/14 and 2014/15), there is evidence that suggests that the PPSTA has been exceeding the APP target, and in this case, the APP target referred to is the Number of Public Servants Trained. This process of meeting or exceeding the APP targets is referred to as an output within the guidance of the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System of 2007 and M&E policy. It is equally important for PPSTA to monitor and evaluate the outcomes (the next phase after meeting the target output or exceeding it) of training provided in the same way as it is important for PPSTA to meet the APP target. This phases within monitoring and evaluating are narrated in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 2).

The process of monitoring and evaluation of training programmes would ensure that the services rendered by the PPSTA are of high quality and where there are gaps there could be recommendations to deal with those gaps. This stance is viewed by the study to be the start of responding to the problem identified. The Republic of South Africa (2012: 1) stated the significance of producing M&E work of high quality in order to influence decision makers in policy formulation, refinement and alignment. A similar pattern has been followed by the study that the findings would be communicated to the PPSTA and provincial departments to make decisions based on the empirical data. If the training programmes are found to yield the positive M&E outcomes, they may be continued or more funds may be allocated to the training programmes, and if the training programmes do not produce the desired outcomes, it may be discontinued or be modified as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 3). The argument made above is strengthened by Ehlers and Lazenby (2010: 29), who stated that “… if you can’t measure something it’s not worth doing it.”
The study realised the need for research to conduct a scientific process to responding to the research problem statement through the development of the research questions and objectives to respond.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The main question that guided the study was: What were the outcomes of the T&D programmes provided by PPSTA to provincial departments?
The sub-questions informing the study included the following:

- How valid is the process used by PPSTA and provincial departments to determine training needs?
- How efficient and effective are M&E policies, systems and tools employed by the PPSTA during and after training?
- What is the level of readiness of the organisation to implement training?
- What change has the training made to the organisation?
- What is the level of alignment in relation to the training and development M&E policies, systems, processes and tools between PPSTA and Provincial Departments?

1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
The main objective of the study was to determine the outcomes of T&D programmes offered by the PPSTA to provincial departments.
The sub-objectives are as follows:

- To establish the validity of the process used by PPSTA and provincial departments to determine training needs;
- To determine the efficacy of the policies, systems and tools employed by PPSTA during and after training;
- To ascertain whether there is level of readiness in the provincial departments to allow for transfer of learning;
- To establish the M&E policies, systems, processes and tools used in the provincial department to determine the effects of training that can be linked to training provided by PPSTA (business gained results), and
- To investigate the level of alignment in relation to the training and development M&E policies, systems, tools and processes between PPSTA and the provincial departments.
1.6. HYPOTHESIS
It is hypothesised by the research that *embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminate in the efficacy of evaluating the outcomes of training programmes.*

1.7. OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS
In the quest to navigate through the contextual narrative, problem statement, research questions, research objectives and the hypothesis, the study is structured in the following chapters, outlined below.

1.7.1 Chapter One: Synopsis of the Study
The overview of the study was highlighted in this chapter. It gave an opportunity for the trajectory of the research to be outlined. The chapter covered the following key aspects: study background, problem statement, research methods and paradigms, findings as well as the limitations.

1.7.2 Chapter Two: Theorising Monitoring and Evaluation within the Public Administration paradigm
The chapter focused on discussing Public Administration as a discipline and as a practice, and the extent at which the discipline and the practice linked to the concept of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and good governance. A discussion on the conceptual framework and legislative mandates was tabled as the pillars of the study.

1.7.3 Chapter Three: Significance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Training and Development Interventions
Chapter Three discussed theories and models that significantly support M&E in training and development interventions. The M&E models and theories were discussed to highlight M&E significance and to provide the theoretical framework that the study was based on, namely, Monitoring and Evaluation theory from the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E System of 2007, Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluations by Opperman and Meyer of 2008.
1.7.4 Chapter Four: Research Methodology

This chapter outlines how the study chose the pragmatism paradigm based on the research methodology. The research stated the logic behind triangulation of quantitative and qualitative of the data in the analysis. The chapter explained how the data collated from qualitative and quantitative approach was to be analysed, and used as a basis to inform research findings and recommendations.

The study chose simple random probability sampling technique as compared to other sampling techniques. The rationale of the utilisation of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 to analyse quantitative data was provided by the study with enough data for analysis, inferential deductions and generalisation. Data collection tools included the qualitative research technique with interviews and the quantitative technique with questionnaires.

1.7.5 Chapter Five: Statement of Findings and Discussion of the Data

Chapter Five presented the implementation of the plan that was outlined in Chapter Four. The study began with a narrative by stating the logic that prompted the pragmatism paradigm. It linked the pragmatism paradigm to choice of the study to utilise the quantitative and qualitative techniques, as well as the triangulation technique.

In the quantitative technique, the research explained the testing of the reliability measurement on the questionnaire tool using the Cronbach’s Alpha Value statistical technique. Results (reliability coefficient score) were found to be within or beyond 0.70, which is considered an “acceptable” reliability measurement. Factor Analysis loadings were found to be suitable for analytical purposes informed by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) score that was beyond 0.05 on all dimensions. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity sig.value was to be below 0.05, which is an acceptable score for hypothesis testing and for checking whether the correlation matrix has the identity matrix. Fundamentally, the data collated met the criteria for statistical analysis.

It can be noted, that the statistical loadings of the other categories’ (Immediate Supervisor, HRD management, PPSTA management and Trainer) samples were too small. The study chose to triangulate the data with the qualitative analysis. The Department of Arts and Culture trainee respondents chose not to participate in the study. Their non-participation did not affect the study due to the high response rate from the other six provincial departments that were part of
the sample. The study utilised secondary data obtained from the study conducted by Mohlomi (2016) titled: An Investigation of the Implementation of the Training and Development programme in the Department of Arts and Culture, Head Office, KZN as part of the triangulation technique. This exercise assisted the study to understand the Arts and Culture training and development context.

In the main, the study found that training and development programmes had positive outcomes to the trainee with the impact of training (outcomes) being less in the higher echelons (directorate, branch and departmental level) of the department. The finding was viewed by the study as the area to be deliberated on by the provincial departments and PPSTA. The findings were not aligned with the Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015 from the DPSA and Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation by Opperman and Meyer (2008) called for strategic positioning of HRD in the departments. The finding was found to be paramount by the research as it proved the availability of systems, processes and policies that guided monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes. The availability of systems, processes and policies culminated in and enabled the study to determine the outcomes of training. The finding from the analysis proved the hypothesis that stated: Embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminates in the efficacy of evaluating the outcome of training programmes to be correct.

The study made other significant findings that were discussed in detail in Chapter Five. These findings allowed the study to derive at the conclusion and recommendations as found in Chapter Six.

1.7.6 Chapter Six: Conclusion and Recommendations
The chapter began by highlighting significance of the study towards the response to the impact assessment gaps in the HRD and Education domain as highlighted by the Executive Committee (EXCO) in the EXCO Lekgotla held in February 2018. Subsequently, the research objectives were discussed to gauge if they were met, followed by the narrative on how they were met as presented by the research. The research questions and the directions for anticipated future research was articulated as the concluding remarks.
1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH
The findings of the research could contribute significantly to achieve the following:

- Assist PPSTA in the development of standardised monitoring and evaluations mechanisms to measure the outcome of the training provided by PPSTA to provincial departments;
- Operationalise PPSTA and Provincial Departments Training and Development Standard Operating Procedures (PPSTA&PD T&D M&E SOPS), the importance of PPSTA&PD, T&D and M&E SOPS is that it can be infused into policy implementation, systems and tools at a strategic, operational and administrative level;
- Guide PPSTA planning and decision-making processes whether to continue, change or amend certain training programmes, and
- Assist the PPSTA to determine the value of the training to provincial departments.

1.9 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY
The study was necessitated by the importance of measuring the outcomes of the training programmes provided by the PPSTA. In measuring the outcomes of training and development programmes, it was vital that the M&E policies, systems and processes should be in place as the enabling tools to measure the outcomes of training. According to Srimannarayana (2011:117), the importance of evaluation is due to the large amounts of monies spent on training and development and the expectation of results from such training programmes. The argument by Srimannarayana agrees with the presentation made at the PPSTA Operational Plan Management Committee meeting stated earlier that highlighted that M&E systems, tools and policies that assisted tracking and measuring the performance. The study aimed to assist strategic planning and decision-making within the PPSTA and in provincial departments, as outlined in the Republic of South Africa (2007b: 1-4). PPSTA was chosen by the study because of its role in the Province i.e. the mandate to build capacity of the public service as outlined in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2013: 5). The research would assist PPSTA to determine whether there are segments in the training and development value chain that have challenges.

This research methodology in measuring the performance outcomes of the training programmes was informed by the M&E policy framework. The research aim was to determine whether there are available M&E policies, systems, processes that can be used as tools by to measure the performance outcomes. The research has stated earlier that PPSTA has the
mandate of aligning itself with the Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014-2019 and Outcome No. 5 and 12. The achievement of the MTSF 2014-2019 Outcome 5 which is focussed on the skilled and a capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path would lead the Province towards the direction of achieving MTSF Outcome 12 which is an efficient, effective and development-oriented public service and an empowered fair and inclusive citizenship.

The research findings alert the PPSTA to minimise the risks of utilising training resources without getting adequate feedback on whether the resources were efficiently, effectively and economically utilised. This step would ensure that the value-for-money-approach is achieved, as raised earlier by Srimannarayana (2011), and to establish findings whether PPSTA and provincial departments have standardised M&E training tools.

1.10 RESEARCH DELIMITATIONS

The study did not cover all fourteen departments due to the enormity and magnitude of such a large study that would impact on time constraints. It adopted sampling as one of the research techniques. The study did not cover all the courses offered by PPSTA, again due to time constraints: it sampled four (4) courses from the NQF-aligned training programmes, which are as follows:

- Chairing of Meeting Effectively;
- Public Sector Administrative Skills;
- Course on Facilitating Learning, and
- Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers

The study did not cover non-NQF-aligned courses; it aimed to utilise the findings of the research as the basis to conduct a more longitudinal study.

1.11 CONCLUSION

The synopsis of the study briefly outlined the need for study, research methodology adopted to respond to that need, proving of the hypothesis to be correct, and other choices made by the study that enabled it to measure the outcomes of training and development programmes offered by the PPSTA to provincial departments. Chapter Two commenced with discussing the details of what has been outlined in the synopsis of the study.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORISING MONITORING AND EVALUATION WITHIN THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PARADIGM

2.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter discusses the M&E concept and its linkage to Public Administration as a discipline and practice. The evolvement of Public Administration was significant for discussion, as it set the tone for the current context and understanding of Public Administration. The concept of good governance received impetus in the New Public Management (NPM) and Post-New Public Management (Post-NPM) paradigms. The chapter highlighted and discussed the implications of the paradigm shift for HRD practitioners as the providers of capacity enhancement support in the public service. This chapter linked the implementation of government interventions and the need for good governance, M&E capacity development also termed in the study as enhancement support, and how this approach can enhance service delivery. It was noted that as Public Administration evolves, the concept of good governance remained important. The study noted the significance of good governance as it resonated with the M&E concept. The concept of good governance, digitalisation and integration could be linked to M&E.

The concept of outcomes measurement in training programmes offered by the PPSTA was the focus of the study, and the concept is often misinterpreted as impact assessment. The difference between outcomes and impact assessment are discussed in depth in Chapter Three.

The legislative foundation on which M&E is pillared was discussed and linked to M&E. This chapter concluded by raising the linkage of the PPSTA as the state institution to the discussion of M&E and Public Administration.

2.2 CONCEPTUALISING MONITORING AND EVALUATION
South Africa is part of the global village. The study was conducted during the phase where the countries of the world were faced with the responsibility of responding to the previous 17 Millennium Developmental Goals (MDGs), New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), as well as the National Monitoring and Evaluation System (NMES). The countries needed to operationalise the former MDGs, NEPAD and NMES in order to be recognised for
upholding good governance. The concept of good governance was discussed in detail in the study. Nanda (2006: 268-269) stated that the notion of good governance positioned countries to be recognised and assisted by donor funders such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and others. Countries, especially in Africa, including South Africa were found to be under pressure to demonstrate good governance principles, (Kimaro and Fourie 2017: 1). In the case of South Africa, NMES can be referred to as the Government-wide M&E system (GWM&ES).

The discussion that follows here focuses on the South African perspective. The study aligned the concepts of M&E and GWM&ES with the principles of the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) in the Office of the Presidency. This perspective and principles of DPME in the Presidency commences by placing M&E into two separate but inter-related sub-concepts. Further, the study highlighted the institutionalisation of the M&E concept in the public sector through the (GWM&ES). The GWM&ES serves as the over-arching machinery that ensures that M&E functions in the public sector are guided by the Government-wide M&E Framework. The M&E sub-concepts were clarified within the context of the study in the discussion that follows. It must be noted that the term Government-wide M&E Framework refers to all the M&E frameworks within the fraternity, while M&E Framework of 2007 refers specifically to the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System.

2.2.1 Monitoring

The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 1) defined monitoring as the on-going process of data collection, analysis and reporting on the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. The M&E practitioners engage the process of monitoring in order to receive regular feedback, which enables progress reporting on the implementation of government interventions. The process of monitoring considers external factors and supports effective management in organisations. Monitoring and Evaluation concepts are inter-related but separated concepts. Monitoring serves at times as the basis for evaluation.

The implementation of the monitoring process by the PPSTA within the OTP was exhibited through the submission of Quarterly Performance Reports (QPRs). The QPRs are submitted by PPSTA and other units within the OTP to assist the Accounting Officer (AO) to gauge or monitor whether the OTP (including PPSTA) would meet its objectives as set out in the
strategic plan, annual performance plan and operational plans. The process of monitoring performance within PPSTA and in the OTP is sourced from the Republic of South Africa (2007b) that guides all state institutions on the management of programme performance information.

The study noted that the PPSTA was executing and exceeding the targets when it comes to the monitoring processes through the submission of the QPRs, specifically to the OTP annual performance plan indicator – Number of Public Servants Trained, but aims to evaluate the outcomes of these trainings as part of the evaluation process discussed hereunder.

2.2.2 Evaluation

Evaluation was defined in the study as the systematic assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the design, and the results of the implementation process of the on-going or completed project. Lucen (2015: 13-14) further stated that the aim of the evaluation process is to evaluate the indicators or the design against the work done. The evaluation is focused on the results emanating from the implementation of the key-performance information concepts known as the inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impact. The key performance information concepts are explored further in Chapter Three.

Cloete, Rabie and de Coning (2014: xiii) revealed that there was an absence of well-designed and well-executed evaluation processes in the public sector. The absence tendency can be attributed to the lack of adequate academic nodes that can provide in-depth research, understanding, innovation and leadership within the evaluation domain.

The study was in agreement with the argument by Cloete et al (2014), hence it conducted an outcome evaluation study. The findings of this study could contribute among the academic nodes to the evaluation body of knowledge in order to provide deeper understanding of the evaluation processes to the PPSTA.

2.2.3 Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System

Government-wide M&E system (GWM&ES) is the principal government framework for information collection, collation, analysis and reporting within government. It involves setting up of structures; processes of management; working standards and setting up and management of key performance information concepts, indicators, plans and strategies, (Lucen, (2015: 14), Republic of South Africa, (2007a: 4). The system is divided into three components or data terrains, namely:
- Programme performance information;
- Social economic and demographic statistics, and
- Evaluations.

A brief discussion of each of the components follows.

### 2.2.3.1 Programme performance information

The Republic of South Africa (2007b: 8) describes the Programme Performance Information (PPI) as the system that focuses on the information collected by the state institutions during the course of delivering on their mandates, for instance, the implementation of a certain programme. The information collected during the implementation of a certain programme would reflect the extent of government performance against envisaged outputs, outcomes and impact. The benefits of having PPI within the system are, amongst others, to set and clarify the expected standards of performance, improve working of structures and systems within government, define and allocate clear roles and responsibilities, as well as the promotion of accountability of the executive authorities and accounting officers by publishing performance information in a timely manner.

### 2.2.3.2 Social, economic and demographic statistics

The social, economic and demographics focused on the ‘official’ statistical information derived from census and surveys primarily collected by Statistics South Africa (STATS SA), and other statistical information collected by the departments. The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 7) states that STATS SA manages the information within the National Statistics System (NSS) guided by the South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework (SASQAF). According to Stofile (2017: 73), one of the aims of SASQAF is to integrate statistical arrangement in the country. In the integration and arrangement of statistics process, the GWM&ES is regarded as amongst the critical sources to achieve accessibility, relevance, accurateness, timeliness, accessibility, coherence, integrity, and methodological soundness highlighted by SASQAF. South African Statistics Quality Assessment Framework provides the framework at which social, economic demographic statistics can be assessed and be certified as ‘official’ statistics, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2010:1) and the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 7-9).
The concept of evaluation was introduced earlier in the study as a separate but inter-related concept in M&E. Further, evaluation data component is within the GWM&ES and refers to a unique set of expertise that incorporates evaluation methodologies. Evaluation practitioners ought to be able to navigate through sectoral, geographic, cultural, social, economic and political dynamics. The practitioner must be in a position to conduct well-designed and well-executed evaluation programmes with smart and realistic indicators, (Cloete et al 2014).

Zhanjun, Weifeng and Jiangbo (2016:87-89) presented the concept of evaluation or developing evaluation processes as a purpose to improve performance, and not to prove or defend the level of performance. Organisations, systems and individuals are in pursuit of continuous, vigorous improvements conduct evaluations, and evaluations assist organisations, systems and individuals to adjust, correct, maintain or improve performance and to set realistic predetermined objectives.

The evaluation data terrain discourse found resonance with the study. The study was ultimately aimed at measuring the outcomes of the PPSTA’s training and development interventions guided by the M&E Framework of 2007. The M&E Framework of 2007 views the outcomes and impact key performance information concepts to be largely linked to the evaluation data terrain. The key performance information concepts are discussed further in Chapter Three.

The research concluded the discussion by highlighting the significance and the obligation on public servants to understand, implement and institutionalise M&E systems within the context of the GWM&ES. The significance and the obligation can be attributed to the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4) that mandated any AO in a government institution to establish the M&E systems and develop capacity. In view of what the framework stipulates, the research understands the institutionalisation of M&E systems and capacity development to be legally binding for any state institution, including PPSTA.

In the section that follows, the institutionalisation of M&E systems and capacity are discussed.

2.2.4 Institutionalising Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Training and Development

The matter of developing systems to monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impact of training have been a continuous gap in the T&D fraternity. Many authors have argued that even when the process of evaluation takes place, it is normally narrowed down to statistics than
behavioural change. Fundamentally, it could be stated from the onset that literature revealed that the M&E system was less institutionalised in most organisations.

Tshukudu (2009: 200-202) presented evidence that suggested that most organisations (including the public service) have adopted the “production approach” when it came to evaluating training. The “production approach” or system was divorced from assessing the outcomes or impact of the actual training and more focused on the statistics, for example, the number of people that were trained on a particular course, the number of training sessions attended annually, and other statistical examples. The significance of focusing on the statistical data was noted; however, this approach lacked evidence that exhibited trainees’ behavioural change after attending the training programme. The “production approach” does not focus on whether the training bridged the gap that was initially identified during the training needs determination process or provide feedback on whether the Human Resource Management/Development units are providing trainings that are aligned to the core purpose of the organisation. Therefore, ETD practitioners needed to devote significant energies on the systematic training evaluation process that measures the efficacy of the training programmes implemented.

It was evident in the study that the practice of the M&E concept is legally binding to any state organisation. The practice of M&E concepts could also be applied within the context of the study where the focal point is on the PPSTA, as the training and development state institution. KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy has the statutory obligation to monitor and evaluate the inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impact of the training and development intervention. The study chose to focus mainly on the outcomes key performance information indicators for the reasons explained earlier by the study.

The research noted that the M&E concept or its institutionalisation does not operate in isolation. It should be embedded within the broader legislative domain. The study has chosen to discuss legislative mandates that highlight the significance of the M&E concept and its institutionalisation in training and development initiatives.
2.3 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION CONCEPT

It was stated earlier that the concept of M&E is a statutory obligation for the public service, and it operates in cooperation with other legislation. In this section, the research discusses the legislative mandate that relates to M&E concept within the context of training and development in the public service.

2.3.1 Legislative Mandates

The following legislative mandates informed the discussion.

2.3.1.1 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996)

The study was focused on the Republic of South Africa (1996:15) Chapter 2, Section 29, subsection (1) that positions education, adult basic education and further education as the basic right. Chapter 10, Section 195, sub-section (1) of the Republic of South Africa (1996: 115) stipulates that career-development practices and good human resources should be cultivated in order to maximise human potential. This Constitutional value is specific to ETD practitioners, and is amongst others, eight values and principles in Chapter 10 of the Constitution that govern public administration, including ETD practitioners. Proper management of government funds, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (1996: 129), Chapter 13 Section 215 sub-section (1), focuses on the promotion of transparency, accountability and efficacy in the economy and debt financial management in the public sector. The task of ensuring transparency and expenditure control is assigned to Treasury in terms of Section 216 of the Constitution. It should be noted, that the recent developments in government took place including the establishment of the DPME in the Presidency. The task of managing performance has moved to the Offices of the Premier, which culminated into the establishment, as well at every government institution of performance management structures, systems and processes that are aligned to the Republic of South Africa (2007a).

Based on the argument presented above, ETD as well as M&E practitioners should uphold the Constitution by ensuring that performance management, in this instance referring to the provision of training to the 14 provincial departments in KZN, is aligned to the Constitutional mandates. The study noted the prominence of ensuring transparency, compliance and expenditure control, which are significant elements to be noted in the M&E concept.
2.3.1.2 White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery (1997)
There are eight Batho Pele Principles practiced in the public service. The Batho Pele Principles emanate from the Republic of South Africa (1997), which are as follows: Consultation, Service Standards, Access, Courtesy, Information, Dealing with Complaints, Value-for-Money, as well as Openness and Transparency. The core of the Republic of South Africa (1997) is to transform the public service, and places the citizens at the centre of planning and decision-making. The province of KZN took an initiative to add three more principles, which are as follows: Service Delivery Impact, Leadership and Strategic Direction, as well as Encouraging Innovation and Reward Excellence, as argued in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2009: 13). These eleven (11) Batho Pele Principles are noted, but for the purposes of the study, the focus is on the following principles: Consultation, Service Standards, Value-for-Money and Service Delivery Impact.

2.3.1.2.1 Consultation
Proper consultation should take place when monitoring or evaluating the outcomes of training programmes, which translate to surveys, one-on-one interviews, suggestion boxes, mass training outcome meetings, as well as other research activities that should be adopted to ensure that proper consultation takes place in the public service, as stated in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2009: 16).

2.3.1.2.2 Service Standards
It is important for the PPSTA to encourage, maintain and promote high standards of work ethics. The PPSTA M&E unit is expected to produce high quality work and lead the improvement of data management standards in reference to the provincial line departments, as per the Republic of South Africa (2012:1-2). The Republic of South Africa (2007b:8) emphasises clear standards of performance information and regular audits. The study noted that when the performance standards or targets are clear and understood, they can be easily monitored and evaluated. In the study, this would mean clear evaluation systems and processes related to measuring the outcome of training programmes offered by the PPSTA.

2.3.1.2.3 Value-for-Money
It was stated earlier that one of the aspects of evaluation is to determine whether the decisions or the theories adopted by government for a particular intervention yielded the anticipated results. In essence, the evaluation process in the M&E concept could assist to determine value-
for-money, and monitoring can assist to check whether the intervention is geared towards the direction of achieving value-for-money. The Republic of South Africa (2007b: 4) focuses on embedding budgetary internal monetary systems, *inter alia*, internal systems with M&E policies, systems and processes in order to understand the value-for-money approach.

**2.3.1.2.4 Service Delivery Impact**

The principle is relevant to the study as it is concerned with public service making an impact in the communities they serve by adhering to the principles of Batho Pele, as raised in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2009: 19). The study aimed to determine the outcomes of the training programmes offered by the PPSTA as guided by the M&E Framework. It was indicated earlier in the study that the outcomes findings may serve as the basis for impact evaluation.

**2.3.1.3 Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System**

Since 1994, the government has improved services that are provided to the people dramatically, but there is a need for government to improve the quality of its services. The challenge facing government is to increase the level of efficacy in the public sector. Monitoring and Evaluation policies, systems and processes are viewed as mechanisms that can contribute to the increase of efficacy in the interventions that are implemented by the state. The Government-wide M&E system (GWM&ES) has an individual, institutional and outcomes-based performance management system, as argued in the Republic of South Africa (2011a: 23). The Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E system of 2007 gives guidance on how performance efficacy should be managed. Performance management is one of the three data terrains where government draws from for the purposes of monitoring and evaluation. Each terrain has the policy that determines what is required for the terrain to be fully functional. The programme for performance information is guided by the Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information of 2007, which aims to clarify the standards expected, provides audit support, define roles and responsibilities, and promotes accountability as outlined in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 8). The Republic of South Africa (2007b: 2) looks into the GWM&ES as the plans of government to bridge the gap in the information needed in planning for service delivery, intervention reviews and analysis of the policy success.
2.3.1.4 Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines on improving Monitoring and Evaluation in the Offices of Premier

The Republic of South Africa (2012) assists the Office of the Premier in understanding their role within the M&E spectrum. It calls for robustness and credibility of the M&E systems within individual provincial departments. There is a strong emphasis on the avoidance of duplication of reports. The importance of individual departments to have functional M&E systems supported by the Offices of the Premier was found to be prominent to the study. The DPME Guidelines on improving M&E in the Offices of the Premier can be understood in the context of the study, as PPSTA ensuring that it has approved M&E training and development policies, systems and processes in place, but also to make sure that provincial departments are also supported to have aligned training and development M&E policies, systems and processes.

2.3.1.5 Outcomes of the Medium-Term Strategic Framework (2014-2019)

Outcome 12 of the MTSF (2014-2019: 1) reads as follows: “An efficient, effective and development-oriented public service”. This outcome focuses on the unevenness of capacity in the public service, which leads to unevenness in the public sector performance. Certain steps need to be taken by the public service to boost the morale, clarify lines of accountability and ethos building in the public service. These steps to be taken requires for the Office of the OTP PPSTA to play the coordinating role, as stated in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2017:10). The implementation of Outcome 12 and other outcomes needs PPSTA to support the provincial departments to achieve Outcome 12, as specified in the Republic of South Africa (2015: 1).

The KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy is mandated to work with the provincial departments to make public service as a career of choice as stated in Sub-outcome 2 of Outcome 12. It becomes vital that efficient and effective management and operation systems are placed to achieve this Outcome, as argued in Sub-Outcome 4 of the MTSF that advocates for efficient and efficient management and operations systems. According to the Republic of South Africa (2015: 14), management should focus their time on addressing the weaknesses in the management and operations systems. The study noted the significance of embedded M&E policies, systems and processes as part of the solution to address the weaknesses in the management and operations systems. The M&E Framework of 2007, systems and processes focuses on addressing a number of gaps in the planning, budgetary and reporting systems, as indicated in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4).
The research noted Outcome 5 of the MTSF, which reads as follows: “A skilled and a capable workforce to support the inclusive growth path”, PPSTA is not the only stakeholder in this Outcome. It involves schools, training vocational and education colleges and universities. It can be stated that PPSTA submits reports on this Outcome to structures such as the Social Protection, Community and Human Development (SPCHD) Cluster, KZN Provincial Growth and Development Plan (PGDP) Technical Task Team, KZN Planning Commission (PPC) guided by the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2014:48-62).

2.3.1.6 National Development Plan, 2030 relating to capacity and skills development
In Chapter 13, the National Development Plan (NDP) raises unevenness of capacity and skills deficit in the state as amongst the major stifling challenges in the provision of services at a local, provincial and national level. Chapter 9 of the NDP views continuous development professionally, lifelong learning, innovation and knowledge production as the vital elements in building state capacity, and in dealing with the public sector skills deficit. The study notes Chapter 13 of the NDP that embeds M&E systems into the NDP by highlighting the importance of improving oversight, instilling compliance, as well as strengthening of responsibility and accountability as crucial elements in building the capacity of the state. Further, Chapter 13 states that the public servants have the responsibility to administer resources in the best interest of the society. The resources should be managed with efficacy, transparency and accountability. The Office of the Public Service Commission (PSC) is the appointed institution to exercise the M&E role of state institutions, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2011: 408-412).

2.3.1.7 Human Resource Development Strategic Framework Vision 2015
The Republic of South Africa (2008), commonly known as the Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015, uses the Annual Implementation Plans, Quarterly Implementation Plan reports, Mid-Term HRD Implementation Reports and HRD Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report templates as the M&E tools concerning planning, budgeting and reporting of training provided by the public service. Further, the Republic of South Africa (2008:81) requires the provincial academies to support, trainings, provide M&E leadership in relation to the HRD implementation agenda in the Province. This arrangement is in keeping with the Strategic Framework for HRD Vision 2015.
The legislation, HRD as well as M&E concepts mentioned above were viewed by the study, as among the crucial pillars that informs training and development in the public service. The understanding derived from correlating the M&E concepts and HRD legislative mandates assisted the research to locate the legality of implementing the training and development interventions in the public service.

It was noted that providing training to the public service is a legal obligation to PPSTA as a state institution. It was vital for the study to establish whether there were PPSTA’s M&E processes, systems and policies embedded within the Provincial HRD. Measuring of the outcomes of PPSTA’s training and development programmes provided to fourteen provincial departments does not operate in a vacuum. It should be embedded in the broad performance management system, which includes the existing legislation, theories and frameworks, as envisaged by the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4).

The study earlier introduced the M&E concept and its significance to training and development. M&E training and development has also been discussed and located within the broader South African legislative framework. The research finds the importance for M&E training and development to be linked to Public Administration, as science and practice in the discussion that follows.

2.4. LINKING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TO MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The M&E concept, as stated previously, does not operate independently: its modus operandi is largely influenced and dependent on the embedded systems, structures and existing administrative policies. In the context of the study, the administrative policies, systems and structures will be largely influenced by Public Administration as a science and as a practice, the study will discuss the influence and linkages of Public Administration to the concept of M&E in relation to the implementation of training and development as state intervention implemented by the public institution (PPSTA).

The point of departure is to understand Public Administration as a practice and science. Subsequently, the research highlights the evolvement of Public Administration and links it to the concept of good governance. The study further highlights the significance of M&E as one of the government enablers of good governance.
2.4.1 Public Administration as a Practice
Public administration is viewed by Mfene (2009: 209-210) as the enabler for government to provide a service. It would not be easy to deliver certain services successfully without sound public administration. Sound public administration includes processes, individuals in formal official roles and positions, organisations, frameworks for the operations of the government institutions, acquiring of certain equipment, funds allocation to the organisations to achieve set objectives, and human resources employed to manage public administration with an intention to provide tangible and intangible services. The quality of the service delivered by the state determines the extent at which public administration within that state can be categorised, as sound or quality public administration.

Du Toit and Van Der Walt (2007: 8) viewed public administration as an activity or action from government that caters for services and products where the private sector is not interested to deliver or produce. Governments are expected to fill the gap where private institutions cannot or would not deliver, and especially where individuals in a society cannot meet those specific needs.

Mfene (2009) highlighted the significance of measuring services rendered by the state, and the development of processes to measure those services rendered in order to measure the quality of the service rendered. The quality of the service rendered determines the soundness of the state public administration. The significance of developing M&E policies, systems and processes as a tool to monitor and measure state performance discussed earlier, can be linked to the narrative of the state service quality measurement presented by Mfene.

2.4.2 Public Administration as a Science
Public Administration can be understood as the discipline that studies individuals’ behaviour within the process of executing administrative duties and managerial duties within the organs of the state. The Public Administration discipline is of Social Science origin, this implies that Public Administration theories could incorporate among others, the social, political, cultural, and economical environments as areas of study. The approach of theorising in Public Administration is multi-dimensional, as it draws theories from other disciplines. Public Administration as a science studies the practice of public administration in practice, as per the view tabled by Thornhill and van Dijk (2010: 95-96).
According to Meier (2014: 15), Public Administration is the ‘artificial’ science that is more focused on the future than the present occurrences of public administration. The futuristic focus of the science calls for scientific quality, as well as practical relevance, which is producing public administration work based on scientific evidence and with empirical validity. Gibson and Stolcis (2006:63) present the field of Public Administration as the study that amalgamates the discoveries from the several of fields of study including Political Science, Psychology and Sociology.

The research defined public administration as a practice, and emphasised the significance of public administration as an enabler for government to deliver tangible and intangible quality service. Further, the study noted the implication of measuring the quality of service, as it links to the focus of the study, which can be understood as developing tools to measure the quality of training and development service rendered by the PPSTA.

In the definition of Public Administration as a science, it transpired that the discipline draws from different theories, which vindicates the study drawing from M&E theory. Monitoring and Evaluation as a concept also accommodates drawing from other disciplines.

The study has chosen to briefly discuss both angles of \( \text{Public Administration} \) that is Public Administration as a science and public administration as a practice, as they set the scene for the discussion of the evolvement of Public Administration.

2.4.3 **Evolvement of Public Administration towards New Public Management**

In the quest for understanding the evolving nature of Public Administration as a science and as a practice, a brief narrative was presented on the intellectual history of public administration.

Public Administration has been generally dominated and understood through the views of the North American intellectuals. Traverso (2017: 275) noted the dominance of Woodrow Wilson literature in 1887 through the publication of “The Study of Administration”. The literature on Public Administration from France and Germany has gained significance in the Nineteenth Century, but was largely presented to understand the extent at which it influenced the work of Woodrow Wilson and other American authors. According to Traverso (2017), literature revealed that as there were Public Administration academic developments in the North, similar academic developments had taken place earlier in Latin America. This argument can be vindicated and exhibited through the publications of the *Elementos de Ciencia Administrativa* (Elements of Administrative Science) of 1840 by Florentino Gonzales and *Manual da Administracion* (Handbook of Administration) of 1857 by Fransisco de Paula Madrazo, as
these were among the South Public Administration intellectuals, as stated by Overeem (2014:32). The lack of acquaintance to the South Public Administration academic work especially by the North could be attributed to the Anglophone public administration readership, but it can be concluded by the study that the Public Administration academe in the South has been in operation as early as 1840s.

The importation of the Western Public Administration to China was understood to have taken place through Zang Jinjian in the 1930s, slowed down in the 1950s and gained momentum in the mid-1980s. Public Administration evolvement in China as a practice and a science was also influenced social surroundings and the quest to realise political and administrative balance as viewed by Wei and Wenzhao (2013: 1-5). The research noted Wei and Wenzhao’s (2013) work that presented the academic developments in Public Administration from the Chinese perspective.

The study noted supporting views expressed by Hanyane (2016: 664-667), that the intellectual history and evolution of Public Administration as a knowledge repository does not reside only and precisely on the Western perspective. It can be traced back to Latin America. Further, Hanyane (2016: 667) raised the limitation of the African contribution to the Public Administration body of knowledge. The limitation can be attributed to among others, the colonial history of the African continent, including South Africa, which evaporated the African indigenous knowledge on public administration as a science and practice. Colonisation of Africa by Belgium, Germany, United Kingdom and other European countries meant European influence in the management and design of social, cultural, economic, political and technological Public Administration constructs.

It can be concluded based on the argument presented by Hanyane (2016) above, and echoed by Louw (2012: 91), that the African continent specifically South Africa ‘inherited’ the discipline from the era of the former president of United States of America Woodrow Wilson as the father of Public Administration, the work of Lydall Urwick, Luther Gulick on the POSDCORB, as well as the German Weberian construct. This era of evolution is also referred to as Traditional Public Administration.

The study noted the Traditional evolution of Public Administration academically and practically in North America, Latin America and China and its influence on the African continent and South Africa that can be traced from the Politics/Administration Dichotomy era.
Traditional Public Administration is viewed by academics to have served as the foundation for the advent of the New Public Management era to be introduced by the study.

2.4.4 Conceptualising the New Public Management

The New Public Management (NPM) paradigm has been in existence for more than thirty years. It gradually gained momentum as a global phenomenon in different countries during the 1970s and the 1980s. The emergence of NPM was characterised by two facets: a science and a practice. The advent of NPM emanates from *inter alia* the immense practical and empirical need for governments’ marketisation, managerialism, performance management, accountability and decentralisation as presented by Tolofari (2005: 75-76), as it was beginning to be difficult for the states to maintain traditional public administration.

The introduction of the NPM with performance management as among the concepts has given rise to the significance of the M&E concept, and as a result, governments have become more concerned not only with the outputs, but the outcomes, impacts, transparency and accountability. The NPM paradigm focuses on the market-based operations, adopts private sector management values and management techniques. The role played by government of principally leading in the socio-economic matters changed to the role of sharing the solutions regarding the socio-economic matters with business, civil society and academics, as argued by Basheka and Byamugisha (2015: 77).

The research found links between performance management and the good governance concept. New Public Management presented the shift within public administration of “good government” which referred to the aspiration of the people dedicated to the betterment and effective management of public institutions with “good governance”. The term ‘good governance’ focuses on the widened, richer and extensive scope of public values, as well as performance evaluation parameters. Good governance represents a balancing act of contradicting standards and values at times in the midst of constrained budgets versus stakeholder expectation, (Perry, 2014: 27).

The intensification of the good governance concept can be noticed to gain momentum through 1980s. In the 1990s, the concept was the *modus operandi* for the institutions such as the World Bank and other donor agencies that used good governance to gauge governments’ performance and readiness to receive or maintain funding from these institutions, (Nanda, 2006: 269).
The discussion of good governance as one of the concepts within NPM paradigm by Basheka, Byamugisha (2015) and Perry (2014) was found to be in sync with the view presented by Nel (2015: 73-74), that simplistic approaches to the complex and ever-changing nature of public administration are no longer suitable. Governments should constantly search for sustainable reform policies that would contribute to structural effectiveness, competitiveness and “fit for purpose” governance. Further, NPM implies more complex and dependent relationships among the stakeholders inside and outside of government.

The study noted that the posture presented by the NPM paradigm of incorporating outside government stakeholders as part of the solution was not strongly featured in the Traditional models of Public Administration. There was less emphasis placed on establishing and maintaining complex relationships with the stakeholders outside government, as part of the solution to policy-making and service delivery. In the NPM paradigm, there are elements presented that are similar to the Network Theory as both paradigms (NPM and Network Theory) are pillared on building and maintaining relationships in and outside government. The other paradigms such as the Principal Agent Theory, Chicago School of Economics, Public Choice Model, Rational Decision Theory, Neo-bureaucratic, Classis and Bureaucratic Theory were noted by the research, but as stated earlier, they are understood to have served as the building blocks towards the fully-fledged NPM paradigm. In essence, NPM is viewed by Nel (2015: 84), as an umbrella concept encompassing multiple reforms. NPM draws from the past, present and emerging theories that are focused on government and society interactions.

The study noted that the concept of good governance plays a significant role within the NPM paradigm. The parallels can be drawn between NPM and M&E, as they both recognise and draw strengths from other existing systematic administrative domains. The parallels of NPM and M&E can be viewed in action implemented by the PPSTA when conducting training and development public administration. These matches will be brought to light as the discussion progressed.

The study chose NPM good governance sub-concepts to be discussed due to their argument advancement and contextualization of monitoring and evaluation into the training and development intervention. The research noted with interest the concept of performance management and M&E raised by Tolofari (2005), as it relates to the focus of the study which is to monitor and evaluate PPSTA’s performance in relation to training and development intervention. The following discussion focused on the NPM good governance sub-concepts.
2.4.4.1. NPM, Good Governance and Transparency

The study found links between good governance and the transparency. According to Brillantes Jr and Fernandez (2011: 20-21), the governance paradigm has brought models and theories including civic governance and good governance as part of the public administration reforms. Civic governance can be understood as the active role the society plays to bring about consensus and transformation. Good governance includes among others; societal involvement in policy making and decision-making, decentralised government, transparency and accountability and respect of the “right to know” by the society. Further, these authors raised good enough governance as based on the deeper understanding of the complexity of government capabilities and the evolvement of the role of government, being explicit about the trade-offs and priorities of government, targeting poverty and employing mitigating strategies and actions that are aligned to the context of the country. The study notes the demand for transparency attached to good governance sub-concept, as part of the reforms brought by the NPM paradigm.

Jain (2012: 506-514) views good governance as a measure of efficiency of the administration in a democratic state. The author argued that a democratic set-up requires an informed citizenry as they are the primary stakeholders in a democratic state. Democracy, Rule of Law and liberty represents the universally accepted trio of the accepted index that represents a civil society. It should be noted that as much as the sub-concept of transparency is vital pillar of good governance, but no government can provide complete access to all of its documents as the decision to do so may impede on the privacy of the society and the government strategies can be used against the state. The argument made by Jain (2012) vindicates the presentation made earlier by Perry (2014) that good governance is the balancing act contradicting cases at times.

The study concluded the discussion by acknowledging the significance of good governance and transparency in NPM, and highlighting that vetting on what, how, who and when the information can be communicated to society is equally important. In the context of PPSTA, transparency and administration efficiency measurement manifests through annual performance plan reports and quarterly performance reports as part of good governance and transparency. The society and other interested stakeholders can be informed of the number of public servants trained (annual performance indicator) quarterly and annually by viewing these documents. On the matter of vetting the information to be dispensed, the PPSTA conducts trainings to public servants on Promotion of Access to Information (PAIA) Act of 2000. PAIA Act controls management and dispensation of public service information.
2.4.4.2 NPM, Good Governance and Capacity Development

Capacity development is another critical facet of good governance. Public administration in the 20th Century has undergone many reforms specifically in the sub-Saharan Africa. Good governance is among these reforms. These multiple reforms in the field of public administration has significance for the officials expected to practice them. Haruna and Kannae (2013:493-494) argue that while the good governance paradigm is well understood and implemented in the public sector sub-Saharan Africa, the challenge is that officials are not adequately prepared for the implementation. There seems to be no systematic curriculum that focuses on the link between good governance, public service and training. Performance evaluation is one of the aspects within good governance that assists in the determination of gaps and failures in the public and private sector, therefore it is critical that public administration training is embraced to determine the outcome of policy implementation and governance reforms.

Hope (2009: 79-80) argued that while sustaining economic transformation is essential for developing countries, many developing nations lack the capacity than the will to achieve or sustain good governance. Further, the author submits that the lack of good governance has resulted in democracy being undermined, policies failing to deliver results, rife corruption, and subverted Rule of Law, discouraged foreign investors, distracted poverty alleviation plans and policies among other challenges. Haruna and Kannae (2013: 496) raise the significance of institutions such as Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA), which are exemplary in terms of providing good governance public administration training including performance management and M&E. The training assists officials to measure the outcomes of any government intervention including T&D.

The argument presented by Haruna and Kannae (2013) can be linked to the role that is played by the PPSTA as the training institution in capacitating public servants on the matters of good governance and M&E. The training of the public servants on good governance and M&E systems, processes and policies by the PPSTA serves to fill the gap raised by Hope (2009) of inadequately trained officials to implement good governance. The study will place the focus on the capacity development of public servants in the latter discussion, as it resonated with the research topic.
2.4.4.3 Capacity Development and Training

The study noted the significance of capacity development that was linked to training and development. According to Hope (2009: 80), capacity building, capacity enhancement or capacity strengthening can be defined as more than just training, but a strategically coordinated set of plans and activities aimed at the individuals, institutions or sectors for the enhancement of all the social actors to achieve sustainable engagement in the socio-economic matters and to strengthen performance. Capacity development involves the competency of individuals, public sector, private sector and civil societies with the aim of achieving beneficial goals such as poverty alleviation, attract foreign investors, good governance, economic growth among other benefits.

Rosenbaum (2014:85) argued that the New Public Management paradigm in Public Administration has implications on training existing public service officials and possibly the next generation of official. Good governance emergence has called for the need to review or strengthen public administration training to prepare the new and existing generation of public administrators for the extraordinary challenges in the field of public service delivery. The argument was based on the following realities:

- The government has the mandate to uphold law and order in the society;
- Government sets the rules within which other institutions operates, and
- Government should be the source of change and the leader of innovations in modern societies.

The study found it as important that HRD practitioners in the public service embrace both T&D and capacity development concepts when implementing government interventions. The research finds links between the presentations made by Hope (2009) and Rosenbaum (2014) to the MTSF Outcome 5 that advocates for a skilled and a capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path. The matters of capacity development include intense and holistic training of the public service. Subsequently, the MTSF Outcome 12 that reads: efficient and effective and development-oriented public service, could be realised.

The realisation of efficacy and development orientation in the public service can be linked to the performance of public officials. The aim of building capacity and training is mainly to improve the overall performance of officials towards enhanced productivity and service delivery. In the NPM paradigm, performance management is one of the critical pillars. Performance management is the next pillar of NPM sub-concepts to be discussed.
2.4.4.4 NPM, Good Governance and Performance Management

The point of departure for the study was to highlight that in the traditional public administration paradigms, not much emphasis was placed on the measurement of performance. The performance appraisal system used in the traditional public administration system had little opportunity for improvements and had no or few targets set. The performance appraisal system was based on the following key matters: loyalty, punctuality and little or no link to individual performance and the strategic goals of the public office. When performance management takes place, it was often incidental. The NPM paradigm focuses on the measurement, monitoring and evaluation of the public institutions to ensure that performance improves, efficacy is achieved and a certain level of accountability is attained. Performance management system (PMS) is one of the adopted public sector reforms incorporated into the NPM paradigm that focuses on management of performance based on the contract or agreement more than a command, (Dzimbiri, 2008: 46-47).

According to Verbeerten and Spekle (2015: 955-956), NPM represented public administration shift from the preoccupation by rules and procedures to the results-oriented public administration. The result-oriented culture encourages managers to perform at their full potential, driven by the set target outcomes and the incentives subsequent to the achievement of the set targets. Performance is monitored and evaluated, whilst policies that are developed are linked to the provision of incentives and performance. Most importantly, when performance is monitored, managers account for the decisions taken. Good decision-making is rewarded and bad decision-making is punished or support is provided. The argument made by Verbeerten and Spekle (2015) was consistent with the submission made by the Republic of South Africa (2007b: 1) stating that if results are not measured, successful performance cannot be recognised and rewarded. If the manager cannot recognise success, it is possible that the manager might be rewarding failure.

The position presented by Dzimbiri (2008) of Performance Management System (PMS) strengthens the reasons for the study to exist, as its core aim was to measure the outcome of the PPSTA’s performance in relation to the training intervention. PMS can be understood as outcomes or impact assessment in the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) theory, which forms part of the discussion in Chapter Three. The study also noted elements of NPM still in existence within the PPSTA public administration. PMS can be related to the PPSTA activity of
submitting the quarterly performance reports (QPRs) as a build-up process towards the annual performance plan (APP) and operational plan (Ops Plan).

Cutler (2011: 130-132) presented a different angle to the study, which claimed that the adoption of performance management techniques in the public sector pre-dates the era of NPM. Performance indicators, devolved management structures, linking costs to measurable outputs and the adoption of the business-like mechanisms into the public office have been employed as early as 1948. The limitation to this argument is that there is no developed literature to account for the implementation of performance management techniques during the pre-NPM era, and it was not widely implemented in major public offices, as it has occurred during the NPM. Cutler (2011) further stated that NPM has been active in certain public offices such as the NHS Acute Hospitals in England.

In the context of NPM and PMS, other authors (Belle and Ongaro: 2014: 389) have argued for the significance of public service motivation (PSM). PSM can be understood as the predisposition of a public service employee propelled by motivational forces to perform meaningfully in the public, community and social service. Public service motivation involves altruistic motivated public servant, correct set of beliefs, commendable values, as well as the attitude that is beyond self and organisational interests, but for the benefit of the larger political entity. Recent studies such as the: what is the motivational profile of Public Servants in Italy? have found that in the developed countries such as Italy, which has adopted elements of the NPM paradigm, PMS that is influenced by PSM have shown higher levels of performance tendencies than in the private sector. Public Service Motivation public servants have been found to have higher commitment to public interest, compassion and self-sacrifice than in the private sector. The evidence found leads the study to the circumstantial conclusion that the greater the PSM, the greater the chances of attracting and retaining public service employees, as argued by Belle and Ongaro (2014: 389-393).

The study found significance in performance management, in that public service motivation is crucial for enhancing productivity, and leans on sub-concepts within good governance and the NPM paradigm. The study noted evidence presented by the literature demonstrating that the result-oriented performance management has been in the public service during the bureaucratic and traditional public administration era. The traditional era performance management implementation literature evidence can be understood to prove that the significance of measuring performance management had been realised and implemented by public
administrators earlier than documented. The study acknowledges all these arguments, as they assist the study to highlight the significance of performance management, PMS and PSM within NPM. Public service motivation becomes important in the PPSTA’s context, the trainee and the trainer ought to have high PSM, this means they both need to be self-motivated public servants and be willing to be trained, as this may increase opportunities for the exhibition of training obtained back at the workplace and better performance, which can lead to performance bonuses, as argued by Wexley and Lathan (2002: 137-138). Performance management can be linked to the PPSTA context in terms of the institution’s performance being monitored and evaluated by the M&E and Strategic Human Resources Chief Directorates in the OTP. The Strategic Human Resources awards bonuses to better performing public servants using the Performance Management Development System (PMDS) as performance measuring tool. The research notes the link between well-functioning PMS and a financially well-managed state institution, which is emphasised in the discussion to follow.

2.4.4.5 NPM, Good Governance and Financial Management

It had been argued earlier in the study, that NPM is informed by the various reforms that highlight opening up of public institutions to competition, focusing on public satisfaction and quality, being transparent in the modernised mechanisms of control, as well as an enhanced sense of accountability by the public managers. Consequently, the acceptance of the NPM paradigm by the developed and the developing states created a need to attain transparent, comparable, accountable, and generally accepted financial standards aligned to good governance. As a case in point, authors such as Aucoin, (1990: 115) that were for the NPM paradigm advocated for the shift from historical cost accounting (HCA) to the fair value accounting (FVA) system although most of the countries still use HCA. The standardised accounting practices aligned to NPM therefore became an important pillar in the implementation model. The implementation of NPM required a sound financial information reporting system for accountability and transparency purposes, which was not necessary under the traditional public administration. The argument presented by Bolivar and Galera (2007: 747-476) is that FVA management techniques were guided by the following aspects that the study finds aligned to the NPM postulates:

- Assists public offices to attain transparency on financial information;
- Public offices can benchmark and share good practice;
- Assists to measure efficiency of the service delivered;
- Increases choice for the relevant best model to deliver services;
• Assists the public sector to assess solvency, and
• FVA can assist the public sector to adapt to the current socio-economic framework.

It should be noted from the discussion, the purpose of the argument was not to prefer FVA over HCA or vice versa, but to highlight the significance of proper financial management system as one of the enablers of good governance within the NPM paradigm. The study found both elements of HCA and FVA in the South African context, the financial decisions that are taken by the public sector financial system in liquid and organised markets prove South Africa to be within the NPM and HCA context. On the other side, the country’s financial decision to sell some of its State-Owned Entities (SOEs) can be associated with NPM and FVA aspects, as mentioned in The Economist (1999). The study found elements of the NPM paradigm in both FVA and HCA South African financials as both decisions (whether FVA or HCA decision) as they are focused on the aspect of increased choice for the relevant best model to deliver services.

There is a strong emphasis on financial management and performance management policies in the country. The Republic of South Africa (1996: 130) calls for the accounting practices that are generally recognised, undeviating classification of expenditures and uniformed norms and standard from Treasury. The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 5) argues for the integrated and encompassing framework for the monitoring and evaluation practices, standards and principles, and further on the concept of attaching outcome and impact to the money spent. The M&E Framework also mandates every accounting officer and chief executive officer to establish a monitoring and evaluation system for the institution that would be aligned to the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and budget implementation plan. The Republic of South Africa (2010) serves to regulate national and provincial governments on all revenues, expenditures, liabilities and assets of the government and provide responsibilities. The study then, correlates the country’s financial performance management developments to the risen need of good governance globally in public institutions, as well as the need to incorporate performance management as part of the NPM paradigm implementation.

The need for the implementation of public service financial management training policies and techniques to attain proper implementation of NPM is emphasized by Bolivar and Galera (2007: 496). This argument highlights the relevance of NPM, good governance and sound financial management in the execution of the training and development intervention by the institutions like PPSTA that provides financial training and development programmes for the
KwaZulu-Natal public service. Good governance and sound financial management need to be interlinked with sound strategic planning.

2.4.4.6 NPM, Good governance and Strategic Planning

Strategic planning can be regarded as among the older management reforms that is still in use. It assists government managers to deal with political and operational environments and shape the focus towards attaining specific goals informed by the political mandates and operations management to improve efficacy. Strategic planning forms the bases of fundamental decision-making in an organisation, it shapes what the organisation does, why, when and how. It involves the communication and collaboration with horizontal and vertical management layers of other governments. Community strategic planning can be understood as building stronger societal consensus. Businesses, public interest groups, non-governmental organisation, ordinary citizens and other societal formations becomes involved in the programs in the programmes developed by government, as mentioned by Kwon, Berry and Jang (2012: 438-439). Strategic planning and community strategic planning can be understood by the NPM practitioners as the enhancement of responsibilities by public offices to the clients or customers in an effort to increase management accountability, reduction of public expenses and the improvement of efficacy as stated by Van de Sluis, Reezigt and Borghans (2015: 3). The study noted the prominence of evaluating the after-effects of strategic planning presented by Hansen (2011: 772). Hansen presents the need for tools to be developed and embedded into the NPM paradigm to measure the after-effects of outcome and impact measurement. This argument is based on the understanding that more organisations are employing strategic planning, as part of the NPM reforms, but do not develop tools to measure strategic planning after-effects.

It was stated earlier, that the study views NPM as the ‘umbrella’ paradigm encompassing the traditional paradigms and other theories. Other theories within Public Administration have served as the building blocks towards the fully-fledged NPM paradigm. The study found certain elements of Public Choice theory, Network theory and NPM within the concepts of strategic management within the umbrella of NPM.

The significant role played by the NPM paradigm in Public Administration is noted, but the NPM paradigm does possess certain inadequacies. The study finds it appropriate to look at the insufficiencies and challenges in the NPM paradigm.
2.4.5 Inadequacies and challenges of the New Public Management

The improvements that the NPM paradigm has made to Public Administration as science and public administration in practice have been highlighted earlier; however, like other theories this paradigm had its own shortcomings. The purpose of this section is to emphasise the NPM paradigm limitations, and to discuss the manner in which they have prompted for the paradigm-shift to the post-NPM.

2.4.5.1 Shift from NPM to Post-NPM

Post-NPM authors have stated that among other limitations, the outcome of decentralisation or ‘agencification’ informed by the NPM paradigm has been paradoxical, and at times resulted in unintended consequences and reverse effects. The NPM contradictions are due to amongst others, the complex and multi-dimensional processes of socio-economic, political, administrative and fiscal autonomy at play when implementing the NPM accountability model. The example of NPM’s contradictions could be political representatives tend to be “uncomfortable” with the discretion and authority awarded to public managers. Subsequently, post-NPM paradigm has been viewed at times as a modifying factor to the NPM paradigm paradoxes since it reintroduces state (including politicians) at the centre of decision-making processes, as argued by Zafra-Gomez, Bolivar and Munos (2012: 711-712).

It should be noted that any reform or paradigm shift does not altogether change the established political-administrative system or culture. To explain further, the paradigm shift that occurred to most of the Anglo-American states from NPM to post-NPM paradigms still preserved elements of the “old public administration” and neo-Weberian features. The notion of old features remaining within the new paradigm are due to among other reasons, the uneasiness that comes with the expected rapid change from historical public administration traditions, hence, the public offices opt for the gradual change towards the new paradigm as opposed to instant change. Public offices still find it easy to rely on the traditional public administration paradigm features, while gradually adapting to the new wave of reforms. This argument is evidenced through countries such as Norway that preserved some of the NPM elements. The implementers were found to be reluctant to post-NPM reform public administration, as presented by Christensen and Leagreid (2008: 8-9). To strengthen the argument with an example, a study conducted in one hundred and eighteen (118) Spain local municipalities with the population of more than fifty thousand population each revealed that at times municipal finance officers (MFOs) prefer historical cost accounting (HCA) that can be largely linked to
the traditional public administration than fair value accounting (FVA), which can be associated more with the NPM than post-NPM paradigms in dealing with verifying financial audits as argued by Bolivar and Galera (2007: 496).

Another perspective on the shift from NPM to post-NPM tabled by Christensen (2011:504) stated that NPM had identified three major problems in the public sector which were efficiency, legitimacy and participation. These problems were to be addressed by vertical (decentralisation) and horizontal (lean higher management) structural changes, greater market focus, outsourcing and treating the public as the client. Bastow, Dunleavy, Margetts and Tinkler (2005: 467) argued that contrary to the NPM advocates’ conviction, the paradigm had proven to be stifled by, *inter alia*, radically increased policy and institutional complexities. Dunleavy and Margetts (2013: 2) further view marginalised technological changes, and competition with the private sector and internal quasi-markets of government as other additional challenges that led to the paradigm shift. The agencification and decentralisation of public offices at times led to the duplication of public offices. According to Christensen, the discoveries of the ailments in NPM paradigm by countries, such as Australia and New Zealand in the 1990s, led to the emergence of post-NPM paradigm. Post-NPM sought to bridge the gaps made by NPM through intensified cross-sectoral collaborations in order to deal with fragmented system emanating from decentralisation and competition. The study noted the posture presented by Christened (2011) that viewed NPM not to have disappeared completely; instead post-NPM played a somewhat modifying role which made NPM stronger. The NPM elements resurfaced as among the multi-layers in the implementation of post-NPM paradigm.

The study found sentiments raised by Christensen and Leagreid (2008) and Christensen (2011) consistent with the views raised earlier by Zafra-Gomes *et al.* (2012), that post-NPM reforms cannot be viewed as an isolated paradigm, but as a modifying factor to the existing NPM paradigm. The changes from NPM to post-NPM are expected to be gradual. It stands to reason that the post-NPM wave might be implemented in the public administration office, as another layer of NPM.

### 2.4.5.2 NPM and the Global economic meltdown

The research acknowledged the argument presented by Levy (2010:234-236) that the global meltdown was one of the strongest persuaders towards the paradigm shift from NPM to post-NPM especially in the United Kingdom and United States of America. The wreckage of financial meltdown around 2008 has made it difficult to place trust predominantly on the free
markets. The significance of more state public administration regulation even in the private sector became necessary.

The economic crisis has, in a way, vindicated countries such as France and German who were not on the leading-edge concerning the full adoption of the NPM paradigm. The study finds Kuhnian theory of scientific paradigm shift presented by Margetts and Dunleavy (2013: 2-6) in Figure 2.1 relevant, as it explained how the emergence of another paradigm (which can be referred to as post-NPM in this case) enters into the existing paradigm arena (which can be referred to as NPM in this case), because the existing paradigm could no longer provide answers to the growing problems.

The economic meltdown is understood by the research to be part of the persistent challenges that the NPM paradigm could not find answers to. As the paradigm had left powers to the quasi-markets, disaggregated public offices and promoted competition. In essence, post-NPM paradigm became the part of the solution as it promoted reintegration and neo-Weberian governance.

Figure 2.1 demonstrates the paradigm shift in the form of a diagram.

Figure 2.1: NPM shift to post-NPM paradigm

Source: Adapted from Margetts and Dunleavy (2013: 3)
The diagram in Figure 2.1 be can be explained as follows: The arrow pointing upward at the bottom of the left hand side represents the era where NPM was the order of the day in most of the First world countries for the last 2 decades or more. At the top of the curve, the arrow points out the economic crisis in 2008 to 2010 that could not be answered by the NPM postulates, the state of the circumstances prompted for the review of the NPM paradigm, as it could no longer provide answers to the economic meltdown. NPM failure to provide answers to the world countries public administration challenges led to the paradigm shift after 2008 (represented by the arrow pointing downwards on the right hand side. The economic meltdown is among the factors that strengthened the rise of post-NPM or the modification of the NPM to post-NPM.

The research found linkages in the argument by Margetts and Dunleavy (2013) and the sentiments shared by Silitala (2013: 469), that the transfer of business management principles especially the transfer of the quasi-market principles has led to lack of self-efficacy and the public calling for direction in the public service. There were questions that could be posed to the NPM advocates, which raised more challenges of the NPM paradigm, and according to the study, those questions persuaded the reviewal of the NPM. Firstly, presuming that countries were to implement fully the quasi-market principles, how would they measure or financially reward public calling? Secondly, how would the reward and punishment principle be implemented when the countries’ economies have been thwarted by the lack of funds? The lack of funds could be associated with the economic meltdown that made it difficult for countries to continue compensating excellent performance, as already raised by Margetts and Dunleavy (2013).

Silitala (2013) viewed NPM to have broken mutual trust between the states and citizens, and the loss of governance predictability. This narrative had forced researchers in world countries public administration to re-examine the notion of incentive and disincentives in the public service. The lack of funds available that came with the economic meltdown made it more difficult to reward efficient behaviour of public servants and to implement ‘agenciification’.

The research conceded that the global economic meltdown was one of the strong persuaders towards the paradigm shift from NPM to post-NPM. The following discussion was found important for the study as it linked Post-NPM to M&E and good governance concepts which were the main focus of the study.
2.4.6 Post-NPM linkages to Monitoring and Evaluation and Good Governance

The research highlighted earlier in the study the modification of NPM to the post-NPM paradigm. The study noted that the term ‘good governance’ remained constant and dominant in the evolution of NPM to post-NPM. Other authors have argued that good governance was reintroduced by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and United States of America in the 1990s as a condition that donor funders and countries stipulates as part of the requirements for developing states to receive funding from the donor agencies and countries. In the 1990s, the requirements for fund donors were broader and with more measuring instruments than in the 1980s, where it was merely the criterion to be followed when allocating financial aid to the underdeveloped and developing countries. These measurements by the IMF and the World Bank reflected new and improved M&E systems to government institutions and an improved concept of good governance. There was no consensus or standardised objectives to measure good governance, but it is the measures that are put in place to ensure the effective usage of developmental assistance is in accordance with political and economic performance of a country, as well as targets and indicators set as conditions by the IMF and World Bank prior to delivering the financial aid. These measures have gained momentum in the late 1990s and early 2000s, as argued by Nanda (2006: 269-271). The research found the upgrading of requirements by the donor countries and international funding institutions for an example measuring performance, development of indicators and targets to be linked to M&E and good governance and to represent the modification of NPM to post-NPM. The study highlighted other post-NPM modifications that at times, happened parallel or followed the concept of good governance and performance monitoring. Therefore the study noted the rise of M&E and good governance expectations in the post-NPM era based on the requirements laid by the IMF and the World Bank, which cascaded to daily improvements in the conduct of public administration to conform to the IMF and World Bank standards.

2.4.6.1 Post-NPM and live Digital-Era Governance

The era of NPM as the leading-edge paradigm in Public Administration had passed. The study stated earlier that NPM has been extensively institutionalised in the past decades; therefore, it cannot be rooted out overnight by the post-NPM paradigm implementations. The study also noted that NPM has had impacts in certain areas of public administration. The post-NPM paradigm was centred on the thinking of banishing bureaucracy and the introduction of post-bureaucratic public administration systems.
Dunleavy, Margetts, Bastow, and Tinkler (2006: 470-472) viewed the NPM paradigm as centred on three themes, which are disintegration, competition and incentivization. The study noted that it has been proven through research that the leading NPM countries have begun the process of reversing or stalling the reforms associated with the above themes. Countries such as Australia, New Zealand and United Kingdom have experienced challenges when it comes to marketization of the IT component of governance. The transfer of public office IT management to private companies without assessing the inadequacies of the private companies has resulted into the public system that did not respond promptly in addressing proactive procurement processes. Dunleavy et al. (2006: 479-480) argued further that contrary to NPM, the post-NPM paradigm embraced Digital-Era Governance (DEG) that promoted neo-Weberian IT public sector system that is structurally distinctive, and centred in terms of information handling, on transition from paper-based to electronic-based filing, electronic services that suits different client groups, with proactive procurement processes among others. The three main themes that drive Digital-Era Governance (DEG) in the post-NPM are reintegration, needs-based holism and digitization changes.

Margetts and Dunleavy (2013: 5-13) noted that the DEG was uncomfortably implemented during the NPM era, as IT by its nature integrates across organisational boundaries. The integration approach from IT sentiments was in contradiction with the NPM managerialism approach that implied decentralisation and competition.

The DEG concept carried no undertone of technological determinism or prominence, but emphasised the significance of DEG embeddedness into the state apparatus of integration, need-based holism and digital change. DEG has evolved from DEG$_1$ which took place during 2002 to 2010, where there was introduction of Information Technology (IT) into the public sector, to DEG$_2$ where the concept referred to sophisticated IT of one-stop shop government websites, social security systems and on-line payment approval by the state officials etc.

DEG$_2$ incorporated three main themes, namely, Reintegration$_2$, Needs-Based Holism$_2$ and Digitization$_2$. The three themes exhibit the extent at which DEG$_2$ has evolved and taken public service to another level of sophistication.

The three DEG$_2$ themes highlighted by Margetts and Dunleavy (2013: 7-14 were found to be in existence during the post-NPM era. These are firstly, the Reintegration$_2$ theme, which is understood as the intense reverse of de-silo public sector administration services; secondly, the Needs-Based Holism$_2$ theme, which functions as the upgraded IT direct communication with
the clients, and thirdly, Digitization\textsubscript{2} as a theme, that is understood as a complete or high level of embracement and the embeddedness of the DEG concept into the public sector.

In the national and provincial government HRD context, the study found elements of post-NPM DEG\textsubscript{2} themes visible when focusing on the National School of Government (NSG) at national level, and PPSTA at provincial level. These institutions have embraced and embedded active and sophisticated well-developed websites where they can interact with their stakeholders. The study finds evidence of DEG (focusing on digitization theme) at the National School of Government (NSG) website visible, as the NSG has a number of training that are being offered on line (e-learning), as presented the National School of Government (2018).

2.4.7 Beyond Post NPM: New Public Governance era

The study also noted the argument presented by Osborne (2010:1-7), that NPM was the transition in the evolution of Public Administration that led to the concept of New Public Governance (NPG). The understanding behind the NPG discourse was that it is based on Public Administration going through three ‘delivery’ regimes: traditional Public Administration, NPM and post-NPM. The study noted that even in the NPG discourse, the concept of governance (public governance) continued to take dominance. The discourse introduced the term ‘public policy implementation and public service delivery’ that denoted the overall implementation of public policy and the delivery of public services. The research noted also the disaggregation of the term ‘governance’ into different categories. The study found relevance in the corporate governance terminology as being aligned to the study’s trajectory. Corporate governance is understood as the creation of systems and processes in the quest of achieving accountability and direction in an organisation. The NPG corporate governance terminology reference is aligned to the stance from the M&E Framework of 2007 discussed earlier in the study.

2.5. CONCLUSION

This chapter noted the evolution from Traditional Public Administration, NPM, and post-NPM to the NPG discourse. Further, it accepted that throughout the evolution of Public Administration as a science and as a practice, the concept of good governance continuously remained relevant. The chapter was able to highlight throughout the discussion thus far, that there is a link between the concepts of governance and M&E.
The literature highlighted that whether the discussion was on traditional Public Administration, New Public Administration, post-New Public Administration or New Public Governance, but the concepts of good governance and M&E could not be divorced from public administration.

The review highlighted that paradigms do not diminish completely in the advent of the new paradigm. The elements of traditional Public Administration, NPM and post-NPM were found to resurface during the evolution of Public Administration. The New Public Governance was found not to be a completely new paradigm within the science, but an extension that needed to be further explored. Some elements of the paradigms could be related to the context of South African public service administration. The robust emergence of post-NPM paradigm is noted, the robustness varied from one layer of administration to another. In certain areas, the public service has brought certain modifications and reconsiderations to the NPM paradigm, and at times changed the implementation processes holistically. The constant prevalence of governance concept in the NPM, post-NPM and NGP paradigms was significantly noted in the research.

The alignment between post-NPM and Monitoring and Evaluation principles needed to be highlighted. Post-NPM is set on the principles of reintegration, while the Republic of South Africa (2007b: 13) calls for integration of performance structures and systems. This M&E principle found its relevance within the theory of post-NPM paradigm. Further, the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 1) argues that government-wide M&E system can be complicated further by the decentralised government. The argument narrated by the Republic of South Africa (2007a) against the decentralised government seems to be in contradiction with the NPM postulates that argued for a decentralised government, but at the same time, it is within the context of the post-NPM public administration narrative that promoted reintegration.

The chapter noticed the need for coexistence inferred by the post-NPM and M&E literature, as well as the role of M&E and DEG in good governance. It should be noted that M&E and IT, which can also be referred to as M&E DEG, is important as determining factors of good governance. The understanding of IT not being a single determinant has already been argued earlier in the study by Margetts and Dunleavy (2013: 6), and it is in sync with the presentations made the Republic of South Africa (2007a:4), that M&E will not result in an automated single IT system, but will shape the policy context of operation for the IT systems in South Africa. The research noticed another angle presented in the M&E literature, which is focused on
outcome assessment, impact assessment and providing integrated systems to perform these tasks. Emanating from this argument, the research concludes that the outcome and impact assessment can be best implemented by employing DEG themes.

It can be conceded, that post-NPM public administration modifications concepts of integration, digitalisation and good governance have played a significant role in the field of training and development programmes. In the training and development fraternity, this can be evidenced by the partnerships entered into by the National School of Government (NSG) and PPSTA in providing training and development programmes. These partnerships are viewed by the research as signs that post-NPM paradigm is in existence, as these partnerships incorporates integration, good governance and digitalisation. Further, part of the integration includes the NSG, as the national structure utilising PPSTA as an extended arm of the NSG not as the competitor in the province of KwaZulu-Natal, as stated on the 9th and 10th of March 2017 in the meeting between PPSTA and NSG researchers on Skills Audit workshop.

The chapter notes the DEG2 ‘wave’ within PPSTA and NSG. These two institutions have one-stop shops sophisticated websites, providing training on line and other digital innovation. There is a strong emphasis in both institutions on measuring performance through conducting of the impact assessments of the training programmes. Training and development impact measurement relate to the research discourse.

The chapter was in agreement with the postulates that claimed that the NPM elements still existed in public service. The NPM current existence can be viewed through the Employee Performance Management Development System (EPMDS) in the public service. principles may have been modified in the post-NPM era but they are rooted within the NPM paradigm, and have a significant role to play in measuring the outcomes and impact of any government intervention. EPMDS also rewards good performance. The PPSTA’s role included conducting training on EPMDS in the post-NPM and NPG era, as they were conducted during the NPM era.

The chapter concludes by stating that as Public Administration evolved and adopted certain theories and models (discussed in Chapter Three), the concepts of monitoring and evaluating the implementation of government programmes including measuring the impact or outcomes of interventions became more relevant and needed in the theory of Public Administration as a science and as practice.
In closing the argument, whether the interventions are implemented following NPM, post-NPM paradigm or NPG, it is important that monitoring and measuring the outcome and the impact of government interventions is implemented. The study finds the presentations made in this chapter to have successfully located M&E theory within the theory of Public Administration, and aligned to the discussion to be made in Chapter Three regarding the importance of the M&E model and theories in Public Administration as a science and as a practice.
CHAPTER THREE

SIGNIFICANCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ON TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, the study located the M&E concepts within the theory of Public Administration. The chapter highlighted the evolving nature of Public Administration as a science and a practice, and it was raised that throughout the evolving process that Public Administration continuously retained the notion of good governance or the governance concept. The chapter linked good governance to M&E practices to the daily public administration activities of the PPSTA as the state training institution. Chapter Three discussed the significance of the M&E in training and development interventions. This chapter was aimed to offer an in-depth discussion and explanations of the M&E concepts introduced in Chapter Two.

The KZN Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) is the chief directorate located within the KZN OTP – Sub-Programme 1, which is Strategic Human Resources. Sub-Programme 1 is focused on coordination, facilitation, and promotion and monitoring of Human Resource Management and Development within the Provincial Government, as well as within the OTP. The PPSTA’s mandate is specifically on the HRD domain as specified in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2016: 34). KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy as a training institution, together with other mandates as part of the HRD Chief Directorate, provides training to 14 provincial departments. These departments, as noted earlier are Agriculture and Rural Development, Arts and Culture, Corporate Governance and Traditional Affairs, Community Safety and Liaison, Education, Economic Development Tourism and Environmental Affairs (EDTEA), Health, Human Settlements, Office of the Premier, Public Works, Social Development, Sports and Recreation, Transport and Treasury. The training conducted by the PPSTA should provide the Province with public servants that are capable, dedicated and competent in order to improve service delivery, as stated in the Training Academy Directory (2013: 2). The KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy as an organisation that is mandated to deliver training and development services needs to have strong capacity that plans, develops, manages and more importantly, determines whether trainees’ performance improves, (Tshukudu and Nel, 2015: 190-191).
The T&D processes provide the employees with improved decision-making opportunities, efficacy in problem-solving and job satisfaction. The organisation benefit better service delivery, profitability, enhanced corporate image and improved labour relations from training and development, (Erasmus, Loedolff, Mda and Nel 2010: 3-4). The study noted another angle brought to the fore by Wexley and Latham (2002: ix), that “it is possible for trainees to do well on performance tests administered during training, yet not be able or willing to exhibit these same skills on their jobs”. The argument by Wexley and Latham raised the need to evaluate whether training acquired through PPSTA was exhibited at the place of work.

The research conceded as a point of departure, that HRD practitioners are mandated by the legislative framework as discussed in Chapter Two, to provide training; more significantly, they have to ensure that there are systems and policies that efficiently and effectively measure that the training obtained is exhibited. One of the systems and policies of ensuring whether the employees (trainees) exhibit what they have learned is through the outcomes or impact assessment exercise. The outcomes or impact assessment emanates from or is often based on M&E policies and systems.

The study found the discussion made above relevant to the PPSTA context. PPSTA is the mandated HRD leader in the Province, and the T&D service provider for fourteen provincial departments. According to the Republic of South Africa (2008:81), PPSTA has the obligation to monitor and evaluate the exhibition of the training provided to the public service employees (trainees) as part of good governance in its HRD plan.

The mandate stated by the Republic of South Africa (2008), that the provincial state academies shall provide the M&E oversight in the training and development interventions, finds resonance with the discourse of the study. Further, it provided a firm background for the study to introduce the concept of M&E, and its significance to PPSTA, as the provincial public service provider of training and development interventions.

The Republic of South Africa (2011a: 32-34) introduces the M&E concept as a process of focusing on the significance of monitoring the consumption of state resources as inputs, and evaluating whether the desired outcome or impact is achieved with efficacy in any government intervention. In essence, the public service officials are expected to provide reports in order to account for the state resources invested as inputs and converted into outputs, as well as to
account for what outcome or impact the intervention has made in the organisation, and in society.

The research noted the relationship between the concepts of M&E and accountability. Section 92 states that Cabinet members are both collectively and individually accountable to Parliament for the performance of their duties, and the manner in which they exercise their powers, (Republic of South Africa 1996: 58). At the provincial level, Section 133 of the Constitution states that members are accountable to the Executive Council and are expected to provide reports, (Republic of South Africa 2007b: 2). The study noted the significance of managing and reporting on performance as highlighted by the Constitution, which is vital for the concept of M&E. The concept of M&E in government is a broad, and the study highlighted terms that funnelled the concept within training and development.

3.1.1 Monitoring and Evaluation conceptualisation within Training and Development Interventions
The DPME highlighted the need of the public service to produce high quality M&E work, and tabled findings or reports to assist in influencing decisions regarding formulation of policy, refinement and alignment across all three spheres of government. Further, DPME stated that “The Offices of the Premier needs to strive to promote a culture of M&E, learning and continuous improvement, including a common understanding of what M&E aims to achieve” (Republic of South Africa 2012: 1). Another aspect of the concept of M&E was raised by the Republic of the of South Africa (2007a: 5), noting the significance of the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES) to be developed by government institutions with the intention to enable critical reflection of the sequence of events. Actions taken by management in response to the utilisation of inputs gathered and activities performed to generate outputs, outcomes and impact are also significant. The Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System highlighted the importance of M&E policies and systems to guide and assist in monitoring and evaluating government interventions.

The study noted the policies and the literature utilised as the introduction of the M&E concept. Subsequently, it is important for the M&E concept to be contextualised specifically to PPSTA, as the HRD component in the OTP, and as the provider of the training service to the fourteen
provincial departments in KwaZulu-Natal. The discussion to follow is on the HRD and M&E concepts central to the discourse.

3.1.1.1 Training
Erasmus et al (2010: 2) viewed training as the systematic process adopted by the employer to modify the knowledge, skills and behaviour in order to achieve the objective of the organisation. Training is focused on the tasks that employees perform guided by the job descriptions, and its main purpose among others, is to serve as the deliberate intervention to improve performance in the organisation. In addition, Fitzgerald (2003: 81-84), define training as knowledge acquisition for the present task, a tool to assist employees to make a contribution to the organisation and as actions taken by the employer to achieve something in an organisation. Training develops, cultivates, boosts the morale, improves performance, improves the organisation image and increases productivity, but more importantly, it is futile, ineffective and useless if an opportunity to apply what has been learned is non-existent. The aim of training is to improve performance to be aligned to the job-related behaviour expected by the employer, is the view put forward by Wexley and Latham (2002:2).

The significance of employees to exhibit the newly acquired skills after attending training is noted, and it tallies with the earlier concession made by the study of linking training with improved performance.

3.1.1.2 Development
Meyer and Orpen (2011: 5) defined development as the ongoing opportunity of learning presented by the employer to maintain or improve high performance levels in the organisation. It is assumed that developing the employees directly contributes to the achievement of the organisational goals. Fitzgerald (2003: 81-82) views development as the long-term acquired knowledge to be used presently or in the future. The long-term focus assists the employees to face new challenges in the organisation and it positions employees to enrich the organisation in the future. Furthermore, the organisation should consider a development plan as the framework towards achieving the organisation’s development objectives.

3.1.1.3 Training and Development Methods
In the training and or development process, the Education, Training and Development (ETD) practitioners need to choose the method to follow when conducting training. The training
methods can be categorised into two broad terms, namely, *on-the-job training* and *off-the job training*.

Nassazi (2013: 24) describes *on-the-job training* as the training and development strategies and activities conducted with and for the employees within the organisations’ premises for example; orientation, coaching, job rotation, and mentoring programmes. *Off-the-job training* refers to the training and development strategies and activities that takes place away from the employees’ usual environment or place of work.

In the context of the study, the PPSTA and the provincial departments utilise both methods of T&D that is the provincial departments’ trainees at times attend the training programmes at the PPSTA, while in some cases, trainers from the Academy travel to conduct training at the provincial departments’ venues.

### 3.1.1.4 Human Resource Development (HRD)

According to Phillips (1997: 13), HRD is the combination of teaching, learning and development. Furthermore, the term ‘program’ refers to the learning courses or training, while the term ‘participants’ is used to refer to trainees.

The concept of HRD is constantly evolving; it has moved from merely organising training to achieve performance improvement and personal growth at the operational and strategic levels, to focus on other aspects such as research, organisational development (OD), career development (CD) as well as training and development (T&D) sections in an organisation. Linking OD, CD as well as T&D to the strategic plan of the organisation is fundamental to achieving the desired outcomes, (Erasmus, Loedolff, Mda and Nel 2012: 21). The research noted the realisation of HRD to be involved in the strategic structure of the organisation, which has not been happening in the past. In the context of public service, the Republic of South Africa (2008: 49) calls for the strategic location of HRD in order to add value. The HRD for the Public Service Strategic Framework Vision 2015 argues that HRD inputs should be made at strategic level, and they should become part of the departments’ strategic priorities. Opperman and Meyer (2008:9) advocated for the use of the strategy of the business as the foundation to training needs identification. This action leads to proactive training that is aligned to the business strategy. The initiative minimises the element of business risks. The research finds the argument above made by Opperman and Meyer tallying with the statement above by Erasmus *et al* (2010), that these aspects (OD, CD and T&D) must be closely linked to the strategic plan of the organisation.
3.1.1.5 Integrated Approach
There is a direct link between T&D. Furthermore, as part of the integrated approach to HRD, the concept of ETD practitioner was introduced and referred to the direct and indirect involvement of ETD practitioners in the facilitation, promotion and support of teaching and learning, (Meyer and Orpen 2011: 5). ETD cannot be easily compartmentalised as more often, one compartment is interlinked to another. For instance, the employees that attend training are being developed in the process, and it can be argued that elements of education take place during the training programme, as stated by Erasmus et al (2012:21).

3.1.1.6 Monitoring
Monitoring as a concept has been introduced in Chapter Two. According to Lucen (2015a: 12), the concept of monitoring involves day-to-day management of operations. Monitoring therefore encompasses tracking of inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impact and processes against set indicators as and when necessary, as well as modifying these activities and processes as the need arise. Monitoring frequently paves the way for evaluation or may form part of the evaluation process. The tools for evaluation may be used in monitoring while the findings from the monitoring process can be utilised for evaluation, as explained by the Republic of South Africa (2011b: 11). The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 1) views monitoring as the data collection, analysis and reporting in relation to the inputs, activities, outputs, as well as outcome and impacts including external factors in order to support management of resources with efficacy.

3.1.1.7 Evaluation
Evaluation is defined as a periodic and time-bound exercise with the intention to provide answers to specific questions in order to influence planning and decision-making in an organisation. Evaluation focuses on impact efficacy, as well as sustainability. It has to do with assessing whether the theories that guided the decisions taken for the interventions were valid and the attainment of the anticipated results as planned. It covers the lessons that can be drawn from the past taken decisions during the implementation of the intervention. It is the decision-making instrument to be embedded into the planning cycle and performance management of the state, (Lucen 2015b:12).

The M&E concepts are the vital pillar of the study and the definition of the HRD concepts inform the focus of the study. In essence, the study aims to establish whether there are M&E systems and policies within HRD concepts that may assist PPSTA to monitor and evaluate the
efficacy of training and development programmes to fourteen provincial departments. It is vital for the study to state that M&E does not operate in a vacuum, but that it must be embedded in the performance management system on the existing legislation, theories and frameworks, as envisaged by the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4).

### 3.1.1.8 Monitoring and Evaluation system

Monitoring and Evaluation system can be defined as the set standards of the organisation, including structures, management processes, strategies reporting and lines of accountability, plans information systems, and indicators that enable government institutions to perform M&E functions with efficacy. The system should be embedded on the existing policy framework that guides budgeting, planning and reporting, as stated in the Republic of the of South Africa (2007a: 4). All the government accounting officers are required by law to establish an M&E system for their institution.

The discussion below focuses on the theoretical framework that the study found significant for the concept of M&E, with reference to the provision of training by the PPSTA to the province.

### 3.2. MODELS AND THEORIES INFORMING PUBLIC SECTOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

This section discusses four theories and provide their associated models to strengthen the need for M&E. In essence, the study is focussed on two theories: Monitoring and Evaluation theory from the DPME Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E System of 2007 and Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluations by Opperman and Meyer (2008). The other two theories, The Ten Phase Strategy by Tshukudu (2015) and the Organisational Requirements theory by Kaufaman (1985), have been selected to support the initial two theories, as stated in Chapter One.

The section of the study commenced the discussion with the M&E theory and the five key performance information concepts model embedded within the theory.

#### 3.2.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Theory and the Model

The M&E theory and model have been in the past managed by the Treasury Department. However, management of performance tasks has been moved from the ambit of Treasury to the Offices of the Premier within the various provinces, as discussed earlier. The research focused on the KZN OTP, which located the M&E performance management function within
the Monitoring and Evaluation Chief Directorate (M&E CD) in the department, (Province of KwaZulu-Natal 2017).

Monitoring and Evaluation theory and the model is based on five key performance information concepts: Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Impact. The five key performance information concepts assist the government institutions to conclude on the public service performance with reference to policy, budgeting, performance agreements and operational plans, (Republic of the of South Africa 2011c: 40). The significance of this theory and model of M&E is further supported by the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 7), stating that in order for performance information concepts to yield the desired results, careful consideration of indicators needs to be taken into account. The indicators need to be verifiable, cost-effective, relevant, appropriate, reliable and well-defined. The postulate by the Republic of South Africa (2007) was understood by the study to refer to the creation of the measuring standards or indicators to measure the effects of the Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts. The M&E theory and model ultimately assist organisations to highlight the intended and unintended results brought about by the implementation any intervention.

The discussion on the M&E key performance information concepts will be tabled, focussed on the outcomes key performance information concept. The argument presented by the outcomes key performance information concept served as one of the critical pillars for the study, as it introduced the significance of measuring the effects of government interventions.

**3.2.1.1 Inputs**

The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 2) defined inputs as the combination of all the resources that contribute to the achievement of service delivery outputs. Inputs include, among other things, human, equipment, financial, land and buildings resources. In the context of the study, inputs referred to the training venues, parking pays, trainees, trainers, associate trainers, training manuals, and all other resources needed for the training to take place at PPSTA.

**3.2.1.2 Activities**

Activities are regarded as the actions or processes used by the government institutions to turn inputs into outputs (the process making a product or rendering a service) in order to achieve the desired outcome or impact. It focuses on what is being done to achieve the output and outcomes, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2011d: 11). In PPSTA, this concept refers
to the actual training taking place i.e. the interaction based on the training manual between the trainee and trainer in the training venue.

3.2.1.3 Outputs
The outputs key performance information concept focuses on the delivered product or service after a specified time. Government frequently exercises this key performance information concept, but it should not be seen as the end of the intervention because more needs to be done, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2011c: 42). The study is in consensus with the argument presented by the Republic of South Africa (2011c: 42), as it was highlighted earlier in the study that the PPSTA has been excelling and exceeding the Number of Public Servants Trained APP annual target indicator for more than three financial years. This is viewed as an output key performance information concept in this context. Further, the study noted that from the M&E theory that the study stems from, do not regard achieving output key performance concept as the end of the M&E process, as measuring outcomes and impacts key performance concepts are also important for due consideration.

3.2.1.4 Outcomes
The outcomes key performance information concept is a results-focused exercise based on specific beneficiaries in relation to achieving or delivering a certain output. This key performance concept is applicable on measuring short-term and/or intermediate outcomes, as argued in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 2). Outputs and outcomes are inter-related concepts, as achieving the outputs often calls for measuring outcomes. According to the Republic of South Africa (2011a: 33), the concept of outcomes involves extensive debates regarding policy. It involves analysing internal and external environments that affected the outputs and outcomes of the interventions. Outcomes key performance information concept can assist to assess the effectiveness of the intervention. Outcomes should be aligned to the strategic plan of the department goals and objectives.

The outcomes performance information concept is relevant to the study. In the PPSTA context, the outcomes concept highlighted measures to be performed after achieving the output performance indicator, which is the number of public servants trained from the APP. The study has noted that PPSTA met the number of public servants trained relating to the APP annual target indicator (outputs – key performance information concept), and seeks to establish whether there are policies, systems and tools to measure or evaluate the extent at which short-
term or intermediate outcomes have been achieved. This can be referred to as an outcomes-performance information indicator in the M&E theory.

### 3.2.1.5 Impacts
Impacts key performance information concept measures achieving results on a longer term. It is focused on measuring the achievements of set target, and more specifically, the changes that the implemented intervention has brought into the lives of the society in line with a particular programme, project or policy implementation. The impacts key performance information indicator is often difficult to measure and indicators needs to be carefully crafted, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2011c: 43). The research noted the significance of measuring impacts, but chose not to focus on this key performance information concept at this juncture. According to the Republic of South Africa (2007a:2), specific findings from the outcomes key performance information concept often forms the basis for measuring impacts key performance information concept. This argument has influenced the research to focus on the PPSTA’s outcomes key performance information concept. It is possible that the PPSTA impacts key performance indicator may be studied after the outcomes key performance information concept has been concluded. Therefore, this study was focused on the outcomes key performance information concept analysis as the basis that may be used towards measuring it in relation to training intervention provided by the PPSTA in the future.

The research may use the term impact assessment at times but referring to the outcomes key performance concept assessment interchangeably, as the respondents were familiar with the impact assessment term, and relate easily to the term impact assessment than outcomes key performance referred to in the study.

The research noted the significance of the M&E theory to the study and considers this theory as one of the important theories that can be used to develop policies, systems and tools to measure the outcomes of training. In order for the study to explain the theory further, the key performance information concepts are presented in a model in Figure 3.1 adapted from National Treasury.
Figure 3.1: M&E key performance information concepts pyramid

Source: Adapted from the Republic of South Africa (2007b: 6)

The pyramid in Figure 3.1 presented a model that explain the M&E key performance information concepts as interconnected and interlinked, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2011a: 33-34).

The key performance information concepts pyramid can be explained as follows:

The bottom of the pyramid represented inputs key performance information concept (shaded in green). It has been stated previously that the inputs embody all forms of resources and activities to be used in the delivery of services or production of goods. In the case of the PPSTA, inputs are focused on what the institution uses to prepare and deliver the training. It includes, *inter alia*, administration offices, training venues, catering, learning material and training manuals. The HRD M&E practitioners need to develop inputs key performance concepts of monitoring and evaluation indicators in relation to financial, human resources, logistical arrangements and other related inputs utilised in order to measure the outcomes and impacts, as implied in the Republic of South Africa (2011c: 41).

The second segment from the bottom shaded in green represents activities key performance information concept. The activities key performance information concept was understood as the actions taken or the combination of inputs to perform or render a particular service or produce a particular good. The Republic of South Africa (2007b: 6) explained the activities as
the actions and processes that utilise a variety of inputs with the aim of producing output or outcomes to make an impact in our society. The research viewed this stage of the M&E key performance information concept process as the actual training taking place at the PPSTA.

In the third green shaded tier from the bottom, the output stage can be understood as the realisation of the final product or service delivery. In the context of training and development, literature revealed that government departments have been successful in the implementation of this segment, but fewer departments go beyond this stage. This stage is focused on what has been delivered and achieved in terms of numbers, as submitted by Opperman and Meyer (2008: 5). The results at this stage are often quantitative.

The argument presented was that government departments have mastered the outputs key performance information concept tallies with case of the PPSTA’s Number of Public Servants Trained APP annual target (output). The 2013/14 Quarterly Performance Reports (QPRs) stated that a total of 7 914 public servants were trained by the PPSTA in transversal and generic fields. This figure achieved by the PPSTA was above the APP initial set annual target of 6 500.

The study noted the sentiments made in the preceding paragraphs showed the bottom three green shaded key performance information concepts (inputs, activities and outputs) as areas where government institutions (including PPSTA) had been making significant headway.

The outcomes key performance information concept was shaded in red, as it is often not implemented by governments departments; significantly, it started the conversation of results evaluations. These are the medium-term outcomes for the specific beneficiaries, which are the results of attaining a specific result. The study was focused on the outcomes key performance information concept, as it viewed the measurement of outcomes using M&E policies, systems to develop M&E tools as one of the mechanisms to establish whether PPSTA made significant changes performance (work behaviour) of its trainees. The study aimed to establish answers to questions such as: what policies, systems and tools used by the PPSTA and provincial departments as the basis to determine the difference made by the training to the provincial departments and to the employees? The answers to these questions could persuade the PPSTA and provincial departments to determine whether to develop or improve existing policies, systems and tools and indicators for monitoring and evaluating the training outcomes, which was highlighted in Republic of South Africa (2011c: 42). The segment is marked in red, as this key performance information concept is one of the segments that is still not popular in the M&E key performance information concepts process. It had been stated earlier that the process
of measuring the outcomes key performance information concept should be aligned to the strategic plan of the department. The outcomes key performance information concept assessments could assist government institutions to determine their proximity to their strategic objectives.

The Republic of South Africa (2007a: 2) viewed the impacts key performance information concept (shaded in red at the top of the pyramid) as the specific outcomes results. The concept is focused on the evaluation of the permanent change brought to the society by specific interventions delivered for an example measuring the impact of a capable state. Impact is the effect or the degree to which an intervention has influence on society in the long term. The development of impacts key performance information concept indicators is the most unpopular in government’s M&E key performance information pyramid. The discussion on impacts key performance information concept is noted but the study was also cognisant of the sequence of the M&E performance information concepts pyramid; therefore, the impacts performance information concepts can be considered after the conclusion of the outcomes key performance information concept segment. The stance of the study to initially focus on outcomes key performance information concept is justified by the argument presented by Selvaggio (2009) that the outcomes key performance information concept findings need to be concluded first, and may be used as the baseline information when engaging the impacts key performance information concept.

The research finds applicability of the M&E key performance information concepts theory and the model relevant to the study, as it provided a clear process on how to evaluate the outcomes and impact of any government intervention, and highlighted the significance of policies, systems and tools thereof. The study noted that the last two red shaded segments of the pyramid continue to pose implementation challenge to government institutions, including the PPSTA.

The M&E theory is viewed by the study to be linked to post-NPM paradigm and NPG discourse discussed in Chapter Two. The M&E theory promotes integration and does not reject other systems; instead it argued for M&E processes to be embedded within existing policies, structures and systems for accountability, as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4).
3.2.2 Linkages between M&E Theory and other theories

The study noted that the M&E theory and model is an over-arching blueprint to monitor and evaluate performance in government institutions. Further, as stated earlier, M&E does not operate in a vacuum. It needs to be embedded within certain frameworks, systems and theories. The theory of Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation was found to be closely linked with the theory and the model of M&E and specific to the training and development intervention.

3.2.2.1 Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation

The second theory to be presented by the study is called Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation. This theory emphasises the need to identify training needs of the organisation and linking the training needs to the organisational strategic plan. The theory calls for evaluation of results using the training evaluation as the tool to judge the worth of training, determine the value of training and the worth of planned training experience to measure the training benefit. Further, the theory calls for the HRD practitioners that are involved at the training analysis need phase to be involved in the evaluation of training, which can be referred to as the last phase in the training cycle, (Opperman and Meyer 2008: 183-193). This theory was significant to the study, as it has similarities with and complemented the M&E theory. Evaluation of training can be referred to as the measurement of outcomes or impact in the M&E theory.

The theory of Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation is further explained by the model presented by the study in Figure 3.2. The model presented the training cycle (which encompasses needs analysis, assessment and training Evaluation). The training cycle also highlighted the importance of the training evaluation phase.
Figure 3.2: Training cycle and significance of training evaluation
Source: Adapted from Opperman and Meyer (2008: 183)

The model presented in Figure 3.2 can be explained as follows: the business cases and the skills audit inform the training needs analysis process. The training needs analysis is informed by, among other things, the extensive research that includes surveys, one-on-one interviews, surveys, focus groups, mass meetings, performance management documents, strategic plan, and annual performance plan, as well as operation plan analysis. When the training needs report has been concluded, the second step would be to develop the design of curriculum or training material in dealing with the shortage or the gap identified by the training needs analysis report, (MacDiarmid 2018). Business case, skills audit and training needs analysis leads to the organisation designing or outsourcing training. Should the training analysis report raise concerns of lack in the interpersonal skills from the public servants, for instance, the ETD practitioners need to develop a Batho Pele (People First) Principles training course informed by the White Paper on Transforming the Public Service of 2007. Batho Pele Principles training courses could be the training intervention to enhance interpersonal skills of the public servants, and for the public servants to start treating the public as “first class” citizens. This process is called training design.

Biggs (2015) described facilitation of training as the broad step that involves Training of the Trainers (TOT), coordination and scheduling of the courses, inviting trainees identified by the
skills audit and training needs analysis, organising venues, preparation for training, choosing a training method, choosing an assessment method, and ultimately training the course (training programme).

Training evaluation (shaded in green) is a significant step in the context of the study. This step assists HRD practitioners to determine the success or failure of the training value chain. The evaluation stage assists the ETD practitioners to collect, analyse and interpret the aspects of the training cycle to determine many other outcomes that can be researched. Training needs analysis ultimately leads to training evaluation (as shown by the above red curving arrow pointing to the right). The results from training evaluation findings may lead back training needs analysis step (as shown by the curving yellow arrow pointing to the left). The argument of learning from the training evaluation findings presented by the Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation theory tallies with the M&E theory. The argument by Lucen (2015c:8) validates that evaluations in the M&E context informs the organisations of the cross-cutting lessons including modifying of strategic frameworks, operational plans and goals. In M&E, the evaluations can lead to starting the process once again, as it occurs in the Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation theory.

Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation is among significant theoretical pillars that can be interpreted as postulating another angle of monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes. The postulates made by the theory can be associated with the outcomes key performance information concept, as presented earlier by the study. Further, the theory and model are able to link outcomes key performance information concepts to the training intervention, which is the focus of the research.

3.2.2.2 Ten Phase Strategy
The third theory to be presented by the study is the Ten (10) Phase strategy, in support of both theories discussed. This theory argues that T&D is a futile exercise if the trainees do not exhibit what they have learned. The ten phase strategy theory is based on the four motivating factors: creation of the learning culture, performance leadership, learning organisation and alignment of individual goals to the strategic plan of the organisation. These four motivating factors set the scene for training and development to take place in an organisation. The performance leadership motivating factor can be understood as providing strong leadership and leading by example; in the context of the study this could mean the PPSTA to lead by example in the
evaluation of training and development interventions as the centre of provincial administration training. The theory also calls for the learning organisation’s role and promote of performance culture as important variables in training and development. The motivating factor and alignment of individuals goals to organisational strategic goals resuscitates the presentations made earlier by the study, of aligning training individual goals to the strategic goals of the organisation. The alignment of training to the strategic goals allows for the ETD practitioners to provide training that is commonly understood and expected by the organisation. This avoids managing diverse goals in one organisation, and allows for the lowest member of the organisation to be align strategic goals to the individual work plan, (Tshukudu and Nel 2015: 191-197).

Figure 3.3 illustrates the ten (10) phase strategy model. The study recognised the correlations between the ten phase strategy model and the M&E key performance information model, because the ten phase strategy model highlights training evaluation as an important tool, which can be related to outcome evaluation. A similar correlation can be seen with theory and model of Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation theory, as it also highlights the significance of training evaluation.
Motivating Factors (SFCs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Identify the Training Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Plan strategically for training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Establish training objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Design a training Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Schedule a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Present the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>Ensure the implementatio n of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>Maintain training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9</td>
<td>Evaluate training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 10</td>
<td>Evaluate change due to training and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Creation of learning culture**  
**Performance Leadership**

**Learning organisation**  
**Aligning individual goals to strategic goals**

**Figure 3.3: Ten (10) Phase strategy of training evaluation**

Source: Adapted from Tshukudu and Nel (2015: 199)
The Ten Phase model can be briefly explained as follows:

Phase 1 is the identification of the training need; this phase is crucial in the training cycle. It is important for trainers to properly identify the training needs before considering rolling out training programmes. Data retrieved through performance appraisal system needs to be accurate, reliable and valid, as presented by Tshukudu and Nel (2015: 199). Phase 2 focuses on strategically planning for training. This refers to the need for ETD practitioners to strategically plan for the training programme; the training needs are to be aligned to the strategic plan of the organisation. According to Kaufman (1985: 28), the alignment of training to the strategic plan minimises ad hoc training projects and ensures training geared towards the achievement of the organisation’s strategic goal. It is also vital that when companies embark on the training needs assessment that the vision, mission and the strategic objectives of the company are understood in order to achieve aligned training.

Phase 3 is focused on the establishment of the training objective. It becomes significant to determine whether the training planned meets the organisational objectives and the individual objectives. The training objectives should be measurable, assessable and specific, as well as set realistic and achievable standards, (Tshukudu and Nel 2015: 201). The argument raised by Tshukudu and Nel (2015) echoes with M&E theory postulates, that calls for the development of indicators to measure inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts key performance information concepts raised in the preceding arguments. Phase 4 is the design of the training programme. A well-designed training programme should fundamentally transform the employees’ performance and in turn, promote efficacy and productivity. Extensive research needs to be conducted to ensure that the training pack is applicable to all stakeholders that needs the training. Phase 5 is the scheduling of the training programmes. The ETD practitioners should consider the seasonal fluctuation and the peak periods, which can cause the trainees not to be released to attend the training programme. The training should be scheduled when all or most of the identified trainees are available to attend the training.

The sixth phase is focused on presentation of the training programme. This phase refers to the trainer presenting the scheduled training programme to the trainees. This involves the trainees going through pre, during and post assessments. The trainer needs to assess trainees’ prior knowledge or historical evidence of the subject. This exercise could assist the trainer to pitch the presentation at an appropriate level for the trainees. MacDiarmid (2018) stated that the
trainer would choose formative, summative or integrated form of assessment, as part of his presentation of the training programme. Phase 7 is transferring and implementation of the training programme. It is vital that learners transfer the knowledge obtained from training into their workstations. This phase (transfer of learning) has proven to be difficult to measure, but it is crucial that it takes place. The study takes an interest in this phase, as it is critical in measuring the outcomes or the impact of the training programme. Phase 8 argues for training maintenance of the implementation of transfer of learning. The support needs to be provided by the organisations to ensure that the knowledge obtained from training is exhibited by the employee that attended the training programme. It has been presented earlier by Tshukudu and Nel (2015) that training is futile if it cannot be exhibited into the workplace. Training is not an event, but should be seen as a process. The process of exhibiting the training can be understood to be seen with the transfer of the learning concept discussed earlier in the study. The manager needs to manage any environment that may the discourage transfer of learning in the organisation.

Phase 9 speaks about the evaluation of the training programme. This phase refers to the evaluation of the training programme to determine whether the training provided had achieved the desired objectives. Evaluations involve matching the training needs to the outcomes of the training, assessment of participants’ before, during and after training, and alignment of the training to the organisational objectives. Phase 10 is the evaluating change due to training attended. This phase is the focus of the study, as it seeks to answer whether the training provided has had an outcome or impact on the skills, attitudes, behaviour and knowledge. It is important to measure how the theoretical training in phase 9 evolves into the actual performance at the workstation. ETD practitioners should ensure that strategies, techniques and approaches that provide training are aligned to the strategic goals. Training must be evaluated in order to tell successes and rewards accordingly, (Republic of South Africa 2007a:1).

The study found the ten phase process to be in support of the two principal theories for the study, and suitable process as well as the correct guide for the development of the survey and interviews questionnaires.
3.2.2.2.1 Training Cycle

In the Ten phase strategy model, the term “training cycle” has been introduced to the study. The term refers to the evolution of training development processes from the planning phase to quality management phase. According to Meyer and Orpen (2011: xi), the occupationally-directed ETD practice training cycle is as follows:

- Skills development and planning;
- Learning programme or curriculum design and development;
- Facilitation, Coaching and Mentoring;
- Learner Support;
- Assessment, Moderation and evaluation, and
- Quality management and ETD administration.

The training cycle is a crucial process for training and development. The study noted that the training cycle is silent about the development of indicators to monitor and determines the gaps in every phase of the training cycle. Wilson (2005: 85-86) views the training cycle as the systematic process that encompasses needs training need identification (TNI), planning and the designing of training, implementing, as well as the evaluation of training, as presented in Figure 3.4 of the classic training cycle.

![Figure 3.4: The Classic Training Cycle](image)

**Figure 3.4: The Classic Training Cycle**

Source: Adapted from Wilson (2005: 85)

Figure 3.4 can be explained within the version from Wilson (2005). Phase One represent the training needs identification, this involves extensive research on what are the strategic objectives of the organisation and what are the T&D programmes needed to realise these objectives. Subsequent to TNI process, the HRD practitioners plan for training that training,
this includes development of training schedules, securing internal and external trainers among others. Phase Three is the actual training taking place (training implementation) and Phase Four is the evaluation of training. Phase Four resonated with the context of the study of measuring the outcomes of training. It has been stated in the study that the training cycle focuses on a systematic process of training needs identification, planning, implementation and evaluation of training and development interventions. The study noted the scarcity of monitoring indicators during the process, which adds value to the study. The study noted further the introduction of the “Strategy and Strategy for HRD” concept by Wilson (2005:86). The Strategy and Strategy for HRD concept focuses on the importance of aligning the training HRD strategy to the strategy of the organisation, as previously raised by the theory of Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation from Opperman and Meyer (2008).

3.2.2.3 Linking Training to Organisational Requirements

The fourth model and theory that resonated with the M&E theory and the model was the Organisational Elements Model (OEM) emanating from the Linking Training to Organisational Requirements theory by Kaufman (1985). The theory and the model by Kaufman were viewed by the study to be in harmony with the M&E key performance information process and the Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation Training theory presented earlier.

The Organisational Requirements theory is based on linking training with what the organisation does or delivers in order to ensure that the training investment is placed and utilised accordingly to achieve the expected outcomes. The theory is of the view that for training to be successful, it must be linked to various levels in the organisation which are Professionals/Technicians, Middle Managers, Senior Managers and Executive Senior Managers, (Kaufman 1985:23-24).

The OEM was based on the understanding that any operations of organisations are based on five elements, which are as follows: Inputs, Processes, Products, Outputs and Outcome. OEM focuses more on placing certain training and development monitoring and evaluation systems according to different levels of the organisation. Kaufman (1985: 24) refers to Executive Senior Managers as the personnel responsible for outcome of the organisation. The author emphasises the significance of allocating functions to organisational community to achieve organisational success. Table 3.1 expresses the theory in a model form.
### Table 3.1: Organisations Element Model

Source: Adapted from Kaufman (1985:24)

The OEM can be explained as follows: Inputs refer to all the raw materials used to commence with the process. It could be training material, photocopying machines that duplicate the training materials, the land and buildings used as the training venues including offices to coordinate the training programmes and other “raw material”.

The process can be understood as processing of the raw material to produce a certain product or service, which could be understood, in this instance, as conducting training sessions. Processes can involve formative and summative assessments, while conducting training.

The output can be understood as the completion of training, issuing of the certificates of competence awarded and the number of trainees that benefitted in the training. The outcome refers to the change related to the training provided to the society, specifically in the context of the research, as it focuses on the change made by the training and development intervention to the provincial departments’ trainees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT NAME</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Land and Buildings, Offices, Teaching Aids, Transport for the Trainers and Training Material, Photocopying Machines</td>
<td>PPSTA inside the organisation</td>
<td>Organisational Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Training conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Training completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Certificate of Competence or Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>The change in the workplace related to PPSTA’s training</td>
<td>Provincial Departments</td>
<td>Society/Provincial Departments Results/Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The OEM claimed a similar view with the M&E key performance information concepts model and theory in reference to the measuring of the outcome of the intervention. It can be noted that the OEM seemed to have combined outcomes and impacts key performance information concepts.

The four theories and models discussed in this chapter are among many theories and models that highlight the significance of measuring training and development outcomes. These theories and models assist the study to emphasise the importance of the M&E systems, processes and policies pre-, during and post training and development intervention.

3.3 CONCLUSION
In conclusion, the research found the M&E key performance information concepts and Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation theory and model prominently relevant to the study and have found the last two theories to adequately support the former two theories and models. The prominence and relevance of the M&E key performance information concepts received more impetus as the study came into the realisation that officially, the M&E theory and the model were the GWM&ES adopted by government. This stance fits in with the research agenda of investigating the outcomes of training and development intervention are implemented by PPSTA as the government institution.

The incorporation of other theories and models are within the M&E key performance information concepts theory as it argued for embeddedness, which included the consideration of other theories and models in the implementation process.

The chapter concluded the discussion by citing the argument from Republic of South Africa (2007b: 1), that postulates the need for government to measure results in order to tell success from failure, to reward success and support and correct failure. The Republic of South Africa (2007b) further states that when an institution is aware of its successes, it can exhibit the successes to the public for support and recognition, and when the institution is aware of its failures, it can devise strategies to correct itself. The argument demonstrates without a doubt, the power of monitoring and evaluating government interventions.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION
In Chapter One to Three, the study had introduced the theory and the model of M&E and its wide-ranging significance to the context of M&E of the T&D programmes, and later in the discussion, the significance was funnelled to the context of the PPSTA as the state training institution. Chapter Two, specifically placed the concept of M&E within the science of Public Administration. The arguments presented by the study in the earlier chapters vindicated the need for a study on M&E of the outcomes of T&D programmes to be conducted by the PPSTA. The research main aim was established which was to assess whether the PPSTA and provincial departments have M&E policies, systems and tools in order to measure the outcomes of T&D programmes offered by the PPSTA. It was highlighted that the study had used the term ‘impact assessment’ or studying the impact of training and development programmes at times for the respondents’ ease of reference, while referring to outcomes assessment. The study explained the difference between the outcomes and impacts concepts in Chapter Three guided by the M&E framework from the DPME.

In this chapter, the discussion presented the method that the study had chosen to research and determine the availability of policies, systems and tools to measure the outcomes of T&D programmes provided by PPSTA to the provincial departments.

The point of departure was for the study to look at the role of the OTP HRD, often referred to as the PPSTA, which is to provide training and development programmes to KZN provincial departments. The training and development programmes are NQF-aligned while others are non-NQF-aligned. The KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy provide T&D programmes to 14 provincial departments. The QPRs divulges that PPSTA has been exceeding the annual performance plan’s strategic objective annual targets commencing from 2012/2013 to 2014/15 financial year as stated preceding chapters.

Within the discourse of the PPSTA exceeding its APP outputs (number of public servants trained) for three years, the significance of measuring the outcomes of the exceeded outputs became the next step guided by the performance information concepts pyramid from the M&E literature, as noted in Chapter Three. It was stated in the previous chapters that the development of the internal M&E policies systems, processes and tools aligned to the GWM&ES is a statutory obligation for any government institution. Measuring of the outcomes of T&D
programmes should be assisted by the embedded existing M&E policies, systems and tools. The study was aimed at gathering evidence around whether PPSTA and the provincial departments had policies, systems and tools in place as the basis for the measurement of the outcomes of T&D.

The study noted a strong relationship between research and the M&E processes. The relationship was based on the applicability of M&E to certain elements in research and *vice versa*. The applicability of M&E to research was discussed in detail below.

### 4.2 APPLICABILITY OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION TO RESEARCH

The study found linkages and applicability between scientific research methods and the concept of M&E. The linkages and applicability of research to M&E can be attributed to the submission made by the Republic of South Africa (2011f: 6) that scientific methods assist M&E practitioners to perform testability or deductions after engaging on the induction process. The validity of data collated, analysed and scientifically tested for presentation to the administrative and political principals relies on the applicability of scientific research methods. It can be submitted that M&E practitioners should provide fit-for-purpose information to the decision-makers, enabled by research conducted on a particular phenomenon.

Emanating from the above argument, Table 4.1 that highlighted the applicability of M&E to scientific research methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENTIFIC METHOD</th>
<th>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theories</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical hypothesis</td>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational hypothesis</td>
<td>Operational objective (indicators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1: Parallels between M&E and Scientific Research**

Source: Adapted from the Republic of South Africa (2011f: 7)

In explaining Table 4.1, the formulation of the theoretical hypothesis can be understood as the induction process where the existing theories about the investigated phenomenon are broadly examined by researcher. In the theoretical hypothesis phase, the hypotheses are generally broad and difficult to measure. Theoretical hypothesis can be referred to as the formulation of strategic objective or objectives by the M&E practitioner. The formulation of the operational
hypothesis can be understood as the deduction process where the theoretical hypotheses are tested to formulate the validated operational hypothesis. This scientific operational hypothesis formulation process can be linked to the formulation of operational objectives by M&E practitioners. The operational objectives are measurable and have embedded indicators. Indicators forms the basis for the selection of the measuring tools.

The study viewed the linkages between M&E and scientific research as the basis and the vindication for this study to take place on conducting research on training outcomes guided by the M&E framework. The research enquires whether there are M&E policies, systems and tools used by the PPSTA and provincial departments to scientifically measure trainees work behavioural change (which is referred to as the outcome in M&E terms) that can be attributed to the training and development programmes provided by PPSTA. The study commenced with the research problem that raised the need for study.

4.3 RESEARCH PROBLEM
The OTP HRD in KZN provides training to fourteen KZN provincial departments using the PPSTA as the T&D machinery, as stated in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (2013: 5). Since the inception of the PPSTA in 2007, there is little evidence to confirm that a scientific study has been conducted to M&E the outcomes of training and development especially in the NQF-aligned training programmes. KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy provides NQF and non-NQF - aligned training programmes. The research opted to focus on the NQF-aligned courses because of the significance and possibility provided by the NQF-aligned training programmes to lead the employee to a qualification or part-qualification. Chisholm (2007: 297) defines the NQF as the mechanisms to integrate the world of training and education using a comprehensive qualification framework. The OTP HRD had developed the draft Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and draft Guidelines for the Monitoring and Evaluation Process in 2011 as the groundwork and the framework for training and development and other HRD processes. In the Operational Plan Management Committee meeting held on the 30th of January 2014, the PPSTA Chief Director highlighted the importance of all the units within PPSTA to incorporate and align their operations into national, provincial and PPSTA M&E policies and systems.

The research noted the presentation above, and viewed these developments to constitute the need to conduct a scientific study on determining whether there are M&E policies, systems and
tools as the basis to measure the outcomes of T&D in the OTP HRD and KZN provincial departments.

The study was guided by the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy framework. The QPR from the Province of KwaZulu-Natal, 2012/13; Province of KwaZulu-Natal, 2013/14 and Province of KwaZulu-Natal, 2014/15 that provided the evidence that suggested that OTP HRD has been exceeding their annual performance plan (APP) target. The APP target referred to is the Number of Public Servants Trained indicator. This process is referred to as outputs in the M&E policy framework as stated in Chapter Three. It is important for PPSTA to develop policies, systems and tools evaluate the outcomes of training provided in the same way as it is important for PPSTA to meet the APP target. The process of monitoring with an intention to evaluate the outcomes of training provided by PPSTA is referred to as the outcomes evaluation in the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 2).

The study noted that the quest to measure the outcomes of training and development programmes is a process, and certain questions were asked and objectives stated in order to draw conclusions.

4.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main research question was: What were the outcomes of the T&D programmes provided by PPSTA to provincial departments?

The sub-questions relating to the research problem were as follows:

1. How valid is the process used by PPSTA and provincial departments to determine training needs?
2. How efficient and effective are M&E policies, systems and tools employed by the PPSTA during and after training?
3. What is the level of readiness of the organisation to implement training?
4. What change has the training made to the organisation? and
5. What is the level of alignment in relation to the training and development M&E policies, systems, processes and tools between PPSTA and Provincial Departments?
4.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The questions raised earlier by the study were based on the main objective of the study was to determine the outcomes of T&D programmes offered by the PPSTA to provincial departments.

The sub-objectives were as follows:

1. Establish the validity of the process used by PPSTA and provincial departments to determine training needs;
2. Determine the efficacy of the policies, systems and tools employed by PPSTA during and after training;
3. Ascertain whether there is level of readiness by the provincial departments to allow for transfer of learning;
4. Establish the M&E policies, systems, processes and tools used by the provincial departments to measure training outcomes that can be linked to training provided by PPSTA (business gained results); and
5. Investigate the level of alignment in relation to the training and development M&E policies, systems, tools and processes between PPSTA and the provincial departments.

4.6 HYPOTHESIS

It is hypothesised by the research that embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminate in the efficacy of evaluating the outcomes of training programmes.

4.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology is understood by Maree, Cresswell, Eberson, Eloff, Ferreirra, Ivankova, Jansen, Nieuwenhuis, Pietersen and Plano Clark (2016: 51) as the link between the philosophical standpoint and methods of the study. The research methodology represents a strategy of data collection, analysis and also describing or explaining the phenomenon. Moreover, research methodology is viewed by Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2012: 2) as the reasoning that informs research methods and techniques. Further, Welman et al (2012) understand the research methodology as dealing with a wider scope than research methods, while research methods operate on a larger scope when compared to the research techniques. The process of determining what research methodology was adopted is largely informed by what the study aims to achieve, (Welman et al 2012).
This study followed a pragmatic approach. According to Europe Alzheimer (2009), the pragmatic approach encompasses the usage any of the research methods, procedures and techniques that appears to be the best suited research approach to deal with the research problem. It practice the approach using qualitative or quantitative approaches. The pragmatic approach diagnoses the limitations of qualitative and quantitative approaches and argues that by using both approaches. The pragmatic approach assists to complement the study. The linkages between M&E and research have been stated in the preceding paragraphs, and based on such linkages, the pragmatic approach was viewed as the best enabler for the creation of M&E tools to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of the PPSTA T&D programmes offered to provincial departments. The data collated using qualitative and quantitative approach was analysed as evidence to inform research findings and recommendations. The findings assisted the research to determine the outcomes of T&D programmes offered by PPSTA to provincial departments. Ultimately, the findings were going to be tabled to inform PPSTA’s decision and policy-making processes.

The adoption of different approaches created an enabling environment for the research to use triangulate on, (Europe Alzheimer 2009). The triangular approach included the usage of two or more methods to conduct research. The concept of triangulation originates from land and surveying techniques, the military, as well as navigation strategies that refer to the determination of a single point in space with the convergence of measurements taken from two other distinct points, (Arksey and Knight 1999). These research techniques allowed for the validation of data through cross verification from two or other sources.

Triangulation allows for the mixture of different or other methods of research to study the same phenomena. This research technique is used to combine multiple observers, theories, methods and empirical material in effort to deal with intrinsic biasness and challenges that come from using a single research method technique, a single observer and single theory studies. Olsen (2004: 3) describes triangulation as an approach of “mixing of data or methods so that diverse viewpoints or standpoints can cast light upon the topic”. Triangulation encompasses mixing of research methodologies, for example, mixing the survey data with interviews. The study developed through the interaction of qualitative and quantitative analysis.
The study found significance in the following benefits of triangulation in research:

- The technique can be utilised in qualitative and quantitative studies;
- It can assist to find credibility in qualitative analyses, where it is an appropriate strategy;
- It provides an alternative to the traditional criteria like reliability and validity; and
- It serves as the preferred technique for social sciences.

The significance of triangulation persuaded the research to adopt the triangulation technique. The study aimed to utilise qualitative method by conducting twelve one-on-one interviews, with the participants composed of the trainers, trainees, immediate supervisors, provincial departments HRD managers, provincial department’s skills development facilitators (SDFs) and PPSTA management.

A survey was conducted as part of the quantitative facet of the triangulation technique. The study aimed to collect quantitative data by establishing or creation of the baseline performance indicator in order to measure, monitor and evaluate the trainee’s performance before and after attending a training programme among other reasons. The quantitative research data was presented in numerical tables; comparisons between variables was done to establish statistical significance. The research was conducted using the sample size of seven (experimentally accessible population) out of the target population of fourteen provincial departments that attended any of the four (4) NQF-aligned courses or programmes provided by the PPSTA during 2013/14 financial year. The sample frame postulates that was guiding the study was informed by Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2012: 126). The research chose these 4 training programmes because of their uniqueness and long-standing program obligation. The study may utilise the findings from this research as the basis of the longitudinal study (impacts evaluation), which may be inclusive of non-NQF-aligned training programmes.

The research used one of the probability sampling strategies called random sampling to increase chances of representation of the population. The decision to follow simple random sampling procedure is based on the presentation made by Salkind (2012: 97), in the pursuit to give equal and independent chance to all the members of the population. The research was guided by the general similarity in the population characteristics. The population is made up of 14 provincial department trainees that have attended the four chosen courses during 2013/14.
The study randomly sampled seven (7) out of the fourteen (14) provincial departments. The sampled departments are presented in Table 4.2.

Salkind (2012) describes four (4) steps in conducting simple random sampling:

- A clear definition of the population where the sample will be made;
- All members of the population to be listed;
- Numbers to be assigned to each population member, and
- Selection criteria to be made for the sample.

The study has chosen the following programmes, as discussed in the preceding paragraphs:

4.7.1 Four (4) Chosen NQF-Aligned Training Programmes

- Chairing of Meeting Effectively – 43 public servants trained during 2013/14 financial year (PPSTA, 2013/14);
- Public Sector Administrative Skills – 17 public servants trained during 2013/14 financial year (PPSTA, 2013/14);
- Course on Facilitating Learning – 40 public servants trained during 2013/14 financial year (PPSTA, 2013/14), and

Respondents’ selection criteria: The research followed the simple random sampling technique to give an equal and fair chance to all 14 provincial departments’ population, and seven provincial departments made it as the sample of the population. The sampling process automatically meant that provincial departments’ HRD managers and SDFs, immediate supervisors of the trainees, PPSTA management, as well as PPSTA trainers were part of the study. The financial year 2013/14 was selected with an understanding that as from the 2014/15 financial year up to the date of the study, the provincial departments would have gained sufficient time to monitor the trainee’s performance, and that conclusions would be in line with any of the PPSTA attended training. The study followed a pragmatic approach. Table 4.2 provides a layout of the sampled respondents of the study.
### RESPONDENT CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 &amp; 2: Provincial Department HRD-Office: Manager (1) &amp; SDF (2)</th>
<th>Category 3: Provincial Department: Trainees</th>
<th>Category 4: Provincial Department: Immediate Supervisor</th>
<th>Category 5: PPSTA Management &amp; Trainer or Trainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Settlements</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety and Liaison</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
<td>Automatically selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Breakdown for survey and one-on-one interviews and categories**

Source: Author’s survey sampling frame, 2018.

Table 4.2 represents 5 categories of the study, which are the provincial department HRD manager and SDF as category 1 and 2, the trainees of the four chosen training programmes in 2013/14 as category 3, and category 4 is the immediate supervisor. Category 5 represents the PPSTA’s management and trainers. The seven provincial departments have been randomly sampled to be part of the study.

The interview questions were focused on the PPSTA trainers, PPSTA manager, provincial department trainees, HRD manager, SDF and the immediate supervisor. The five (5) categories of respondents excluding the trainees, were part of the study based on the role they play in the planning and execution of the training programme. According to the (PPSTA, 2013/14), 304 trainees attended the above-mention NQF-aligned training programmes during 2013/14 financial year. Ninety-two (92) has been sampled as part of the study. The study randomly sampled twelve (12) participants for one-on-one interviews and eighty (80) respondents from the seven sampled provincial departments and PPSTA. The respondents for surveys covered all the categories (Trainees, HRD managers, SDFs, immediate supervisors, PPSTA.
management and trainers). Tables 4.3 and 4.4 represent the numerical breakdown of the one-on-one interviews and survey process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREAKDOWN OF THE RESEARCH RESPONDENTS: INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial departments breakdown of the interview respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) Provincial department HRD manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) Provincial departments SDFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) Provincial immediate supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) Provincial departments trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of the provincial departments interviews: 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA breakdown of the interview respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) PPSTA Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) PPSTA Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of the PPSTA interviews: 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESEARCH INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS : 12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Breakdown for the Research Interviews

*Source:* Author’s survey sampling frame, 2018.
### BREAKDOWN OF THE SURVEY RESEARCH RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Departments breakdown of the survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six (6) Provincial department HRD manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) Provincial departments SDFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) Provincial immediate supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty eight (58) Provincial departments trainees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of the provincial departments survey respondents: 74 of survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPSTA breakdown of the survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six (6) PPSTA Trainers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of PPSTA survey respondents: 6**

**TOTAL NUMBER OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS : 80**

**TOTAL INTERVIEWS AND SURVEY COMBINED: 92**

Table 4.4: Breakdown of the Research Survey

**Source:** Author’s survey sampling frame, 2018.

#### 4.7.2 Research Design

Maree *et al* (2016:35) described research design as the method used to describe the procedure or procedures to be followed for conducting the study. The aim of the research design is to devise ways or procedures to be followed in the quest for answers to the research questions.

As stated earlier, research followed the pragmatist research design using the triangular research technique as a mode of inquiry. The research designed one-on-one interviews and survey questionnaires to collect data from the respondents. The research consisted of a sample of 12 participants interviewed in 5 categories, and a sample 80 respondents who participated in the questionnaires. The following discussion explained the pragmatic research design in detail.

The research randomly sampled seven provincial departments from the population of fourteen provincial departments. The sampled departments were to provide the study with the trainees (main respondents) that attended at PPSTA training in the four (4) NQF-aligned courses. The trainees’ immediate supervisors were automatically chosen for the reason that they supervise
the main respondent, and were significant to be understood by the study to provide better understanding of the outcomes of training programmes to the trainee as part of the training value chain. The HRD manager, trainers, skills development facilitators (SDFs) and PPSTA management were automatically chosen as they have played an important role in the planning and execution of the training programme value chain.

The pragmatic research design incorporated qualitative and quantitative research data collection and analysis designs techniques which will be discussed.

4.7.2.1 Quantitative research design and data collection instruments
Quantitative data collection consisted of 80 questionnaires that were sent out to 7 sampled departments from the population of fourteen departments. Sampled provincial departments were: Department of Social Development (DSD), Department of Health (DoH), Department of Transport (DoT), Department of Human Settlements (HS), Community Safety and Liaison, Department of Arts and Culture (DA&C) and Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD). The study was focused largely on using data from the trainees that attended any of the 4 PPSTA T&D programmes conducted during 2013/14 financial year, and the trainee as the exhibitor of behavioural change.

Fifty eight questionnaires informed the data collection process from the trainees. Twenty-two questionnaires were for the other four categories (PPSTA management, PPSTA trainers, provincial department’s HRD managers, SDFs and immediate supervisors). The four latter categories were included in the sample frame even though there was an understanding that they will be a small sample. It was necessary for the study that they become a part thereof, as they assisted in offering a better understanding of the context of the trainee.

In the quantitative data collection, the questionnaires had 5 dimensions: Biographical data, Training Needs Determination, Monitoring and Evaluation during and after training, Training Impacts and Alignment of M&E policies between PPSTA and provincial departments.
4.7.2.2 Qualitative research design and data collection instruments and techniques
The study design included 12 interview questions as part of the data collection instruments for the five categories. Categories were as follows: 1 PPSTA manager, 2 PPSTA trainers, 2 SDFs, 1 HRD provincial department manager, 3 immediate supervisors, and 3 trainees. Responses from the qualitative data supported the quantitative data to corroborate the findings, as stated by Creswell (2008). The study triangulated observations of participants’ gestures, body languages, tone of voice and pauses as part of the qualitative data collection techniques, Welman et al (2012: 211). It can be noted that the research design was informed by a mixed methods approach.

4.7.3 Research Paradigm
The study followed the pragmatic paradigm. It was necessary to briefly state why the study chose the pragmatic paradigm against other paradigms such as the transformative, post-positivist, participative action research and constructivist perspectives.

4.7.3.1 Transformative research
Dietz and Rogers (2012: 22-23) viewed the transformative research (TR) paradigm as characterised by innovation, high risk, boldness, exploration, thinking out of the box and pioneering. Transformational research can be defined as ideas that have the potential to radically change the research status quo, in the process creating a new paradigm. The paradigm is based on ideas that challenge the current status quo, introduce large changes in the field of science and transform paradigms. It should be noted that this paradigm does not normally fit in project-focused and disciplined environments and is generally understood not to have a set formula.

The TR paradigm was found to be in contradiction with the objectives of the study. The study was guided by the Republic of South Africa (2007a: 4) frame of thinking, that argued for the M&E tools to be embedded within the existing management internal systems, such as the planning, budgeting or reporting systems. The research aimed to table findings that were enhance, supplement, maintain and add to the body of the existing knowledge in the implementation of the existing M&E policies which can be understood as the current status quo. The research does not intend to radically change the status quo; instead it aims to add to the existing body of knowledge.
4.7.3.2. Participative action research

Ozanne and Saatcioglu (2008: 423-425) presented Participative Action Research (PAR) as driven by the end-goal in mind, of empowering underprivileged constituencies. The PAR understands local constraints and opportunity, and is sensitive to the needs and desires of its constituencies. Participative Action Research originates with the people’s problems in mind and directed by the notion that people have the solution or solutions to their problems. The research was concerned with not only the present social theories in the local context but aims to empower and change society as whole. The research agreed with the notion presented by PAR of social change but did not choose this paradigm as it was characterised by the principle of empowering underprivileged constituencies. The debate angle of the PAR paradigm was in contrast with the research as it aimed to present its findings to the PHRDF made out of HRD managers, which cannot be categorised as an underprivileged constituency.

4.7.3.3 Constructivist approach

The constructivist approach is occupied with establishing casual, contextual and constitutive effects. Constructivists scholars view the social world as made up of inter-subjective understandings, material object and subjective knowledge. This research approach is composed of broad spectrum of researchers that involves being linguistic, radical and critical, as well as sub-approaches from modernists, (Lupovici (2009: 195-197). The School of Government (2015: 16) found relations between the constructivist and interpretivist paradigms. The latter paradigm refers to interpreting and observation in understanding the social world. This approach lacks systematic interpretative methods and application of such an approach and can limit the research. The study was not be guided by the constructivist approach as the study is aligned to GWM&ES.

4.7.3.4 Qualitative approach and quantitative approaches

According to Krauss (2005: 759-761), the epistemology and ontology of qualitative research is premised on the understanding that the best way to study a phenomenon is in its natural state. The qualitative approach views quantitative approach as limiting as it is focused on one portion of reality instead of the whole phenomenon. Qualitative researchers do not believe in a single or unitary reality. Further, the qualitative researchers are often linked to the constructivist paradigm presented earlier by the study, and may be opposed to aggregating as it normally occurs in the quantitative researcher’s religiosity. The constructivist qualitative researcher’s religiosity is based on the understanding that each individual is unique. Qualitative approach
argues that research is essentially biased since the researcher has his or her own perceptions while conducting research.

Maree et al (2016: 162) viewed qualitative research as based on linguistic words while quantitative research bases its existence on the systematic and objective methods of utilising numerical data from a certain population in order to generalise findings of the studied phenomenon. Quantitative approach uses a process of analysis, which is based on complex and structured methods in confirming or disproving the hypothesis. Further, the quantitative approach is aimed at understanding the research from the outsider’s perspective, and holds the stability of the research process in high regard, as opposed to qualitative research, where a study can be dynamic and changeable depending on the nature of reality, (Welman et al 2012: 8-9).

4.7.3.5 Pragmatic and mixed methods approach
The debate between qualitative and quantitative purists highlighted in the previous quantitative and qualitative discussion has occurred for more than a century. These discussions persuaded the research to choose the mixed methods technique with the aim of extracting the benefits from both the quantitative and qualitative methods to complement the study. A pragmatic approach refers to the mixing of research approaches fruitfully. The study looks for the best opportunities of using different and suitable approaches, for the best opportunity to answer the research question. The pragmatic approach is based on the pluralistic and/or compatibilist approach. The mixed method approach originates from the pragmatism approach. Mixed methods refer to the researcher choosing what method or methods, or techniques would answer the research question best, (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie 2004: 15-17). The Republic of South Africa (2011e: 15) stated that qualitative and quantitative methods have advantages and disadvantages, thus a mixed method approach to collect, collate and analyse data allows for the study to utilise positive aspects of both methods in order to increase the validity and accuracy of research. The study chose the pragmatism approach as it allows for triangulation. The research finds synergies between the pragmatic approach, mixed methods approach and the triangulation research technique. The concept of triangulation has been discussed earlier in the study.
4.7.4 Study Site and Population

The study sites were the PPSTA and seven of the fourteen KZN provincial departments. The unit of analysis was the PPSTA, with seven sampled provincial departments, and the respondents composed of trainees, trainers, immediate supervisors, SDFs and HRD managers. The sample was from the population of 14 provincial departments and PPSTA. One of the main sources of the population used for the sample was the PPSTA Learner Management System (LMS) and the data that was subsequently confirmed by the provincial departments.

The research followed one of the probability sampling strategies. According to Salkind (2012: 96), simple random sampling (probability sampling strategy chosen by the research) gives the population an equal and independent chance.

The study noted during the sampling process that the current population figure might be smaller than the initial population figure of 2013/14 financial year. The study attributed these changes to respondents within the unit of analysis getting promotion to work outside the Province, employment outside government, death, and retirement or resigning.

4.7.5 Sample Size

The study followed the simple random sampling technique to choose the sample. The study opted for the simple random sampling technique among other probability sampling techniques as it afforded every trainee that met the criteria a chance to participate in the study, (Welman et al 2012: 59). The statement made by Welman et al (2012:59) can also be viewed through the lenses of Emerson (2015: 166), that even though random sampling is cumbersome and expensive to the researchers to achieve, it is the best way to reduce uncontrolled factors such as random error. These arguments persuaded the study to opt for simple random sampling.

The research followed a pragmatic approach triangulated with the concept of population versus the sample as stated in the Republic of South Africa (2011f: 22). Twelve (12) one-on-one interviews were conducted, and 80 survey questionnaires dispersed to the respondents which amount to a total of 92 respondents (interviews and survey combined). The respondents were from the 7 provincial departments and PPSTA. Each unit of the population meaning the trainees, immediate supervisors, SDFs, HRD management, PPSTA trainers and management, were represented in the sample.
The units of the population consisted of randomly sampled seven out the fourteen provincial departments focusing on seven immediate supervisors, seven provincial departments HRD managers and SDFs. In cases where there was more than one HRD manager in a provincial department, the research randomly selected one manager. The trainers and PPSTA manager were chosen automatically as they are part of the training and development processes and had conducted or facilitated the training and developments programme chosen by the trainees.

The sample frame consisted of twelve (12) interviews, composed of the trainees from provincial departments, SDFs, immediate supervisors, HRD managers, PPSTA manager and trainers. A similar pattern was adopted by the research when sampling 80 respondents to participated in the survey. The study had chosen simple random sampling techniques to afford all the trainees that attended the training an equal opportunity to participate in the study, (Welman et al. 2012: 59). The research was granted approval by the Acting Director-General (DG) in the Office of the Premier, and subsequently by the seven Head of Departments (HoDs) for their departments to participate as sampled.

4.7.6 Data Collection Methods
The researcher had followed the pragmatism approach in the data collection. The methods utilised to collect data were the survey questionnaires for quantitative data collection method and interviews for qualitative data collection method.

The interviews conducted followed a structured and at times unstructured face-to-face, open-ended question interviews format. The study used field notes, audiotapes and observations as part the qualitative data collection methods.

The survey questionnaires followed a closed-questions structured approach of collecting data. The research was open to utilise the secondary data to triangulate it with the interviews or questionnaires data (primary data). The pragmatic approach and triangulation of the primary and the secondary data collection tools were properly designed to ensure that the study exhaustively comprehensively unearth the phenomenon, (Moyo 2017: 285-286).

The study relied on population versus sampling concepts and the random sampling technique to obtain accurate and reliable data from smaller samples of the population. The research was open to the possibility of smaller samples not meeting the required collection quantitative
sample size for generalizability purposes, and had planned to triangulate that data with qualitative data.

### 4.7.7 Data Quality Control

Data quality is an essential feature in M&E and research. Statistics South Africa in the Republic of South Africa (2011g: 12) defines data quality on the basis of its “fitness for use”, and this concept is understood to refer to the quality of data that measures the circumstances at ground level. The reliability and the validity maintenance was crucial for the study, (Republic of South Africa 2011b: 50-51).

The research ensured that the data was to be kept safe at all times, the data was be coded, transcripts locked in cabinets after the survey and interviews were concluded, and confidentiality was to be maintained upon request of the interviewee or the respondent.

The research was influenced by the South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework (SASQAF) cited in the Republic of South Africa (2011c: 9-10) that highlighted the following dimensions to be considered in data quality control: relevance, accuracy, methodological soundness, timelines, accessibility, coherence, interpretability and integrity. The respondents who wished to remain anonymous were to fill the survey questionnaires without writing their names. The twelve (12) one-on-one interviews had been chosen to be conducted to the trainees, immediate supervisors, SDFs, HRD Managers, PPSTA trainers and management to maintain confidentiality and to increase confidence in the fairness of the research process.

### 4.7.8 Measurements

Salkind (2012: 109) defines measurement as the value assigned to outcomes. Measurement refers to a particular judgement being made in relation to a particular outcome. The research will be futile if it does not present assessments, measurements, evaluations and grades. According to Welman et al (2012: 135-136), that measuring the dependent variable in the quest to attain accuracy of the hypothesis of the study will be difficult when the study deals with human behaviour; therefore, the study focused on indicators which are embedded within the research questions in order to test the accuracy of the hypothesis.

The research was guided by Salkind (2012: 110-113), and triangulated nominal and ordinal levels of measurements as part of the statistical analysis to determine the efficacy of the
policies, tools and systems and to determine the outcomes of the training programmes offered by PPSTA. The study aimed to determine the efficacy of the existing M&E tools, processes and systems, measuring the level of alignment to the National, Provincial and Departmental M&E policy making and implementation and the change that has been provided by the PPSTA training to the Provincial Departments and the trainee. The level of support provided after training to allow for transfer of learning and the efficacy in the training needs determination methodology, was also measured.

4.7.9 Data Analysis
The research was influenced by the argument presented by the Republic of South Africa (2011h: 9) that viewed data analysis as the process of describing and comparing the data in the form of facts and figures involving bar graphs, pie charts, rows, columns that are used to explain and gain certain knowledge in relation to the research topic. In understanding the research, the study chose the pragmatic research approach which utilises both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect and analyse data. In the qualitative method, the study adopted the thematic identification methods as part of the qualitative data analysis. The study was influenced by Flick’s (2014:5) sentiments that qualitative data analysis is the “… classification and interpretation of linguistics material to make statements about implicit and explicit dimension and structures of meaning-making in the material, and what is represented in it”. This qualitative research strength mentioned by Flick (2014) was viewed as critical to address the quantitative research gaps.

The quantitative research analysis was done through the use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0. The research planned to test the reliability of the instrument through the use of Cronbach’s Alpha value that regarded the reliability co-efficient score of 0.70 as acceptable. The factor analysis was used as the data reduction technique utilising Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO). This technique was used to test for structure detection and testing of variances with Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity for hypothesis testing. It was important for the dimensions to meet the criteria. The study aimed that biographical data should have a fair distribution and representation of respondents’ work experience. The study viewed all of the above as the correct platform for the study’s analysis. The quantitative data sample needed to provide adequate data for
correlations and cross-tabulation. The data was to be triangulated with the qualitative data for further analysis.

The research adopted the thematic identification and content analysis approach. The thematic technique was understood as the ‘umbrella’ constructs that were identified by the research before, during and after data collection, (Welman et al 2012: 211-213). Theme identification focused mainly on word analysis, linguistic features and secondary data analysis. Thematic analysis was planned to search for themes that became important to describe the phenomenon, (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane: 2006: 82). During the interviews, field notes were taken as support to the audiotapes data. After the interviews, the audiotapes data was subsequently transcribed into typed data. Field notes and transcriptions were used for further identification of themes using patterns and experiences for the thematic analysis process. These patterns and experiences were identified and expounded to relate them to the specific themes that had been identified in discussions with respondents, (Aronson 2006). The study triangulated the theme identification and analysis process with the quantitative data analysis in order to make balanced inferences and to support the quantitative aspect of the research. Design for collection and analysis of quantitative data informed discussions in the following paragraphs.

Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data was viewed to eliminate or minimise internal validity threats and strengthen causality factors as the respondents confirmed whether the independent variable (T&D programme) had caused an effect on the dependent variable (trainee). The qualitative analysis used field notes, voice recordings, interview questions templates, secondary data to make deductions and responded to the themes identified in the interview instrument, (Welman et al 2012: 107-211 & Simon and Goes 2013). Thematic and content analysis was done on the views of the respondents.

The study noted that the M&E framework draws from applied research, as stated earlier. The relationship between M&E and applied research prompted the simple random sampling choice from the probability sampling techniques. Collection and analysis of data was informed by 80 questionnaires. The questionnaire had 40 items that were analysed using the SPSS version 25.0. The study planned to test precision using reliability and validity, and wanted the Cronbach’s alpha value to be within and mostly above 0.70, which is statistically acceptable.
The study drew from Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter’s (2011: 189-193) sentiments that raw data collection precedes data analysis. Raw data consisted of completed questionnaires, sets of readings, written text codes applied and other raw material collected data. Raw data was unordered and had errors that needed to be updated accordingly. Before data was analysed it was prepared using coding, entering and cleaning techniques. When the data had been cleaned, the process of analysis commenced. The study focused on the descriptive data analysis to achieve inferences. The data was codified using spreadsheets and utilised SPSS to make credible sense statistically.

Inferences emanating from the quantitative and qualitative data analyses process were done and viewed within the tenets of the Republic of South Africa (2011h: 29), which argues that M&E practitioners need to give reasons as they proceed with the analysis of data, raising questions such as: Why is data analysed? This refers to the understanding of the data and its relevance to what is aimed to be measured. The second question is: Who will use the data? The information must be analysed to feed into various levels of government. Finally, how will the data be used? M&E practitioners must be clear that the data is used appropriately and within the ethical boundaries.

4.8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The research did not cover all fourteen departments due to the enormity and magnitude of such a large study that would impact on time constraints. Instead, sampling was adopted as one of the research techniques.

The study did not cover all the courses offered by PPSTA due to time constraints; it sampled four (4) courses from the NQF-aligned training programmes, which are as follows:

- Chairing of Meeting Effectively;
- Public Sector Administrative Skills;
- Course on Facilitating Learning, and
- Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers

The study did not cover non-NQF-aligned courses. The limitations raised above are based on the research method chosen but it should be noted that the study understands and admits these limitations. It has concluded that in spite of the limitations, it can best achieve its objective
without compromising the validity and authenticity of the study. The study is convinced that the sample is representative and provided an equal opportunity to the respondents such that the research can draw useful conclusions, generalisations and recommendations. The study aims to utilise the findings of the research as the basis to conduct a longitudinal study.

4.9. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study took into consideration the ethical aspects when conducting research. This approach meant the study’s ethical adherence standards were done in accordance with the University requirements for postgraduate study. In the study, a signed informed consent form was part of the research ethical adherence.

The African-centred approach resonated with the study’s ethical considerations are based on *inter alia*: balance, truth, order, righteousness, self-reflection and self-questioning that was expected from an African (South African) M&E research, suggested Bagele (2007) and Cloete *et al* (2014).

Ethical responsibility ought to be upheld by public service M&E practitioners in the 17 Millennium Developmental Goals (MDGs), New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), National Monitoring and Evaluation System (NMES), as discussed earlier in the case of South Africa NMES, and can be referred to as the GWM&ES. There is a dire need for the operationalisation of the MDGs, NEPAD and NMES. NMES or GWMM&E ethical responsibility and considerations that ultimately cascade down to the provincial ethical responsibility conducted at provincial level. The need for the correct employ of men and women in the public service to determine the ethical aspects guided the continuous questioning throughout the study. In essence, the study found M&E practitioners are obliged to have ethical standards. The M&E ethics included presenting useful recommendations, respecting of personal data, respect dignity and human values, compliance with the rights, truth and wisdom, moral standing and respect for physical rights of the communities being studied, (Kimaro and Fourie 2017).

The argument by Kiamro and Fourie (2017) tallied with the presentations made earlier by Begele (2007) and Cloete et al (2014) on ethical considerations of M&E practitioners. Evaluators were also obligated to initiate, develop, maintain ethical considerations in partnership research, (Mertens and Wilson 2019:216)
The study noted conclusively that the ethical considerations to be complied with were two-fold: the research ethical consideration for example, signing of the consent forms, and adherence to the M&E.

4.10. CONCLUSION

This chapter outlined the study’s empirical epistemological approach. Within the approach, the research discussed the parallels between scientific research and M&E, which justified the existence of the study. The research questions, objectives and hypothesis were highlighted as the basis for the research methodology. Data collection including analysis techniques were discussed and the rationale behind adopting a pragmatism approach in the collection, analysis and inferential phase of the study highlighted. The research paradigm, delimitations, design, limitations and ethical consideration were narrated as factors that underpinned the research methodology. The following chapter discussed the analysis of the empirical study.
CHAPTER FIVE

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the study presented the results, interprets and discusses the findings obtained from the questionnaires and interviews. The research was guided by the pragmatism paradigm that allowed for the utilisation of quantitative and qualitative techniques during the data collection, collation and analysis processes. The questionnaire was the quantitative tool used in the collection, collation and analysis of data. The study used interviews for collection, collation and analysis of qualitative data. The research chose the triangulation technique for the analysis of data, and for alignment to the pragmatism paradigm.

The study received the approval from the Office of the Premier Director-General (DG) to conduct the study, and subsequently permission was received from the seven Head of Departments (HoDs). Seven randomly sampled provincial departments participated in the study within the population of 14 provincial departments. The unit of analysis was the seven provincial departments with a particular focus on the trainees that attended any of the 4 PPSTA T&D conducted during the selected 2013/14 financial year. The immediate supervisors, SDFs and HRD managers were included in the study to better understand the context of the trainee. The PPSTA management and the trainers were also incorporated as part of the study based on the training provider position within the training cycle.

In the sample, six provincial departments namely, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD), Department of Social Development (DSD), Department of Health (DoH), Department of Transport (DoT), Department of Human Settlements (HS), as well as Community Safety and Liaison fully participated in the study. The Department of Arts and Culture (DA&C) did not participate fully, and the study used the secondary data to bridge the gap. The study used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 to analyse the data collected from the respondents. The quantitative analysis presented the results in the form of descriptive statistics, which were graphs, cross tabulations and other figures. The study utilised inferential techniques which included the use of correlations and chi square test values, which are interpreted using the p-values. The qualitative data analysis adopted the thematic identification.
5.2 THE SAMPLE

The sample had aimed at a maximum of 92 participants (12 for interviews and 80 for the survey). A total of 83 respondents participated, which gave the total of 71 respondents for the survey and 12 for the interviews, resulting in a 90% response rate.

The survey served as the quantitative data collection aspect of the study, and was composed of five categories, which are trainees, immediate supervisors, SDFs, HRD managers from the seven sampled provincial departments and trainers and management from PPSTA. A total of 58 questionnaires were despatched for the trainees, and 53 respondents from 6 provincial departments participated in the survey, which gave the trainee category a 91.37% response rate. The six provincial departments that participated are as follows: DoT, DSD, DoH, DARD, DHS, as well Community Safety and Liaison. The response was not the same on all the departments. The study did not get full participation from the trainees of the Department of Arts and Culture, while in other departments for example, Agriculture and Rural Development, all categories of the study participated.

The large number of the sample was focused on the trainee category as it played a critical role in the quest for the study to determine the outcomes of training provided by PPSTA. In essence, the trainee is the only respondent in the study that can exhibit change or no change in the work behaviour that can be associated with training attended. The other categories' role was to monitor and evaluate the change using M&E policies, tools and systems as stated in the preceding chapters. PPSTA management, PPSTA trainers, provincial departments’ human resource development managers, skills development facilitators and immediate supervisors’ categories were incorporated into the study to better understand the context of the trainee, and as monitors and evaluators of the behavioural change. The study noted the significance and the role of the other four categories (PPSTA trainers and management, HRD managers, SDFs and immediate supervisors) in the training and development value chain, but the focus was on the trainee, to measure the outcomes (behavioural change) of training provided informed by the M&E policies, systems and processes.

The sum of 22 questionnaires were dispersed to the other four categories (PPSTA management, PPSTA trainers, provincial department’s HRD managers, SDFs and immediate supervisors) and 18 questionnaires were returned. All seven sampled provincial departments and PPSTA trainers participated, which gave the study the response rate of 81%. These categories were not the main focus of the study but were automatically selected to better understand and
corroborate the responses of the trainees. The four categories samples were too small for statistical analyses, hence the study understood that they were to be triangulated with qualitative data if the need arose. These categories are by their construction small units in provincial departments and in the PPSTA. It should be noted that though the response rate was high at 81%, they still could not reach the requirements of a representative sample, (Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2012: 70-71).

The study collected qualitative data using 12 one-on-one interviews with all five categories and received 100% response rate. The study interviewed 1 PPSTA manager, 2 PPSTA trainers, 2 SDFs, 1 HRD manager, 3 immediate supervisors, and 3 trainees. The study had chosen to triangulation data analysis technique to accommodate the pragmatism approach. The study chose to triangulate to accommodate insufficiency of the arguments that would have arisen if the study had chosen one method instead of the other, to provide different “pictures” and to explain, as well as corroborate, the quantitative with qualitative findings, Creswell (2008).

The study initially discussed the research instrument used to collect quantitative data, the instruments used for qualitative data collation and the analysis, all informed by the thematic identification technique. The discussion on the instruments used for the collection of data lays the foundation for the analysis and the conclusions of the study.

5.3 STATISTICAL REQUIREMENTS: THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The means to gather data, tests, explain the research hypothesis and answer the research question is through the research instrument, (Sunderlin, Larson, Duchelle, Sills, Luttrelle, Jagger, Pattanayak, Cronkelton, Ekapturi 2010: 35). The research instrument used for quantitative data was the questionnaire, which consisted of 40 items, with a level of measurement at a nominal or an ordinal level. The questionnaire was divided into 5 dimensions that measured various themes, including:

- Biographical data
- Training Needs Determination
- Monitoring and Evaluation Systems during and after Training
- Training Impacts (Outcomes)
- Alignment of M&E policies between PPSTA and provincial Departments

5.3.1 Reliability Statistics

The two important aspects of precision are reliability and validity. Golafshani (2003: 596-599) defines reliability as the extent of the consistency of results over time and the representation of
the population accurately, as well as the ability to reproduce similar outputs using the similar methodology and validity as the ability of the research instrument to measure what it intended to measure.

Reliability measurement used in the study was computed by taking several measurements on the same subjects. A reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered as “acceptable”. The reliability scores for all sections meet the recommended Cronbach’s alpha value. This indicates a degree of acceptable, consistent scoring for all the dimensions. Though the sample size was small, the sample consisted of a group of individuals having inclusive criteria. Table 5.1 reflects the Cronbach’s alpha score for all the items that constituted the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Training Needs Determination</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Systems During and After Training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Training Impacts (Outcomes)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alignment of M&amp;E policies between PPSTA and Provincial Departments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Reliability coefficient scores vis-à-vis the Cronbach’s alpha value

Source: Adapted from IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (2017)

The study determined that the instrument (questionnaire) used was reliable. The succeeding phase was for the study to minimise data for analysis purposes. Factor analysis was found to be a significant technique suitable for data reduction and structuring.

5.3.2 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis can be defined as a statistical technique whose main goal is data reduction and structure detection. It is used as a tool to explain the variance and or covariance in the population’s observed variables that can be loaded into a simpler structure in order to explain a set of fewer unobserved weightings and factors. Factor analysis may be used to test a theory or theories, and also may be used for dimensionality reduction as per the lenses of Lambert (2014). Other authors like Kline (1994: 3) viewed factor analysis as composed of a number of statistical techniques with the aim of simplifying the complex sets of data. In social sciences,
factor analysis is often applied to correlations between variables. Typical use of factor analysis is in the survey research when a researcher wants to represent a number of questions with a small number of hypothetical factors. As an example, as part of a national survey on South Africans attitudes towards the environmental policy, participants may answer three separate questions regarding environmental policy, reflecting on issues at the local, provincial and national environmental policy levels. Each of the separate sets of questions (local, provincial and national environmental policy oriented) would not have been an adequate measure of attitudes of South Africans towards the environmental policy individually, but the three sets of questions together may provide a better measure of the construct, which in this instance, is the South Africans’ attitude towards the environmental policy.

Factor analysis can be used to establish whether the three measures (set of questions) do, in fact, measure the same thing (validity). If the research is able to establish that the set of questions do measure the same thing, they can then be combined to create a new variable, a factor score variable that contains a score for each respondent on the factor. A factor score is understood by Distefano, Zhu and Mindrila (2009:1) to refer to the composite variable that provides information about the individual or variable placement in the factor or factors. Factor analysis techniques are applicable to a variety of situations. Another example can be that the study may want to know if the skills required to be a decathlete are as varied as the ten events that are performed in a decathlon, or if a small number of core skills are needed to be successful in a decathlon.

The factor analysis adoption in the study was based on its possibility to produce unobserved factors, the study was convinced that these unobserved factors were actually in existence, hence, there were provided names, and spoken of as real things as part of the model to bring the underlying factors to the fore, (Lambert (2014).

The matrix tables were preceded by a summarised table that reflected the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett's Test. The KMO indicated the suitability of the data for structure detection, it signified a percentage of variables’ variances that may have been caused by underlying factors. The higher values (close to 1.0) indicated the usefulness of the factor analysis to the data collected to be analysed. The lower values (0.50) would have signified that the results of the factor analysis would not have been useful for analytical purposes. Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was used in testing the hypothesis to determine whether the correlation matrix was the identity matrix, and it was discovered that the variables
were sufficiently suitable for structure detection at less than 0.05 level, (https://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/en/SSLVMB_24.0.0/spss/tutorials/fac_telco_kmo_01.html 13 December 2018). The requirement was that KMO should be greater than 0.50 and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity less than 0.05. In all instances, the conditions were satisfied, which allowed for the factor analysis procedure. Factor analysis was done only for the Likert scale items. Certain components were divided into finer components, which the study explained below in the rotated component matrix. The KMO value should be greater than 0.500 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity sig. value should be less than 0.05. Table 5.2 illustrates that the all of the conditions were satisfied for factor analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</th>
<th>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Training Needs Determination</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Systems During and After Training</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Training Impact</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alignment Of M&amp;E Policies Between PPSTA And Provincial Departments</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: KMO and Bartlett’s Test scores

Source: Adapted from IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (2017)

The study found that the KMO and Bartlett’s Test scores conditions were satisfied as illustrated in Table 5.2. It was stated in the preceding paragraphs that one of the KMO’s uses is to indicate the proportional variances of variables that may have been caused by underlying factors. The research used rotated component matrix to highlight the underlying factors.

5.3.3 Rotated Component Matrix

The rotated component matrix was the interpretation of the factor analysis. It represented the grouping of items that load together in the factor analysis, as stated by Grande (2016). The rotated component matrix assisted the study to determine and state what the components really represented. Components with a high statistical significance provided the study with impetus for further analysis to provide value-added information to the research, (https://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/en/SSLVMB_23.0.0/spss/tutorials/fac_cars_rotcompmtrx_01.html 13 December 2018).
Loading of the rotated component matrix resulted into Section B that was focused on the Training Need Determination (TND) construct exhibiting three underlying factors or sub-themes. The underlying factors were named as follows: High Trainee Participation: TND (HTPTND), Low Trainee Participation: TND (LTPTND) and Norm Trainee Participation: TND (NTPTND). These established and named underlying factors finds resonance with the Integrating Training Needs, Assessment and Evaluation theory by Opperman and Meyer of 2008 as well as Linking Training to Organisational Requirements theory by Kaufman (1985), discussed in Chapter Three. The theories highlighted the need for deeper research in the TND processes, systems and policies alignment of the TND to the strategic plan and linking the TND to various levels of the organisation. The TND research and alignment of the processes to all the levels of the organisation leads to impactful, monitored and evaluated training. The sub-themes reflected different levels at which the trainees participated in the TND process, which was discussed in detail in the progression of the study. The term Training Needs Determination and Training Needs Identification (TNI) was used by the study interchangeably to mean the training needs research systems.

In Section C, the construct concentrated on the M&E systems during and after Training. The rotated component matrix loaded two underlying factors that were named as: Functional During training Monitoring systems and Functional During training Evaluation systems sub-themes. Underlying factors in Section C found resonance with the Monitoring and Evaluation theory by highlighting the Activities key performance information concept (which in this case, refers to conducting of the actual training by PPSTA). The activities key performance information concept implementation needs to be monitored and evaluated. The M&E indicators must be developed, to monitor and feed into the evaluation of the training programmes.

The construct in Section D was the training impact (outcomes) which can be related to the M&E theory with a focus on the outcomes key performance information concept. The outcomes refers to evaluation of the inputs, activities and outputs key performance information concepts to determine the efficacy of the training intervention. The Ten Phase Strategy of Training Evaluation is the complementing theory with a particular focus on Phase 9 (Evaluate Training) and 10 (Evaluate Change due to Training Development) was found to resonate with Section D sub-themes. It should be noted that the term training impact had been used by the study because it was a familiar term to the respondents than training outcomes. In fact, the
research wanted to determine the availability of policies, systems and tools to determine the training outcomes. According to M&E literature, the training outcomes findings may serve as the basis for the training impact study, as discussed in Chapter Two and Three. The study ensured that presentations were made to the respondents to explain the difference between impacts and outcomes key performance information concepts in line with the M&E literature and legislation before the respondents started to populate the questionnaire. The training impact (which is the outcomes in this case) revealed two factors: Positive Impact (Outcomes) and Functional After Training Evaluation systems.

Section E was focused on the Alignment of M&E Policies between PPSTA and Provincial Departments and the underlying factors extracted were T&D M&E Policy communication and T&D M&E Policy gaps. These sub-themes further strengthen the argument raised in Chapter Three by the M&E Framework of 2007, that every AO must develop M&E structures and systems. The sub-themes reflected the communication of M&E policies and policy gaps. The factors assisted the study in the determination of how embedded and aligned M&E T&D policies were the in provincial and PPSTA. The study is of the view that if the M&E T&D policies are embedded in provincial departments, as well as PPSTA the outcomes, training assessment would be easily evaluated.

Underlying factors in the factor analysis rotated component matrix were discussed in detail as the study progressed. Tables 5.3 to 5.6 express the findings in a table format.

| Rotated Component Matrixa | Component |  |  |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| Section B                | High Trainee Participation: TND | Low Trainee Participation: TND | Norm Trainee Participation: TND |
| Trainee requested the training programme | 0.104 | 0.043 | 0.705 |
| Trainee researched the training programme | 0.435 | 0.152 | 0.580 |
| Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf | 0.084 | 0.731 | 0.043 |
| Trainee and immediate supervisor requested the training programme using the Personal Development Plan in the Employee Performance Management and Development System | 0.055 | 0.288 | 0.878 |
| Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs | 0.796 | -0.162 | 0.212 |
Table 5.3: Training Needs Determination


Source: Adapted from IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (2017)

| Aware of the department’s needs identification system | -0.092 | 0.831 | 0.215 |
| Satisfied with the departments training needs identification system | 0.265 | 0.837 | 0.219 |
| Aware of the PPSTA training needs identification process | 0.717 | 0.419 | -0.178 |
| Attended my department meeting where the PPSTA training need identification process was explained | 0.776 | 0.072 | 0.316 |
| Satisfied with the PPSTA needs identification process | 0.754 | 0.122 | 0.088 |

Table 5.4: Monitoring and Evaluation Systems During and After Training

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Source: Adapted from IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (2017)
### Rotated Component Matrix\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section D</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Positive Impact (Outcomes)</th>
<th>Functional After Training: Evaluation systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrote evaluation report after the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with my immediate supervisor held on how to implement what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully implemented what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made a positive impact in my professional life</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the sub-directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recommend the course to a colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.5: Training Impact (Outcomes)**

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Source: Adapted from IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (2017)
It was stated in the preceding paragraphs that the main goal of factor analysis is to reduce data. In the survey conducted, factor analysis was used to represent a number of questions with a small number of hypothetical factors.

The research used the following statistical mining methods in reference to the tables above:

- The Principle Component Analysis was used as the extraction method, and the Rotation Method was Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. This is an orthogonal rotation method that minimizes the number of variables that have high loadings on each factor. It simplified the interpretation of the factors.
- Factor Analysis loading showed inter-correlations between variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;D M&amp;E policy communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluation (T&amp;D M&amp;E) policy or before, during and after training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended HRD directorate or sub-directorate meeting regarding the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the meetings regarding KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware how department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy links with PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA and the department T&amp;D M&amp;E policies needs to be aligned.</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6: Alignment of M&E Policies between PPSTA and Provincial Departments**

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Source: Adapted from IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (2017)
• Items of questions that loaded similarly imply measurement along a similar factor. An examination of the content of items loading at or above 0.5 (and using the higher or highest loading in instances where items cross-loaded at greater than this value) effectively measured along the various components.

In the study, it was noted that the variables that constituted Section B loaded along 3 components (sub-themes) and the remaining Sections (C, D and E) loaded along 2 components. This meant that respondents identified different or more trends in Section B.

Three splits (sub-themes) in Section B are colour-coded as follows: The yellow shaded code represents a HTPTND sub-theme, which revealed that the trainees and immediate supervisors were using beyond the normal TND process Personal Development Plans (PDPs) and system Employee Performance Management Development Plans (EPMDS) to determine the training needs. Awareness and satisfaction in the TND policies processes and systems was exhibited to be beyond the departmental level as the trainees exhibited awareness and satisfaction with the PPSTA’s TND process.

The light green shaded sub-theme refers to LTPTND. This sub-theme refers to a minimal or less participation of the trainee in the TND process. In this instance, the study found that the training was requested on the trainee’s behalf, the scope of the trainee awareness and satisfaction of the TND process was limited to the departmental level.

The light blue shaded code characterised the NTPTND sub-theme. The NTPTND is understood as the trainee conforming to the norm of the TND process based on the stipulated EPMDS. These trainees were found not to have gone beyond the PDPs and EPMDS norm. They were participating at the TND process up to their unit’s Trainee and the Immediate Supervisor level. Less evidence was found that showed the level awareness or satisfaction with their provincial departments’ or PPSTA TND process. The study found corroboration between the statistical data from the NTPTND sub-theme and the responses from the interview with the trainees and immediate supervisors. They did not provide information beyond the normal PDP and EPMDS TND process, their responses made the study locate her within this sub-theme.

Section C was split into two sub-themes: functional during training monitoring systems and functional during training evaluation systems. Functional during training monitoring systems sub-theme shaded in yellow resembled high statistical significance of functionality of the
systems *during* the training programmes. This statistical claim for the functional *during* the training and monitoring system was supported by the responses of the interviewees (3 trainees agreed to have written during training, 2 SDFs reported to have sit-ins during training to monitor progress, and 2 PPSTA trainers reported to conduct the monitoring process during the training sessions). These responses were in agreement that a functional *during* training monitoring systems were in existence. The study recognised the existence of the functional *during* training Monitoring system, but noted that the respondents revealed the lack of a designated *during* training Monitoring official that sit in during the training of all four sampled programmes. The official that occasionally performs this task (sit-ins during training), was the SDF or the HRD practitioner in provincial departments on the first and last day of the course. The study viewed this setting as the M&E gap as trainers are left to monitor and evaluate their performance. It was confirmed by the study, that monitoring during training does exist but it needs to be interrogated in order to fill the gaps highlighted by the interview participants.

The second sub-theme in Section C is referred to as functional *during* training evaluation systems. It was noted in the study that high factor loading of trainees have evaluated the relevance of the course to their work and persuaded the trainees to finish assessments. These responses were accepted as the contributing factors to the functionality of *during* training evaluation system. Interviews of the HRD managers, PPSTA manager, and SDFs sighted a gap in the evaluation of training as there was no designated person for this task, and often the HRD practitioner and the SDF (designated for the training evaluation) come in on the last day of training,

Section D was constructed to measure the training impact (outcomes). Two sub-themes found through the loading process were positive impact (outcomes) and functional *after* training evaluation system. The positive outcomes sub-theme provided the study with a statistical finding that proves that the 4 training programmes provided by the PPSTA have positive outcomes on the trainee’ professional life, sub-directorate, directorate, branch and at organisational (departmental) level. The second underlying factor was the functional *after* training evaluation system, which evidenced that systematic evaluation systems were in existence.
Section E represented the construct that wanted to determine whether PPSTA and provincial departments’ M&E policies were aligned. Two underlying factors surfaced from the loading: T&D M&E policy communication and T&D M&E policy gaps. There were two sides to this effect: firstly, a group of trainees agreed that T&D M&E policy was well communicated and did not see the need for improvement and alignment of T&D M&E policies between PPSTA and provincial departments (T&D M&E policy communication); secondly, a group of trainees were not aware of their provincial departments and the PPSTA T&D M&E policy and thought that both policies needed to be improved and aligned (T&D M&E policy gaps).

This section concludes by highlighting that the instrument used was found to be statistically reliable and valid. Use of factor analysis was significantly explained. The study deemed it fit to interpret and analyse data as the instrument used to collect and collate the findings has been found to be methodologically sound.

5.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS
In the preceding discussions, the study established the reliability and validity of the instrument, suitability of the study for factor analysis and detected the underlying factors in the rotated component matrix. It has been proven statistically that the instruments used by the study had met the statistical requirements for further data analysis and interpretation. In commencing with the data analysis and interpretation, representativity of biographical data became significant.

5.4.1 Section A: Biographical Data
With the distribution of respondents in terms of the held positions as summarised in Table 5.7, there is a fairly even spread of respondents in these categories (p = 0.433).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director SAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker - Policy Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD: SOM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD: HRA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD: Restorative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Agricultural Advisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Advisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Practitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Assistant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assistant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD Practitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AET Educator HRD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant HR Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHS Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFMO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.7: Spread of the Respondents**

Source: Outcome of Author’s Fieldwork, (2018)

It was concluded in the study that the biographical characteristics of the respondents were fairly represented. The other facet that informed the study was the sampling technique discussed in the progression of the study.
5.4.2. Analysis and Interpretation of the Sampling Technique

The sampling technique involved 7 provincial departments’ trainees, immediate supervisors, SDFs, HRD managers, PPSTA trainers and management from the population of 14 provincial departments and 1 PPSTA that attended or participated in the four training programmes (Public Sector Administration Skills, Course on Facilitating Learning, Chairing of Meeting Effectively and Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers) offered by the PPSTA during the 2013/14 financial year. The simple random sampling is among probability sampling techniques that allows for generalisation and provided equal opportunity to the respondents to participate in the study. The sample was on the trainee respondent and the other respondents or categories was sampled as part of a better understanding of the context of the trainee respondent. In total, the study had opted for 92 respondents to participate in the twelve interviews and dispatched 80 questionnaires. The sampling technique chosen by the study yielded positive results, as the number of respondents that participated in the study was 83 in total, with a complement of 12 interviewees and 71 respondents to the questionnaires.

5.4.3 The Trainees Sample

The study had sampled 7 provincial departments: Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Department of Social Development, Department of Arts and Culture, Department of Health, Department of Transport, Department of Human Settlements, as well as Community Safety and Liaison. All of the respondents were employed within one of the KwaZulu-Natal provincial departments, as illustrated in Figure 5.1. The trainees from the Department of Arts and Culture were part of the 7 sampled departments but did not participate in the survey. The figure did not reflect Department of Arts and Culture as their trainees did not participate due to their non-availability, however, the research used secondary data to understand the provincial departments’ context.
Figure 5.1: Provincial departments’ respondent illustration
Source: Outcome of Authors Fieldwork, (2018)

Significantly, more respondents were from Department of Agriculture and Rural Development at 35.8% with the smallest contingent being from Community Safety and Liaison at 5.7% (p = 0.002). The study was focused on M&E of training programmes offered by PPSTA. It sampled four training and development programmes: Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers, Public Sector Administration Skills, Course on Facilitating Learning and Chairing of Meeting Effectively to make generalisations on the outcomes of training programmes offered by the PPSTA. The study noted that Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers was captured as three different training programmes, when it was supposed to be captured as one training programme. Therefore, Effective Management at 32.7%, Management Principles for Junior Managers with 13.5% and Junior Management at 1.9% represents one training and development programme, which is Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers. This is a total of 48.1% combined in the research. The split could be attributed to the respondents that have developed their own course coding (familiar names) of the training programmes.

In the final analysis, significantly more respondents attended Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers (48.1%) and Public Sector Administration Skills (21.2%), which gave the p value of 0.002 (p = 0.002).
The four sampled courses attended by the respondents are reflected in Figure 5.2; as stated earlier, the Effective Management at 32.7%, Management Principles for Junior Managers with 13.5% and Junior Management at 1.9% represent one training and development programme, which is Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers.

![Pie Chart](Figure 5.2: Four sampled courses represented in the pie chart)

Source: Outcome of Authors Fieldwork, (2018)

### 5.4.4 Number of Years in Employment

Approximately 90% of the respondents have been employed for more than 5 years at a statistical value of $p < 0.001$. This implies that respondents have been in the departments’ employment list for a long time, which is a useful and a positive fact as it indicated that the responses were from experienced workers that have attended training, and have accumulated knowledge and skills over a longer time span. Figure 5.3 presents a spread of the respondents’ work experience.
The study viewed the respondents as a matured and reliable source of data due to their work experience and their positioning in the structure of their departments. This gave the study a degree of trust in the responses as the trainees have been working for the departments for some time. The experience was also observed as long service in the qualitative study as trainees had more than 5 years’ experience. The immediate supervisors, SDFs, trainers and PPSTA managers had more than 5 years to more than 20 years’ experience, which echoed the earlier long service sentiments from the quantitative data.

In terms of the positions the respondents held at their departments, the study revealed that less than a third of the trainee respondents were at the level of management, with the majority of respondents being at non-management level (p < 0.001). This meant that there was a deeper understanding of M&E, especially with the trainees that held management positions.

Table 5.8 shows the positions that the respondents occupy as shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Held</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.8: Distribution of the position held by trainees**

Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)

The findings concluded that the biographical data assisted the study to solicit respondents as per the sample frame. The biographical data concluded that the sample was fairly representative of the population which serves the generalisation and analysis. The discussion on the analysis, generalisation and inferences, thereby concluding the four themes chosen by the study follows in the next part of the empirical aspect.

**5.4.5 Section Analysis**

The section that follows analyses the scoring patterns of the respondents per variable per section. Results are first presented using summarised percentages for the variables that constitute each section. Results are then further analysed according to the importance of the statements.

**5.4.5.1 Section B: Determination of the training needs**

This section deals with the theme: *Determination of the Training Needs*. The study aimed to determine whether the determination of the training needs can be related to the impact (outcomes) of training. Significance of determining the training needs additionally, that are aligned to the strategic plan of the organisation had been highlighted by the study in Chapter Two in support through the Opperman and Meyer (2008: 183) Integrating Training Needs, Assessment and Evaluation theory and model. The authors stated that training should be informed by, *inter alia*, extensive research, strategic plan, annual performance plan, workplace skills plan and other organisational dossier analysis. Training needs determination phase is among the critical factors of T&D systems that need to be monitored carefully for the training to be impactful. Through the quantitative and qualitative data analysis, the PDP was considered the main TND tool used and valid by the departments. It was also understood by the study to be linked to the EPMDS as part of the linked strategic plan of every provincial department.
The study presents the Section B responses on the Determination of Training Needs from the survey as Table 5.9 and Figure 5.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section B</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Chi Square p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainee requested the training programme</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee and immediate supervisor requested the training programme using the Personal Development Plan in the Employee Performance Management and Development System</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the department’s needs identification system</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the departments training needs identification system</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended my department meeting where the PPSTA training need identification process was explained</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA training needs identification process</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9: Summary of the respondents’ scoring patterns in Section B

Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)
Figure 5.4: Summary of the respondents’ scoring patterns in Section B
Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)

The study observed the following patterns: some statements show (significantly) higher levels of agreement, while other levels of agreement are lower (but still greater than levels of disagreement). In the statement B1, the sum of 60.4% of trainees agreed (45.3 % agreed and 15.1 strongly agreed) to have requested the training programmes, trainees at 34.7% agreed and 4.1% strongly agreed to have researched training prior to attending it, as presented in statement B2. In statement B3, the total of sixty three percent (63%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed that the training was requested on their behalf. Statement B4 revealed 58% of the trainees that agreed that the T&D programmes were requested through the PDPs and EPMDS. The study noted statement B5 of 45.3% trained that agreed to utilise beyond PDP and EPMDS.

Statement B6 found respondents at 68.8% awareness of their departments’ TNI system, and B7 was at 69.2% in terms of the trainees’ satisfaction with their provincial departments TNI system.
Statement B8 showed 36.7% of respondents that were aware of the PPSTA’s TNI process. In statement B9, the figure was at 62.2% of trainees that disagreed to have attended a meeting in their departments on PPSTA TNI system. Statement B10 recorded 60.4% of uncertainty, disagreement and strong disagreement on the trainees being satisfied with the PPSTA TNI system.

Another angle of Training Needs Extrapolation (TNE) within the TND discourse was introduced by the PPSTA management in the interview. The term referred to the extrapolation of TND data from the Workplace Skills Plans (WSPs), Annual Training Reports (ATRs) and consultation with the department. This process (TNE) culminated into the provision of training programmes using the data sourced from these processes.

Statements B8, B9 and B10 reflect the low percentages of awareness, participation and satisfaction in the PPSTA TND system. This can be understood by the research as low level of awareness of the PPSTA needs TNI system. It can be stated that through the interviews conducted, the PPSTA trainers and management as well as the SDFs, HRD management in provincial departments were aware of the PPSTA TND process. The trainees and the immediate supervisors were not aware of the PPSTA TND process.

The study noted the links between the analysis presented above and the factor analysis loading discussion made earlier that highlighted three statements that formed sub-themes or underlying factors that were named, as follows: HTPTND, LTPTND and NTPTND. Data presented in Section B located about 45% of trainees within the HTPTND sub-theme, and 60% to the NTPTND sub-theme. Majority of respondents at above 63% fell within the LTPTND underlying factor where there was limited participation in the whole TND process and the training programme was requested on the trainee behalf. The study found links between observable factor with unobservable weightings and factors discussed earlier. There were commonalities in the linking the statements and the study called it a sub-theme. The Determination of training Needs theme, as well as the HTPTND, LTPTND and NTPTND sub-themes, afforded the study to conclude that there is the existence of provincial department’s policies, processes and systems of identifying the training needs but that it is restricted to the NTPTND.

The Chi-square test was done to determine whether the scoring patterns per statement were significantly different per option a. The null hypothesis claimed that similar numbers of
respondents scored across each option for each statement (one statement at a time). The alternate stated that there is a significant difference between the levels of agreement and disagreement. The results were reflected on the Table 5.9 highlighted in yellow. The highlighted sig. values (p-values) are less than 0.05 (the level of significance); this implied that the distributions were not similar. Differences between the way respondents scored (agree, uncertain, disagree) were significant. The Chi-square test was conducted in other themes to follow in the study and similar results were found, where the null hypothesis was rejected and they were shaded in yellow for consistence purposes.

Sentiments presented by the statistical analysis findings on the Determination of Training Needs construct were echoed by the qualitative facet of the research, as five interviewees (1 SDF, 1 HRD manager, 1 Immediate Supervisor and 2 Trainees) agreed that the TND process was effective and valid. All participants who found the TND process to be valid did not consider any TND techniques beyond PDP and the EPMDS, which made these interviewees to fall within the LTPTND and NTPTND sub-theme in the statistical analyses. The study interpreted these findings as there was not enough evidence to indicate that majority of trainees were in use of the TND processes beyond the EPMDS and PDPs. The finding placed the trainee within the LTPTND and NTPTND underlying factor. It was noted that a small number of participants agreed to have used beyond the PDP and EPMDS in the TND process, which were found to be within HTPTND sub-theme. This meant a low number of trainees were using beyond the PDP and EPMDS in the TND process.

One Immediate Supervisor did answered the question on the validity of the TND process by linking the validity of the EPMDS and PDPs within the Public Service Act prescription. The findings related the response of the Immediate Supervisor to the matter of department concerned with complying and not wanting to ‘go the extra mile’. In this case, it would warrant further research beyond the PDPs and EPMDS processes before the training needs are determined.

Six respondents (2 PPSTA trainers, 1 PPSTA manager, 1 trainee, 1 SDF and 1 Immediate Supervisor) did not agree that the TND process was valid. They raised the need of going beyond the PDP and EPMDS in the TND process as the reason for their response. The research located these respondents as aspiring to highly participate and go beyond PDPs and EPMDS. It has been determined earlier in the statistical analysis that these respondents belong in the HTPTND sub-theme.
Generally in the provincial departments, the TND process is mainly driven by the PDPs within the EPMDS, and at times, the training programmes were requested on the trainee’s behalf. As a result of not being exposed or not aware of the PPSTA TND process, the trainees do not have full knowledge when they choose the training programmes or when filling out their PDPs. There is a small portion within departments that was found to have gone beyond the EPMDS and PDPs.

These findings answered the first research question raised throughout the study on: *How valid is the process used by PPSTA and provincial departments to determine training needs?* The study conceded that there is a valid system that existed in the PPSTA and provincial departments for TND process but it is largely implemented at NTPTND and LTPTND. There are a few instances where there was evidence of ‘pockets’ of excellence where departments did go beyond the norm (PDP and EPMDS), which can be aligned to HTPTND process.

**5.4.5.2 Section C: Monitoring and evaluation systems during and after training**

This phase is subsequent to the TND process. It is focused on the training that took place and was informed by any of the three sub-concepts in the TND process. The theme aimed to answer the second research question raised in Chapter 1 on: *How efficient and effective are M&E policies, systems and tools employed by the PPSTA during and after training?* In answering this question, Monitoring (*during*) and Evaluation (*after*) of training sessions were viewed to be critical to gauge whether training provided responded to the need identified. Table 5.10 and Figure 5.5 present the data collected to respond to the construct for analytical and concluding purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section C</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Chi Square p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrote all assessments during the training</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 5.7%</td>
<td>3 5.7%</td>
<td>28 52.8%</td>
<td>19 35.8% 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote assessments after the training</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1 2.0%</td>
<td>6 11.8%</td>
<td>6 11.8%</td>
<td>24 47.1%</td>
<td>14 27.5% 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted the portfolio of evidence</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1 1.9%</td>
<td>10 19.2%</td>
<td>4 7.7%</td>
<td>19 36.5%</td>
<td>18 34.6% 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the course to my work prompted me to finish the assessments</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 5.9%</td>
<td>3 5.9%</td>
<td>25 49.0%</td>
<td>20 39.2% 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled the evaluation form after the training programme</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 5.7%</td>
<td>25 47.2%</td>
<td>25 47.2% 0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.10: Summary of the respondents’ scoring patterns in Section C**

Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)
The statements in Section C were focused on the theme: *monitoring and monitoring and evaluation during the and after training, and* the results showed (significantly) higher levels of agreement, with low levels of uncertainty and disagreement. The theme was aimed to ascertain whether subsequent to the need identification process there were integrated M&E systems that takes place *during* and *after* the training programme. The survey revealed the following findings.

In the statement C1, a total 87.16% of trainees agreed and strongly agreed to have written all the assessments during the training sessions. The finding was viewed as PPSTA to have strong monitoring systems *during* training. Statement C2 reveals that at the total of 74.6%, the trainees wrote their Portfolios of Evidence (PoEs), which can be understood as the high rate of completion of summative assessments. In statement C3, there was a 71% totality of agreements and strong agreements with the statement that trainees submitted their PoEs. The study noted that close to 30% of the trainees were either uncertain or did not submit their PoEs after
training. The study noted statement C2 and C3 to reflect strongly after training evaluation systems at beyond 70% response in terms of completion of summative assessments, including PoEs.

In statement C4, 88.2% of the trainees were prompted by the relevance of the course attended to their work to finish the assessments. The statement of the relevance of courses offered by the PPSTA to the trainees’ work is viewed as stimulus for trainees to complete their assessments.

In statements C5, a total of 95% trainees agreed and strongly agreed to have filled the evaluation form. The evaluation form serves as the evaluation to assist PPSTA trainers, PPSTA management and provincial departments to evaluate the extent at which the course has contributed to the trainees’ skills and capacity development.

It transpired in the qualitative data that both PPSTA and the provincial departments did not have a designated M&E official that monitors and evaluate the training to gauge whether it was in line with the TND process. The M&E processes that takes place during and after are largely focused on the logistical arrangements than content analysis. In the interview, the PPSTA management revealed the need for the during training monitoring tool, and confirmed to have the after training evaluation tool in the form of evaluation forms and trainers reports. One of the PPSTA trainers confirmed minimal departments’ pockets of excellence in terms of after training evaluations through the “reaction evaluation form”. It was stated that on few occasions, he has been requested to leave the training manual for the department’s HRD official.

In conclusion, the research question was of relevance to the study. How efficient and effective are M&E policies, systems and tools employed by the PPSTA during and after training? The findings revealed that PPSTA and provincial departments do not have an official and holistic monitoring systems, and when it does take place, it is not well planned. On the evaluation of training, the PPSTA was found to have a firm system of evaluating after training through the training evaluation forms and trainers evaluation report. Provincial departments were found in the main not to have concrete and holistic after training systems.

5.4.5.3 Section D: Training impact (outcomes)

The theme: Training Impact (outcomes) responded to the argument made earlier in the study by Tshukudu (2009: 200-202) that there is a need for institutionalising M&E systems in T&D that
are beyond the “production approach” and to place the focus on the behavioural change of the trainee. The “production approach” is largely focused on the number of employees trained (which has been the case also in the PPSTA context) and often unconnected with measuring whether the training provided bridged the gap that was initially identified during the training needs determination process. It is necessary to show whether the Human Resource Management and Development units are fulfilling their core purpose in the departments as it was discussed in the Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation theory by Opperman and Meyer (2008: 183-193), and Ten (10) Phase strategy by Tshukudu and Nel (2015: 191-197) in Chapter Three. These two theories complement each other in ensuring that behavioural change is not merely about numbers, but is measured after conducting or coordinating training.

It was further highlighted in Chapter Two that ETD practitioners need to devote significant effort on the systematic training evaluation process or processes that seek to measure the efficacy of the training programme implemented. The Training Impact (outcomes) construct was specifically orchestrated for the purpose of determining the availability of preparation and implementation systems for the newly acquired training and the extent of impact that training made to the trainees.

It has been stated in the preceding discussions, that it is the M&E framework of 2007 that guided the study; in the framework, the outcomes evaluation often serves as the basis for or precedes impacts evaluation. The term ‘training impact’ had been “borrowed” by the study for ease of reference to the participants. Table 5.11 and Figure 5.6 represent the data collected for the construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section D</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrote evaluation report after the training programme</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>7 14.0%</td>
<td>7 14.0%</td>
<td>3 6.0%</td>
<td>24 48.0%</td>
<td>9 18.0%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with my immediate supervisor held on how to implement what I have learned</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>4 7.8%</td>
<td>14 27.5%</td>
<td>7 13.7%</td>
<td>23 45.1%</td>
<td>3 5.9%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially implemented what I have learned</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>2 3.8%</td>
<td>9 17.3%</td>
<td>6 11.5%</td>
<td>28 53.8%</td>
<td>7 13.5%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully implemented what I have learned</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>4 7.5%</td>
<td>8 15.1%</td>
<td>9 17.0%</td>
<td>17 32.1%</td>
<td>15 28.3%</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not implemented what I have learned</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>19 37.3%</td>
<td>20 39.2%</td>
<td>6 11.8%</td>
<td>3 5.9%</td>
<td>3 5.9%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made an positive impact in my professional life</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td>2 3.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>7 13.2%</td>
<td>30 56.6%</td>
<td>14 26.4%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 1.9%</td>
<td>13 24.5%</td>
<td>28 52.8%</td>
<td>11 20.8%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The training programme has made positive impact in the sub-directorate

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11: Summary of the respondents’ scoring patterns in Section D

Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)
In Section D, the theme was focused on *Training Impact (outcomes)*. It has been stated earlier that the aim of the study is to measure the outcomes not impacts as guided by the M&E framework. The term ‘training impact’ has been used for the respondents’ ease of reference. The researcher conducted presentations to the respondents prior to conducting the survey or interviews to explain the difference between the two M&E concepts. The impacts concept is long-term evaluation and the outcomes concept is a short- to medium term evaluation, and this study is aligned more to the outcomes evaluation than impacts evaluation concept.

In this theme, there was a generally a high level of agreement with the statements among the respondent, except for disagreements in D5, D11 and D12.

Statement D1 reflects a high number of trainees (66%) that agreed and strongly agreed to have written an evaluation report after the training. In D2, a total 51% of trainees were in agreement and strong agreement to have had a meeting with their immediate supervisor after the training, while 49% disagree or were uncertain whether the meeting took place. Availability of the processes and systems followed to measure and ensure the outcomes of training was at 51%. The study noted with concern that almost half of the trainees did not get a chance to sit down and evaluate the course with their immediate supervisor. This may affect the transfer of learning in
the planning processes. In the interviews conducted, it was significantly noted that there was no mention of the PPSTA&PD, T&D and M&E SOPS with regards to the this matter. Statements D1 and D2 answered the questions raised by the study in the preceding chapters on: What is the level of readiness of the organisation to implement training?

In statement D3, a total of 67% in total of respondents agreed and other trainees strongly agreed to have partially implemented what they have learned. Statement D4 responses reflected 60.4 of participants agreed to have fully implemented what they have learned from the course attended.

Sixty percent of trainees that have fully implemented what they have learned. These responses were interpreted as follows: 60% of trainees have transferred to some extent the learning obtained from the four programmes to their workplaces, while other trainees at close to 40% were uncertain or disagreed with the statement. It can be concluded that 60% of trainees implement the training at the workplace.

A sum of 76.5% in statement D5 of respondents were in disagreement with the statement that they had not fully implemented what had been learned. Statement D6 reveals that the majority (86%) of respondents were found to agree or strongly agree with the statement of training to have made a positive impact (which will be understood as positive outcomes guided by the M&E framework of 2007) on their professional lives, while D7 statement attests that 73.3% of the respondents viewed the training attended had a positive impact (outcomes) at a sub-directorate level. In the category D8, the statement reveals that 63.4% of respondents had a positive impact (outcome) emanating from attending one of the four of the PPSTA courses.

The study recorded a high level of uncertainty (43.1) in Statement D9 whether their training had an impact at a branch level. It can be noted that even though there was a high-level uncertainty in D9, majority of the respondents at 53% still held the view that the training had a positive impact at a branch level. In D10, 66% of the respondents stated that the training programmes attended made a positive impact (outcome) on their departments overall.

In D11, the respondents disagreed at more than 70% that the training attended made no impact (positive outcomes). Statement D12 showed that 73.5% of the respondents disagreed with the statement around not being awarded an opportunity to implement what they had learned. In the statement D13, 96% of the participants agreed that they could recommend the courses to a colleague.
Notwithstanding some gaps and differing views, overall the training programmes have proven to have a generally positive outcome on the trainees. The study noted that the impact (outcomes) of training had a greater training impact on the trainee as an individual as compared to the higher structures (sub-directorate, directorate branch and department level). The training impact (outcomes) theme had answered the fourth research question namely, what change has the training made to the organisation? The change confirmed by the statistical data is largely attributed to the courses offered by PPSTA. In the interview with one of the employees that attended Public Service Administrative Skills (PSAS) programme, the interviewee linked doing well in the interviews, attaining a higher post and better understanding of EPMDS, as well as other public service legislation deemed significant aspects in attending the PSAS training programme.

**5.4.5.4 Section E: Alignment of M&E policies to the PPSTA and Provincial Departments**

The theme: Alignment of M&E policies to the PPSTA and Provincial Departments was constructed to measure the level of awareness, participation and satisfaction with the alignments of PPSTA and provincial departments M&E policies. The construct was aimed at responding to the research question on: What is the level of alignment in relation to the training and development M&E policies, systems, processes and tools between PPSTA and Provincial Departments?

This construct is informed by the M&E Framework of 2007 discussed in Chapter Two. It stated that, as a requirement, any state institution’s AO is required to develop an M&E system. The requirement from the M&E Framework of 2007 informed the hypothesis made by the study, which reads that an embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminates in the efficacy of evaluating the outcomes of training programmes. The results are collated in Table 5.12 and Figure 5.7, and narrated in responses from the participants with regard to this theme and construct followed in the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section E</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1, Aware of Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluation (T&amp;D M&amp;E) policy before, during and after training &amp; M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2, Attended HRD directorate or sub-directorate meeting regarding the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3, Satisfied with the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4, The department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5, Aware of the meetings regarding KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6, Aware how department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy links with PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7, PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8, PPSTA and the department T&amp;D M&amp;E policies needs to be aligned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12 Summary of the respondents’ scoring patterns in Section E

Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)
Figure 5.7: Summary of the respondents’ scoring patterns in Section E
Source: Outcome of Fieldwork, (2018)

Section E represents the theme: *Alignment of M&E policies between PPSTA and provincial departments*. The theme was aimed at examining the level or extent of awareness by the respondents of the provincial departments and PPSTA Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluation (T&D M&E) policies, and their alignment. The assumption made by the study was that high levels of awareness and understanding of the alignment of the PPSTA and provincial departments T&D M&E policies by the respondents is a significant platform for the implementation of training and development programmes and for raising areas of improvements in the PPSTA and provincial departments T&D M&E policies.

The theme revealed significantly high levels of uncertainty in E3, E4, E6, E7 and E8. Statement E1 highlighted 55% in total of respondents who have agreed and strongly agreed to be aware of the provincial departments’ Training and Development and Monitoring & Evaluation (T&D M&E) policy.

The study discovered in statement E2 that the majority (84.3%) of the respondents had disagreed or strongly disagreed, while others were uncertain that they have attended any
departments’ HRD meeting regarding the T&D M&E policy. The responses to statements E1 and E2 were understood by the study to signify an average awareness of the provincial T&D M&E policy, with less participation in the T&D M&E policy process. The understanding by the study was that through the T&D M&E policy, provincial departmental meetings are among other critical platforms where the T&D M&E policy gets to be developed, updated, reviewed and approved. These findings resonated with earlier findings in the Determination of the Training Needs theme, where the trainees were not fully participative in the TND process.

In Statement E3, more than half of the trainees (respondents), at 57.7%, were either uncertain, disagreed or strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their departments’ T&D M&E policy. In Statement E4, the majority of respondents at 47% felt that the provincial departments’ T&D M&E policy needed improvement; the study also noted that 37.3% were uncertain about the matter. Statements E3 and E4 were noted as a concern by the study, and these responses further raised the need for the provincial departments to communicate with their trainees to ascertain the reasons behind their responses and address the these concerns.

In Statement E5, there was generally disagreement at 50% in terms of the awareness of PPSTA’s meetings regarding T&D M&E policy, and 19% percent of the respondents were uncertain. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the respondents were aware of the linkage between PPSTA and provincial departments T&D M&E policies in Statement E6. In the Statement E7, there was an indication of uncertainty at 52% on whether the PPSTA T&D M&E policies needed improvements, which can be related to the low levels of awareness noted around Statement E6. Statement E8 shows a combined indication at 46.6% of the respondents that strongly agreed and agreed that PPSTA and provincial departments T&D M&E policy should be aligned. The study noted the high percentage of 38.5% that were uncertain about the statement.

The high levels of uncertainty in the theme results in terms of the awareness of the PPSTA and provincial departments T&D M&E policies revealed the need for PPSTA and provincial departments to significantly review T&D M&E communication and implementation strategies.
5.4 CROSS-TABULATIONS

The reporting of the results required a statement of statistical significance. A p-value is generated from a test statistic. A significant result is indicated with "p < 0.05". A second Chi square test was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables (rows versus columns).

The null hypothesis stated that there was no association between the two. The alternate hypothesis indicated that there was an association, for instance, the p-value between statement “Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs” and the statement “How long have you been employed?”, is 0.017 (highlighted in light green) informed by the Fisher’s Exact Test score in Annexure I1. In essence, there is a significant relationship between the two variables. The length of employment of the respondent did play a significant role in terms of how respondents viewed their training needs. The statistical significance revealed that the employees employed for a longer period are highly likely to use measures beyond the PDP and EPMDS to determine their training needs. The statistical finding could be linked to the HTPTND sub-theme discussed earlier within the Determination of Training Needs theme. The interprets of this finding was as the more the years spent in the organisation, it is likely that those employed will go beyond the NTPTND sub-theme and use other methods beyond the PDP and EPMDS in the TND process.

The study also noted the instances where the null hypothesis reflected no association between the statements, and it was proven to be within the argument of the study. An example is where the study revealed no association or no statistical significance between the statement “Trainee requested the programme” and the statement, What is your level of employment in the department? In this instance, the p value was found to be beyond 0.05 (p > 0.05) at 0.804 using the Fishers Exact Test technique highlighted in light blue Annexure I2, This was understood by the study to mean that there was no relationship between the trainee that requested the training programme and their level of employment and the training requests. Whether the employee is junior or senior staff member in the department, he or she will still request training.

The finding resonated with the theory by Kaufman (1985) of Linking Training to Organisational Requirements narrated in Chapter Three. The theory links training to various levels of the organisation: Professionals/Technicians, Middle Managers, Senior Managers and Executive Senior Managers.
A similar argument can be presented when discussing the variable “The trainee requested training programme” and variable “Position”. The non-significant relationship between the two variables is aligned with the earlier discussion on requesting the training programme unrelatedly to the level in the organisation, but in this instance, it did not matter what position the trainee held, he or she still requested the training. These arguments raised sharply the need for training in the provincial departments. The argument is also corresponds with the findings from the biographical data that resulted in a fair distribution of trainees from all the levels in the departments (operational, supervisory junior, middle and senior management).

5.5 CORRELATIONS

Bivariate correlation was performed on the (ordinal) data. The results were found in the Annexure J, and the results indicate the following patterns. Positive values indicate a direct proportional relationship between the variables and a negative value indicates an inverse relationship. All significant relationships are indicated by a * or **.

The correlation value between “Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs” and “Satisfied with the PPSTA needs identification process”, is 0.493 (highlighted in yellow in Annexure J). This is a directly related proportionality in that respondents indicated that the more satisfied they were with the identification process, the more other methods were used to determine training needs, and vice versa. The finding resonated with HTPTND factor analysis loading already discussed earlier. It can be concluded, that when the trainees are highly participative in the TND process, and they utilised measures beyond the normal PDP and EPMDS to determine the training needs, they are likely to be satisfied with the PPSTA needs identification process. It can be further argued in the study, that a small proportion was found to be belong to the HTPTND sub-theme.

Negative values imply an inverse relationship. The variables have an opposite effect on each other, for an example, the correlation value between “Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf” and “The training programme had made no impact” is -0.325 (highlighted in light blue in the Annexure J). The more training that was requested on the trainee’s behalf, the less impact the training had. This statistical finding highlights the need of going beyond the LTPTND and NTPTND in order for the training to have a desired impact (positive outcomes).

The study found direct related proportionality between the variable: “Submitted portfolio of evidence” and the variable “Wrote all assessment during training” at 0.437 (highlighted in
orange in Annexure J). The finding highlights that trainees that have written the during training assessments were also writing their after training portfolio of assessment. The finding raises the importance of the PPSTA and provincial departments to have strong during and after training M&E systems, as stated earlier in Section C’s theme narrative.

5.6 SECONDARY DATA
The study had used secondary data sourced from the work presented by Mohlomi (2016: 105-107) to supplement for the non-participation of trainees from the DA&C. It was found that there were corroborations between Mohlomi’s findings and recommendations with this study. The research noted the following findings and recommendations, inter alia, that resonated with the study:

- Identification of training needs was based on the PDPs and EPMDS informed by the Skills Development Act and the Department Policy on Training and Development. There was a need for DA&C to go beyond TND and EPMDS in the identification of training;
- Training communication strategies to be reviewed;
- It was concluded that in provincial department, trainees do not receive adequate training programmes;
- The study raised the significance of training evaluation for training relevance reasons;,
- and
- Reviewal of the strategies and policies that pertained to training.

The study noted that Mohlomi (2016) raised the questions of gaps in the policy, systems and processes of the training cycle and also raised the issue significance of training evaluation, but did not measure the outcomes of training as it had occurred in this study.

5.7 CONCLUSION
The study noted the findings that proved that the T&D conducted by the PPSTA had generally positive outcomes largely on the trainees’ professional work, and the training impact decreases its influence in the higher structures of the departments. On the one hand, the findings signified that there was value-for-money in the training programmes provided by the PPSTA.
On the other hand, the research was able to respond to research questions and achieve the research objectives. The M&E theory or framework had allowed the study to monitor and evaluate the training programmes offered by OTP, KZN.

The study found the M&E systems, policies and processes to be in existence, but there was a need for the M&E policies, systems, and processes to be developed and in some instances, improved and aligned.

Existence of an approved Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E System of 2007, the draft M&E policy within PPSTA, valid and existing TND and TNE systems and processes and embedded on Public Service Act of 1994, as well as the usage of M&E tools like the PDP (for data collection) and EPMDS gave the study an adequate basis to measure the outcomes of the training. There was weak evaluation during training monitoring systems in the PPSTA and provincial departments, strong evaluation after training processes and systems in the PPSTA, and weak after evaluation processes and systems, which have contributed to the study on monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of training programmes. Finally, the existence of the policies, processes and systems, whether weak or strong, proved the alternate hypothesis to be correct, that embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminate in the efficacy of evaluating the outcome of training programmes. The existence of M&E policies, systems and processes in the PPSTA and provincial departments was critical in proving the hypothesis correct. Realisation that the study reached the milestones it had set at the beginning, led logically to the beginning of the concluding Chapter Six, which also offers pertinent recommendations for due consideration.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In conclusion, the study was justified by one of the Executive Committee Lekgotla resolutions stated in the Provincial Growth and Development Plan Action Work Group 7 Quarter 2 Reporting template that argues for the “…impact of Human Resource Development and Education programmes which must be measured for impact assessment”. The resolution reflected the recognition by the Provincial Executive Committee (which is the Executive Authority) of the need for training, education and development impact assessment studies to be conducted.

Findings obtained from this study could be viewed as empirical evidence from the public administrators that responds to the resolutions taken by the Provincial Executive Authority. The resolution taken by the Provincial Executive Committee can be viewed as highlighting the relevance and need for more studies on the outcomes and impact assessment.

In the preceding chapters, the rationale for the study to be conducted was introduced. The rationale subsequently raised questions to be answered and the objectives that the study intended to achieve. The research hypothesis was that embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminate in the efficacy of evaluating the outcomes of training programmes. The study was based on the view that in order to monitor and evaluate training programmes offered by KZN OTP, the M&E policies, systems and processes must exist in the PPSTA as the training ‘machinery,’ as well as in the provincial departments as the recipients of training. Moreover, the M&E policies, systems and processes between PPSTA and provincial departments should be aligned. The existence of policies, systems and processes creates an enabling environment for the measurement of tangible outcomes to take place linked to the vision and mission of training and development including capacity building. The trainee had been identified by the study as the core category (source) to measure the outcomes. Other categories had been viewed as the additional categories to better understand the trainee.

The study was premised on Public Administration as a theory and in practice, the effect of improving the skills set to enhance service delivery. The literature to back up the stance was stated, as well as the theories that informed the study. The research methodology chosen created a path for the study to have concrete empirical analysis and make strong references,
generalisations and recommendations based on the data obtained through examining the findings in relation to the theoretical and practical constructs of M&E.

The process outlined in the preceding paragraphs has led to the presentation of the conclusion and recommendations. The research had chosen to utilise the research objectives to gauge whether training and development programmes offered by the KZN OTP have been sufficiently monitored and evaluated.

6.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
The research objectives presented along with the conclusion and recommendations are stated below.

6.2.1 Establish the validity of the process used by PPSTA and Provincial Departments to determine training needs
The study concluded that TND systems and processes in the provincial departments existed and were found to be valid, but there was a need for stimulation of the systems and processes to reach a level where the TND process utilises beyond the EPMDS and PDPs. The conclusion was informed by the findings that stated more than sixty percent of trainees used the EPMDS and PDPs for TND processes. The need for stimulation was based on the findings that approximately one third of trainees agreed to have used measures beyond the EPMDS and PDP for TND process. The study commends the provincial departments for EPMDS and PDPs utilisation at 60%, but the recommendation is for the provincial departments to be encouraged to use other TND research methods for greater alignment to the organisational strategic objective, and to maximise the impact (outcomes) of their training programmes. The study found the T&D system to be valid and functional. The trainees, immediate supervisors, SDFs, HRD management do comply with the NTPTND processes and system; however, there seems to be less evidence of trainees that go beyond the normal TND processes. The PPSTA TND processes was found to be functional but it had challenges as it extrapolates data after the consultation processes with the provincial department and the WSP analysis. The data processing and analysis require stringent data management and validation for accuracy and reliability. The study noted the compliance to the system and TND process in departments but saw a gap as the departments largely conform to the norm and a small group of respondents agreed to have gone beyond the EPMDS. It could be argued, that the TND process is done at
times for compliance purposes, and ‘going an extra mile’ and conducting further research could be considered as more work by the officials.

PPSTA confirmed the usage of training needs extrapolation (TNE) process instead of the TND process that occurred in provincial departments. The TNE referred to extrapolating or extracting the training needs from the provincial departments’ WSPs and ATRs.

The PPSTA needed to revisit the communication strategy as the trainees seemed to be more aware of their department’s TND processes or to fall within the LTPTND sub-theme. The trainees revealed that they do not have knowledge of the courses offered by the PPSTA, hence these training programmes were requested on the trainee’s behalf. The recommendation here is for measures to be put in place to raise awareness or dissemination of information to the trainees about the PPSTA TND process and the training and development courses offered. The PPSTA TND process and the courses offered were understood by the PPSTA trainers, PPSTA management, provincial departments SDFs and HRD management. The trainees and the immediate supervisors were found to have less or no knowledge about the PPSTA TND process and the courses that were offered by the PPSTA. The recommendation is based on the statistical finding that there was an inverse relationship between the training requested on the trainees’ behalf and the impact of training.

The PPSTA LMS needed to be strengthened as the main source to retrieve and store data regarding the training programmes as another critical aspect of the M&E T&D value chain.

6.2.2 Determine the efficacy of the policies, systems and tools employed by PPSTA
during and after Training

It was seen that the PPSTA does not have a functional tool, weak during the training and monitoring of the system. The during training monitoring system was performed by default by the trainees at a minimal level. The system does not have a designated official to conduct during training monitoring. The during training monitoring tasks were performed by default by the trainers and the recommendation was for the system to be well-structured and organised. The recommendation was based on the fact that it is often difficult for the trainer to monitor herself or himself. The study noted that trainees agreed in their majority to have written the assessments during the training sessions, which can be accepted as monitoring during training, but is still not adequate, as there is no designated impartial official to perform these important tasks.
The study further revealed that departments do not have a designated official to perform monitoring tasks during training. This recommendation is for the PPSTA and the departments to develop mechanisms to work towards strengthening monitoring during training. The recommendation is aligned to the Human Resource Development System (HRDS) stance raised by Rao (1982) in Chapter One. Part of the solution could be partnerships between PPSTA and provincial departments. This step could ensure that indicators for a functional during training monitoring systems are utilised in line with the M&E policy key-performance information concept model raised in Chapter Two. The study revealed that the during training, monitoring is performed by departments was largely focused on logistical arrangements, as it transpired in the interviews with the trainers and SDFs and PPSTA trainers. Further, the recommendations are informed by the statistical revelations in the study that there were strong correlations that existed between writing assessments (that serves as the monitoring mechanisms) in the classroom and submission of the PoE (which serves as the evaluation mechanism). PPSTA was found by the study to have a strong after training evaluation systems through the training evaluation forms and the trainers’ report, while aspects of excellence in some departments were raised to be in existence but without a proper system as compared to the PPSTA after training evaluation system. There is a need for PPSTA and the provincial departments to develop a holistic during training monitoring and evaluation tool.

6.2.3 Ascertain level of readiness in provincial departments for transfer of learning and realisation of results

The empirical study chose to combine the two research objectives as they were both used as the indicators towards understanding the training impact construct. As stated in Chapter One, transfer of learning is the ability to exhibit what has been learned in the new environment or existing environment. It was crucial that units in the provincial departments have discussions regarding on the transfer of learning process between the trainee and the supervisor supported by the HRD office. The findings revealed that 49% of trainees disagreed, and others were not certain or strongly disagreed that they have participated in this process. The scoring of 49% is of concern to the study, as it resembled the level of the usage of M&E policy, systems and processes to determine the outcomes of training programmes as not being strong in provincial departments. This finding recommended the need to strengthen the M&E, processes, with systematic mechanisms of ensuring that the transfer of learning and evaluating the training outcomes takes place in the provincial departments as an important aspect of introspection and assessment of return on investment by government.
In the interview with PPSTA management and trainers, it was found that the mechanisms to monitor transfer of learning and evaluate the outcomes of training should be developed to enhance the training initiatives.

Data revealed that the training programmes offered had a general positive training impact (outcomes). The study noted that the training impact (outcomes) of training had more impact to an individual trainee, as compared to the higher structures of the department. The recommendation is to devise mechanisms in departments so that the knowledge gained is utilised in the departments. The research standpoint was informed by dimension D that found that the courses had a positive impact (outcomes) on the trainees in their professional lives at 82% (D6); at sub-directorate level the impact is at 79.2% (D7); at directorate level 63.4% (D8), and at the level of the branch it was 52% (D9). The trainees rated the impact of training programmes at 66.1% (D10) in their departments. The findings noted that the impact (outcomes) of training programmes was higher at an individual professional level and decreased on impacting the sub-directorate, directorate, branch and the department level. It can be concluded, that the training programmes had more impact on the trainees professional and at the sub-directorate level. The research noted the need for the training to have impact at the higher structures of the department levels, as per the stance taken by the Strategic Framework Vision 2015 of strategically positioning HRD, as well as Opperman and Meyer HRD of Integrating Training Needs Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation discussed in the preceding chapters.

6.2.4 Investigate alignment to training and development M&E PPSTA and provincial departments

There was an urgent need for the approval of the draft Provincial M&E T&D policy. The study found that the provincial departments were waiting for either the approved PPSTA M&E T&D policy or their provincial departments M&E directorates or sub-directorate to lead the process of developing the provincial departments’ M&E T&D policy. There needs to be collaboration between the PPSTA, M&E directorates and HRD directorates in provincial departments.

In the development of provincial departments or approval of the draft Provincial M&E T&D, policy consultation process needs to be strengthened, as the data results on the alignment of policies stated that the provincial departments feel that both M&E polices for the PPSTA and provincial departments needed improvements. There was a lack of synergy between PPSTA and provincial departments M&E T&D policy. The study revealed the need for a dialogue
between the PPSTA, M&E units and the provincial departments on the role of M&E units in the development of the provincial departments’ M&E T&D policy.

6.3 CONCLUSION
The findings proved that the training programmes conducted by the PPSTA had generally yielded positive outcomes. These positive outcomes were largely due to the trainees’ individual professional work, and the training impact decreases its influence in the higher structures of the departments. These findings signified that there was value-for-money in the training programmes provided by the PPSTA. On the other hand, the research was able to respond to research questions and address the research objectives. The existence of policy, systems and processes at times were found to be at minimal level, which allowed the study to monitor and evaluate the overall level of effectiveness of the training programmes offered by OTP KZN.

The existence of an approved Policy Framework for the Government-wide M&E System of 2007, the draft M&E policy within PPSTA, valid and existing TND and TNE systems and processes and embedded on Public Service Act using Monitoring and Evaluation tools like the PDP (for data collection) and EPMDS were found to be in existence, but weak on during training monitoring systems in the PPSTA and provincial departments. There were strong evaluation after training processes and systems found in the PPSTA. Existence of weak after evaluation processes and systems in provincial departments informed the study to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of training programmes. On the other hand, the existence of the policies, processes and systems proved the alternate hypothesis correct that embedded M&E policies and systems in training and development programmes culminate in the efficacy of evaluating the outcome of training programmes. Existence of M&E policies, systems and processes in the PPSTA and provincial departments assisted the research to measure the outcomes of the training programmes, and was found as the necessary guide to address areas of concern and fulfil the mission of the efficacy of training and development initiatives.

Through this study, the possibility of conducting a longitudinal study as a future study on impact assessment is put forward. The data obtained during the outcomes assessment study could serve as the basis for an impact assessment research to probe this area of return on investment of the depth of knowledge, skills and capacity development of trainees and identify the gaps that warrant deeper attention by provincial departments in general.
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School of Management, IT Governance
Westville Campus

Dear Mr Sithole,

Protocol reference number: HS5/1353/016H
New project title: Monitoring and Evaluation of Training and Development Programmes within the Office of the
Premier, KwaZulu-Natal Province

Approval Notification – Amendment Application

This letter serves to notify you that your application and request for an amendment received on 07 August 2019 has now been
approved as follows:

- Change in Title
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ANNEXURE B:

GATEKEEPERS LETTERS

SUBMISSION

To: Ms P.D. Khumalo
From: Mr T. Sithole

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this submission is to obtain approval to conduct research on the topic: Monitoring and Evaluation of training and development programmes of the Office of the Premier, KwaZulu-Natal. The research will be conducted who is employed as the Education, Training and Development Practitioner: Research within the Office of the Premier – Provincial Public Service Training Academy. The research forms the last part of the requirements from the University of KwaZulu-Natal in order to complete the Masters in Public Administration degree.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The Acting Director-General approved the initial submission requesting to conduct the research in the Office of the Premier-PPSTA on the 22nd of March 2016 (Annexure A). The provisions stipulated on the advisory memorandum from the Human Resource Policy and Practices directorate have been fulfilled.

3. MOTIVATION

3.1 The research is prompted by the PPSTA’s the mandate to build capacity of the public service as outlined in the Medium Term Strategic Framework Outcome (MTSF) 12. The study will assist PPSTA to determine whether there is change in the work behaviour of the trainees from Provincial Departments after attending PPSTA’s training programmes which will in turn provide answers in relation to building the capacity of the state. The research will focus on four (4) PPSTA National Qualification Framework (NQF)-aligned-training programmes namely: Chairing of Meetings Effectively, Public Sector Administrative Skills, Course on Facilitating Learning and Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers.

3.2 The objectives of the research are:

- To measure the outcome or impact of the training programmes offered by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy to Provincial Departments by conducting surveys and interviews to PPSTA and to the sampled Provincial Departments.
SUBJECT REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER – PROVINCIAL PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING ACADEMY (PPSTA) AND TO SAMPLE PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS ON: MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OFFERED BY THE OFFICE OF PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

- Investigate the existence of the training Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Standard Operational Procedures (SOPS) between PPSTA and Provincial Departments by conducting surveys and interviews to PPSTA and to the sampled Provincial Departments.

The sample of interview and survey questions is attached (Annexure B)

3.3 The study will utilise government documents as the basis of its theoretical framework, literature review and research methodology. These documents includes Quarterly Performance Reports, Annual Performance Plans, PPSTA Training Directory, Monitoring and Evaluation reports and the Learner Management System (LMS).

3.4 The research will adopt a pragmatic methodology that will include surveys, one-on-one interviews, pie charts, bar graphs and other mixed approaches for collection and analysis of data. The research will randomly sample seven (7) of the fourteen (14) Provincial Departments. The interviews will be conducted mainly during lunch breaks and the respondents will sign the consent form. The five (5) categories involved in the training and development process will be interviewed namely: Provincial Departments Human Resource Development managers, Provincial Departments Skills Development Facilitators, Provincial Departments Trainees, Immediate Supervisor as well as PPSTA Management and Trainer/s.

3.6 The research findings or paper will be tabled to the Office of the Premier-PPSTA, and to the Provincial Departments through Provincial Human Resource Development Forum (PHRDF). The PHRDF structure is composed of the HRD managers from fourteen Provincial Departments. It will be made available to all research respondents upon request.

4. ADVISORY MEMORANDUM RESPONSE

4.1 The response to the Advisory Memorandum received from the office of the Director: Human Resource Policy and Practices is as follows:

4.1.1 The ethical clearance from the University of KwaZulu-Natal’s Ethics Committee has been received (Annexure C).

4.1.2 The Research Proposal is attached (Annexure D).

4.1.3 It is acknowledged that after receiving the approval from the Acting Director-General, the authority to conduct research from each of the Heads of Department will be requested.

4.1.4 The Office of the Premier will have intellectual property rights over the dissertation. The University of KwaZulu-Natal will release the copy of the research to the Office of the Premier when it is completed.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There will be no financial implications for the Office of the Premier.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Acting Director General grants approval to:

a) Conduct research in the Office of the Premier – PPSTA; and

b) Access non-confidential documents where necessary.

Mr T Sithole  
ETD Practitioner: Research  
Provincial Public Service Training Academy  

Supported / Not Supported  

Mr F.M.A. Safia  
CD; Provincial Public Service Training Academy  

Supported / Not Supported  

Miss MJ Khumalo  
Acting DDG; Corporate Management Support  

Approved / Not Approved  

Ms P.D. Khumalo  
Acting Director-General  

Comments
MEMO

TO: MR MB MNGUNI
   ACTING HEAD: DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

FROM: MR JSB JAFTA
       DIRECTOR: HRM & D

REF: HR-5/2/4/4

DATE: 07 MARCH 2017

SUBJECT: APPROVAL FOR MR T SITHOLE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER TO CONDUCT RESEARCH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

1. PURPOSE

1.1 To obtain approval for Mr T Sithole from Office of the Premier to conduct research on monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes to fulfill his requirements for the completion of his Masters Degree in Public Management.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Reference is to the attached communiqué in respect of the above request.

2.2 Mr Sithole is employed by the Office of the Premier, as an Education Training and Development Practitioner and he is currently doing his Masters Degree in Public Administration.

2.3 His research is in line with the mandate directed to the Provincial Public Service Training Academy, which is "to build capacity of the public service as outlined in the Medium-term Strategic Framework Outcome (MTSF) 12."

2.4 In view thereof, the Department of Arts and Culture is one of seven (7) departments selected within the province to assist in this research.
3. DISCUSSION

3.1 This research is anticipated to commence by 15 March 2017 within the Department of Arts and Culture.

3.2 The research will comprise of a pragmatic methodology, including a survey, one-on-one interviews and other mixed approaches for collection and analysis of data with officials who attended the relevant training programmes as indicated below.

3.3 This research will examine the training programmes rolled out by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy within respective departments.

3.4 The programmes are:

- Chairing of Meetings Effectively
- Public Sector Administrative Skills
- Course on Facilitating Learning
- Effective Management Principles for Junior Management

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 It is recommended that approval be granted for Mr T Sithole from the Office of the Premier to conduct research within the Department on monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes to fulfil his requirements for the completion of his Masters Degree in Public Management.

MR JSB JAFTA
DIRECTOR: HRM&D

DATE: 09/03/17

Recommendation supported/ not supported

MS LBP GWALA
CHIEF DIRECTOR: ADMINISTRATION SERVICES

DATE: 10/03/2017
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that approval be granted for Mr T Sithole from the Office of the Premier to conduct research within the Department on monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes to fulfil his requirements for the completion of his masters in Public Management.

Recommendation approved/ not approved

[Signature]
MR MB MNGUNI
ACTING HEAD: DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

DATE: 12/3/2021

APPROVAL FOR MR T SITHOLE FROM OFFICE OF THE PREMIER TO CONDUCT RESEARCH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

171 Boshoff Street, Pietermaritzburg 3201
tel: +27 33 341 0999
twitter: @DSCA website: www.kznstc.gov.za

HR Management and Development
TO: Head of the Department
   Mr C.T. Mavundla

CC: Director: Corporate Services
    Ms. N Dlamini

FROM: Mr T. Sithole - University of KwaZulu-Natal Student; and
       Assistant Director: Education, Training and Development
       Practitioner: Research (OTP - KZN PPSTA)

DATE: 30 January 2017

SUBJECT: REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT COMMUNITY
          SAFETY AND LIASON - ON THE TOPIC: MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF
          TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE
          PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL.

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this request is to obtain approval for Mr. T. Sithole to collect data in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the completion of his Masters in Public Administration degree, the study is on:
'Monitoring and Evaluation of training and development programmes of the Office of the Premier,
KwaZulu-Natal to be conducted during the 1st of March 2017 until the 31st of March 2017. Mr. Sithole
is enrolled with the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Mr. Sithole is also employed as the Education Training and Development Practitioner in Research
within the Office of the Premier – KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (OTP -
KZN PPSTA). The research pursued is prompted by the mandate of the KZN PPSTA, “to build capacity
of the public service as outlined in the Medium-Term Strategic Framework Outcome (MTSF) 12”.

As a result, the study aims to assist PPSTA to determine whether there is change in the work
behaviour of the trainees from Provincial Departments after attending PPSTA’s training programmes.
It is expected that this research question will in turn provide answers in relation to building the
capacity of the state as envisaged in the MTSF 12. The research focuses on four (4) Office of the
Premier KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (OTP - KZN PPSTA) National
Qualification Framework (NQF)-aligned training programmes namely:

a) Chairing of Meetings Effectively;
b) Public Sector Administrative Skills;
c) Course on Facilitating Learning; and
d) Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers.

2.2 The research adopts a random sampling technique whereby seven (7) of the fourteen (14) Provincial
Departments were selected and the Department of Community Safety and Liaison is among the
sampled departments for the study. The pragmatic methodology will be adopted by the study, which will include survey, one-on-one interviews and other mixed approaches for collection and analysis of data.

3. **MOTIVATION**

3.1 The Acting Director-General has approved the request to conduct the research in the Office of the Premier: KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy [Annexure A]. In addition, ethical clearance has been granted by the University of KwaZulu-Natal [Annexure B].

3.2 The provisions stipulated in the advisory memorandum from the Human Resource Policy and Practices Directorate in the Office of the Premier requires the researcher to seek permission to conduct research from all sampled Provincial Departments.

3.3 The planned interviews will be conducted during lunch breaks. In an attempt to uphold ethical principles of social research, each respondent will sign a consent form before an interview. The five (5) categories involved in the training and development process will be interviewed namely; Provincial Departments Human Resource Development managers, Provincial Departments Skills Development Facilitators, Provincial Departments Trainees (Level 1-12), Immediate Trainee Supervisor as well as PPSTA Management and Trainer/s. The study will require a maximum of 20 respondents to be part of the survey and one-on-one interviews. The sample of the interview and survey questions is attached for your information (Annexure C).

3.4 Equally, as an employee of the state, Mr Sthole is bound by Public Service legislation, and as a research student, by the UKZN code of ethics for researchers.

3.5 The research findings will be tabled at the Office of the Premier-KZN PPSTA, and the sampled Provincial Departments through the Provincial Human Resource Development Forum (PHRDF). The findings will also be made available to all research respondents upon request.

3.6 The Office of the Premier will have intellectual property rights over the dissertation.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There will be no financial implications for the Provincial Department.

7. **REQUEST**

It is requested that Head of Department grants Mr T. Sthole the approval to conduct the study on “Monitoring and Evaluation of training and development programmes of the Office of the Premier, KwaZulu-Natal” to the five (5) categories involved in the training process namely; Provincial Departments Human Resource Development managers, Provincial Departments Skills Development Facilitators, Provincial Departments Trainees (Level 1-12), Immediate Trainee Supervisor.

Mr T Sthole  
UKZN Student: 9608639  
ETD Practitioner: Research  
Provincial Public Service Training Academy  
063 507 0412/031 274 4146  
Thando.Sithole@kznpremier.gov.za/thando.sithole@webmail.co.za
REQUEST APPROVED / REQUEST NOT APPROVED

REMARKS:__________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

MR TS MOHLOMI

CHIEF DIRECTOR: CORPORATE MANAGEMENT

DATE: 08/06/2017
MR T SITHOLE
ETD PRACTITIONER: RESEARCH
PVOINCIAL PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING ACADEMY

APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT ON THE
TOPIC: MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES
OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

Your letter dated 30 January 2017 refers.

Kindly be advised that approval has been granted by the Head of Department for you to conduct
research in the Department.

You are requested to communicate your plan with proposed dates well in advance in order to make
the necessary arrangements with the participants.

MS MC ZWANE
CHIEF DIRECTOR: HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

22/03/2017
DATE
Mr T. Sithole  
KZN Provincial Public Service Training Academy  
Private Bag X454  
Pietermaritzburg  
3200

Dear Mr Sithole

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

This matter has reference

Kindly be informed that permission has been granted by the Head of Department for you to conduct research in Department of Social Development to fulfill the requirement of his Masters in Public Administration Degree.

The permission authorizes you to:-

(a) Approach and distribute survey questionnaires to employees willing to participate in the study in order to solicit information intended for the research;

(b) Interview employees at their consent deemed relevant to your research project and maintain high level of confidentiality; and

(c) Share your findings with the department.

Wishing you success during your research project.

Yours Faithfully

[Signature]

MS NG KHANYILE  
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT  
Date: 05.12.17
12 June 2017

YOUR REF: 9608639


The KwaZulu-Natal Department of Human Settlements has considered a request from Mr. T. Sithole (Student Number: 9608639) to use the Department of Human Settlements as one of the respondents in the research that he is undertaking as a requirement towards completion of a Master's Degree in Public Administration.

The Department wish to inform the student that his request has been accepted and hereby assures him of the Department's utmost cooperation in his pursuit of achieving the set academic goals. The Department trust that the outcome of the study will to a certain extent benefit the Department, particularly the Human Resources Development Unit in ensuring efficiency and relevance of training programmes.

In return it is requested that the student comes back in the near future to present the research findings to the Department.

Mr. R. Mohan
Director: Product Development
Department of Human Settlements-KZN

Ms. G. Apelgren-Narkedien
Head of Department
Department of Human Settlements-KZN
MEMO

TO: MR MB MNGUNI
   ACTING HEAD: DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

FROM: MR JSB JAFTA
   DIRECTOR: HRM & D

REF: HR-5/2/4/4

DATE: 07 MARCH 2017

SUBJECT: APPROVAL FOR MR T SITHOLE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER TO CONDUCT RESEARCH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

1. PURPOSE

1.1 To obtain approval for Mr T Sithole from Office of the Premier to conduct research on monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes to fulfill his requirements for the completion of his Masters Degree in Public Management.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Reference is to the attached communiqué in respect of the above request.

2.2 Mr Sithole is employed by the Office of the Premier, as an Education Training and Development Practitioner and he is currently doing his Masters Degree in Public Administration.

2.3 His research is in line with the mandate directed to the Provincial Public Service Training Academy, which is "to build capacity of the public service as outlined in the Medium-term Strategic Framework Outcome (MTSF) 12."

2.4 In view thereof, the Department of Arts and Culture is one of seven (7) departments selected within the province to assist in this research.
3. DISCUSSION

3.1 This research is anticipated to commence by 15 March 2017 within the Department of Arts and Culture.

3.2 The research will comprise of a pragmatic methodology, including a survey, one-on-one interviews and other mixed approaches for collection and analysis of data with officials who attended the relevant training programmes as indicated below.

3.3 This research will examine the training programmes rolled out by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy within respective departments.

3.4 The programmes are:

- Chairing of Meetings Effectively
- Public Sector Administrative Skills
- Course on Facilitating Learning
- Effective Management Principles for Junior Management

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 It is recommended that approval be granted for Mr T Sithole from the Office of the Premier to conduct research within the Department on monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes to fulfil his requirements for the completion of his Masters Degree in Public Management.

[Signature]
MR JSB JAFTA
DIRECTOR: HRM&D
DATE: 09/03/17

Recommendation supported/ not supported:

[Signature]
MS LBP GWALA
CHIEF DIRECTOR: ADMINISTRATION SERVICES
DATE: 10/03/17
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that approval be granted for Mr T Sithole from the Office of the Premier to conduct research within the Department on monitoring and evaluation of training and development programmes to fulfil his requirements for the completion of his masters in Public Management.

Recommendation approved/ not approved

MR MB MNGUNI
ACTING HEAD: DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND CULTURE

DATE: 12/13/2017
Mr. T. Sithole
321 ZK Mathews Road
Glenwood
DURBAN
4001

Dear Mr. Sithole


Your correspondence regarding support from the Department refers.

This is to confirm that the KZN Department of Health will provide the required support as you will be conducting your research within the Department.

The Department will avail the resources namely infrastructure, approaching potential participants, handing out questionnaires and any other essential requirements as part of your study. The Department Health employees will be made aware of the study in order to ensure required participation when they are needed.

Moreover, I Mr. M. Mhethwa – Director HRD will ensure that I fully support your study as it will benefit the Department and look forward to working with you.

Yours sincerely,

KZN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
KWAZULU-NATAL

Fighting Disease. Fighting Poverty. Giving Hope

Enquiries : Eric Stuart
Telephone: 033 395 2722
Date : 17 March 2017
REQUEST TO GRANT MR T. SITHOLE FROM OFFICE OF THE PREMIER TO
CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL
DEVELOPMENT TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON THE TOPIC “MONITORING AND
EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE
OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL”

1. PURPOSE
1.1 The purpose of this submission is to seek approval from the Acting Head of
Department to grant Mr. T. Sithole (Student Number: 9608639) permission to use the
KwaZulu-Natal Department of Agriculture and Rural Development as a case study in
pursuing his Master’s in Public Administration degree research study titled “Monitoring
and Evaluation of Training and Development programmes of the Office of the Premier,
KwaZulu-Natal” through University of KwaZulu-Natal. The research forms the part of
the requirements from the University of KwaZulu-Natal in order to complete the
Masters in Public Administration degree.

2. BACKGROUND
2.1 Mr. T Sithole is currently registered at University of KwaZulu-Natal studying towards
Master’s in Public Administration degree. The study aims to assist PPSTA to determine
whether there is change in the work behavior of the trainees from Provincial
Departments after attending PPSTA’s training programmes. It is expected that this
research question will in turn provide answers in relation to build the capacity the state
as envisaged in the MTSF 12. The research focuses on four (4) Office of the Premier
REQUEST TO GRANT MR T. SITOLE PERMISSION TO USE THIS DEPARTMENT AS A CASE STUDY FOR HER MASTER'S DEGREE STUDY

KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (OTP - KZN PPSTA)
National Qualification Framework (NQF)-aligned training programmes namely:

a) Chairing of meetings Effectively
b) Public Sector Administration Skills
c) Course on Facilitation Learning, and
d) Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers

DISCUSSION

3.1 Mr. S Sithole's research study titled "Monitoring and Evaluation of Training and Development programmes of the Office of the Premier, KwaZulu-Natal". The primary objective of the study is to determine organisational factors that motivate the employees as well as their job satisfaction level that impact on their productivity.

3.2 The applicant has attached his motivation letter to request an opportunity to conduct his research in the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development attached as Annexure "A"

4. LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Mr. Sithole will be bound by the Public Service legislation, departmental policies, and as a research student, by the University of KwaZulu-Natal code of ethics for researchers.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 No financial implication to the Department.

6. ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The Department will also have an opportunity to assess itself on the impact of training and the behavioral change in scope of work in terms of efficiency.

7. COMMUNICATION IMPLICATION

7.1 Upon approval of this submission Mr. Sithole will be handed a letter of approval and conditions on conducting his research.

Authored By: SB ZONDI

Signature: ____________________________

TOGETHER WE HAVE MADE KZN A BETTER PROVINCE TO LIVE IN.
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ANNEXURE D:

LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT: INTERVIEWS

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL
School of Management, IT and Governance
MPA Research Project

Researcher: Thando Sithole (083 349 8807)
Supervisor: Prof. M. Subban (031 260 7763)
Research Office: Mrs. M. Snyman (031 260 8350)
Ethical Clearance Number: HSS/1353/016M

Dear Respondent,

I am a Masters student, at the School of Management, IT and Governance, of the University of KwaZulu-Natal. You are invited to participate in the research study entitled: Monitoring and evaluation of the training and development programmes of the Office of the Premier, KwaZulu-Natal. The aim of this study is to: conduct a scientific study on the outcome of training and development provided by the Office of the Premier Human Resource Development Chief Directorate called Provincial Public Service Training Academy to KZN provincial departments.

Through your participation in this study, the research aims to understand the impact or outcome of the training programmes provided by the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) during 2013/14 financial year. The responses from your interview are intended for the determination of the impact or outcome of the training programmes provided by the PPSTA.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the project at any time with no negative consequence. There will be no monetary gain from participating in this survey. Confidentiality and anonymity of records identifying you as a participant will be maintained by the School of Management, IT and Governance, UKZN.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing this interview or about participating in this study, you may contact me or my supervisor at the numbers listed above.

The interview should take about 20-25 minutes of your time. I hope you will take the time to complete it.

Sincerely

Investigator’s signature__________________________ Date________________
CONSENT

I………………………………………………………………………………………….(full names of participant) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project.

I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT                  DATE

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
ANNEXURE E1:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SDFs

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SKILLS DEVELOPMENT FACILITATOR

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Please tick on the box provided below to indicate whether you are employed within one of the KwaZulu-Natal provincial departments.

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

____________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

1.1 What is the department system to determine the training needs?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.2 What tools does the department use to determine the training needs?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.3 Do you think the training needs determining tools used by the department are valid?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.1 Please provide reasons for the choice made above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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1.4 Please tick below systems used by the department to determine training needs?

| 1. Personal Development Plan |   |
| 2. Surveys                   |   |
| 3. Performance Agreement    |   |
| 4. Other                     |   |
| 5. All of the above         |   |
| 6. None of the above         |   |

1.4.1 Please state other systems that are not listed above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.5 Are you aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining the training needs?

Yes
No

1.6 Do you think Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining training needs is effective?

Yes
No

1.6.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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1.7 What are the areas do you think the Provincial Public Service Training Academy needs to improve on in determining your training needs?

SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

1.8 Please tick below to indicate whether the department has a “during training” monitoring system.

Yes  No

1.8.1 Please explain the “during training” monitoring system used by the department.

1.9 Does the department have “after training “evaluation system?

Yes  No
1.9.1 Please explain the “after training” evaluation system?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.10 Do you have a designated M&E designated person or persons in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.10.1 Provide reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.11 Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received from your department’s “during training” monitoring system?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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1.12 Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received from your department’s “after training” evaluation system?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

1.13 Does the department have post-training outcome or impact evaluation system?

| Yes | No |

1.13.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.14 Please indicate whether the training programme provided by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy has been effective?

| Yes | No |

1.14.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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1.15 Did the training programme provided the trainee with the relevant skills?

Yes
No

1.16 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what is the general level of trainees' performance before attending the course? Please choose by using a tick on the next column.

1. Very poor performance
2. Poor performance
3. Average
4. Good Performance
5. Excellent Performance

1.16.1 Please explain the reasons of choice you have made above.

1.17 On scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what is the trainees’ general level of performance after attending the training programme do? Please tick, make a cross or circle in column B.

1. Very poor performance
2. Poor performance
3. Average
4. Good Performance
5. Excellent Performance
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1.17.1 Please explain the reasons of the choice you have made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.18 Did the department link training to the Employee Performance Management Development System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.18.1 Please explain how the system assisted to measure post-training effects.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.19 Does your department allow space for the employees to implement newly acquired your training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.19.1 Explain the reasons that prompted the choice above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.20 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being no impact and five (5) being directorate impact or more, what impact or outcome do you think the training programmes has made?

| 1. No impact |   |
| 2. Small impact |   |
| 3. Neutral |   |
| 4. Sub-directorate significant impact |   |
| 5. Directorate impact and more |   |

1.20.1 Explain the reasons of the choice made above.

1.21 Have you attended similar training before?

| Yes |   |
| No |   |

1.22 How did you know about the course? Tick in column B to respond.

| 1. I was told by a colleague |   |
| 2. I read about it from the PPSTA website |   |
| 3. I read about it from the PPSTA directory |   |
| 4. I did not know |   |
| 5. I had researched it myself |   |
| 6. Employee Personal Development Plan |   |
| 7. Other: please specify |   |
1.23 What were the reasons that for choosing the training programme?

1.24 Did the training programme fulfil those reasons?

1.25 On a scale of 1-5, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree would you recommend the training programme for your department?

| 1. Strongly disagree |  |
| 2. Disagree           |  |
| 3. Neutral            |  |
| 4. Agree              |  |
| 5. Strongly agree     |  |

1.28.1 State the reason for the choice above
1.26 What would you recommend in order for the training programmes to be more effective in the workplace?

SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

1.27 Is the department aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy training and development monitoring and evaluating policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.28 State whether the department is satisfied with the Provincial Public Service Training Academy training and development monitoring and evaluation policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.28.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

Yes
No
1.29 Have you attended any workshop, training or meetings facilitated by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding before, during and after training programmes training and development monitoring and evaluation policy?

Yes
No

1.30 What are the areas do you think PPSTA needs to improve on regarding training and development monitoring and evaluating policy?

1.31 Does the department have the training and development monitoring and evaluation (T&D M&E) policy regarding before, during and after training?

Yes
No

1.32 Are you satisfied with the department T&D M&E policy?

Yes
No

1.32.1 State the reason for the choice made above.
1.33 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to the employees?

1.34 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to Provincial Public Service Training Academy?

1.35 Is the department aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy T&D M&E policy regarding before, during after training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.36 Have you attended any workshop organised by Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding T&D M&E policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.37 Are you satisfied about the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

| Yes | No |

1.37.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.38 What do you think can improve the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

| Yes | No |

1.38.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thank you for your participation
ANNEXURE E2:
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HRD MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENT HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Please tick on the box provided below to indicate whether you are employed within one of the Kwazulu-Natal provincial departments.

| Yes | No |
---|---|

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

______________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

| 0-3 years | 3-5 years | 5-10 years | 10-15 years | 15-20 years | 20 years or more |
---|---|---|---|---|---|

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

| Operational | Supervisory | Junior Management | Middle Management | Senior Management |
---|---|---|---|---|

SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

1.2 What is the department system to determine the training needs?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.2 What tools does the department uses to determine the training needs?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.11 Do you think the training needs determining tools used by the department are valid?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.1 Please provide reasons for the choice made above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.12 Please tick below systems used by the department to determine training needs?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Performance Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. None of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.1 Please state other systems that are not listed above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.13 Are you aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining the training needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.14 Do you think Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining training needs is effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.15 What are the areas do you think the Provincial Public Service Training Academy needs to improve on in determining your training needs?

---

SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

1.16 Please tick below to indicate whether the department has a “during training” monitoring system.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.17 Does the department have “after training” evaluation system?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.9.1 Please explain the “after training” evaluation system?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.18 Do you have a designated M&E designated person or persons in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.10.1 Provide reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.11 Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received from your department’s “during training” monitoring system?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.12 Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received from your department’s “after training” evaluation system?

SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

1.13 Does the department have “post-training” outcome or impact evaluation system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.13.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

1.14 Please indicate whether the training programme provided by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy has been effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.16.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.17 Did the training programme provided the trainee with the relevant skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.18 On a scale of 1- 5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what was the general level of trainee's performance before attending the course? Please choose by using a tick on the next column.

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

1.16.1 Please explain the reasons of choice you have made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.17 On scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what is the trainees’ general level of performance after attending the training programme do? Please tick, make a cross or circle in column B.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.17.2 Please explain the reasons of the choice you have made above.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.18 Did the department link training to the Employee Performance Management Development System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.18.1 Please explain how the system assisted to measure post-training effects.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.19 Does the department allow space for the employees to implement newly acquired your training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.19.1 Explain the reasons that prompted the choice above.


1.20 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being no impact and five (5) being directorate impact and more, what impact or outcome do you think the training programme has made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. No impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Small impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sub-directorate significant impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Directorate impact and more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.20.1 Explain the reasons of the choice made above.


1.21 Have you attended similar training before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.22 How did you know about the course? Tick in column B to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. I was told by a colleague</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I read about it from the PPSTA website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I read about it from the PPSTA directory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I did not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had researched it myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee Personal Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other: please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.23 What were the reasons for choosing the training programme?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.24 Did the training programme fulfil those reasons?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.25 On a scale of 1-5, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree would you recommend the training programme for your department?

| 1. Strongly disagree |   |
| 2. Disagree |   |
| 3. Neutral |   |
| 4. Agree |   |
| 5. Strongly agree |   |
1.25.1 State the reason for the choice above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.26 What would you recommend in order for the training programme to be more effective in the workplace?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

1.27 Is the department aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluating (T&D M&E policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.28 State whether the department is satisfied with the Provincial Public Service Training Academy Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluating policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.28.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

1.29 Have you attended any workshop, training or meetings facilitated by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding before, during and after Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluation policy?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.30 What are the areas do you think PPSTA needs to improve on regarding Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluating policy?

1.39 Does the department have the Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluation (T&D M&E) policy regarding before, during and after training?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.40 Are you satisfied with the department’s T&D M&E policy?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.32.1 State the reason for the choice made above.

1.41 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to the employees?

1.42 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to the Provincial Public Service Training Academy?

1.43 Is the department aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy T&D M&E policy regarding before, during after training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1.44 Have you attended any workshop organised by Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding T&D M&E policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.45 Are you satisfied about the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.37.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.46 Do you think the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments can improve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.38.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Thank you for your participation
ANNEXURE E3:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISORS

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Please tick on the box provided below to indicate whether you are employed within one of the Kwazulu-Natal provincial departments.

| Yes | No |

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

______________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

| 0-3 years | 3-5 years | 5-10 years | 10-15 years | 15-20 years | 20 years or more |

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

| Operational | Supervisory | Junior Management | Middle Management | Senior Management |
SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

1.3 What is the department system to determine the training needs?

1.2 What tools does the department use to determine the training needs?

1.19 Do you think the training needs determining tools used by the department are valid?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.1 Please provide reasons for the choice made above

---

---
1.20 Please tick below systems used by the department to determine training needs?

| 1. Personal Development Plan |   |
| 2. Surveys                    |   |
| 3. Performance Agreement      |   |
| 4. Other                      |   |
| 5. All of the above           |   |
| 6. None of the above          |   |

1.4.1 Please state other systems that are not listed above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.21 Are you aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining the training needs?

| Yes |   |
| No  |   |

1.22 Do you think Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining training needs is effective?

| Yes |   |
| No  |   |

1.6.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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1.23 What are the areas do you think the Provincial Public Service Training Academy needs to improve on in determining your training needs?

SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

1.24 Please tick below to indicate whether the department has a “during training” monitoring system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.8.1 Please explain the “during training” monitoring system used by the department.
1.25 Does the department have “after training” evaluation system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.9.1 Please explain the “after training” evaluation system?

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.26 Do you have a designated M&E person or persons in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.10.1 Provide reasons for the choice made above.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.11 Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received from your department’s “during training” monitoring system?

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.12 Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received from your department’s “after training” evaluation system?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

1.13 Does the department have post-training outcome or impact evaluation system?

Yes
No

1.13.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.14 Please indicate whether the training programme provided by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy has been effective?

Yes
No
1.18.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---

1.19 Did the training programme provided the trainee with the relevant skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.20 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what was the level of trainees performance before attending the course? Please choose by using a tick on the next column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Very poor performance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.16.1 Please explain the reasons of choice you have made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.17 On scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what is the trainees’ general level of performance after attending the training programme do? Please tick, make a cross or circle in column B.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.18.1 Please explain the reasons of the choice you have made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.19 Did the department link training to the Employee Performance Management Development System?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.18.1 Please explain how the system assisted to measure post-training effects.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.19 Does your department allow space for the employees to implement newly acquired training?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.19.1 Explain the reasons that prompted the choice above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.20 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being no impact and five (5) being directorate impact or more, what impact or outcome do you think the training programme has made?

| No impact |  |
| Small impact |  |
| Neutral |  |
| Sub-directorate significant impact |  |
| Directorate impact and more |  |

1.20.1 Explain the reasons of the choice made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.21 Have you attended similar training before?

| Yes |  |
| No |  |
1.22 How did you know about the course? Tick in column B to respond.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I was told by a colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I read about it from the PPSTA website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I read about it from the PPSTA directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I did not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I had researched it myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Employee Personal Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Other: please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.23 What were the reasons that for choosing the training programme?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1.24 Did the training programme fulfil those reasons?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1.25 On a scale of 1-5, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree would you recommend the training programme for your department?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.25.1 State the reason for the choice above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.26 What would you recommend in order for the training programme to be more effective in the workplace?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.28.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.29 Have you attended any workshop, training or meetings facilitated by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding before, during and after training programmes training and development monitoring and evaluation policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.30 What are the areas do you think PPSTA needs to improve on regarding training and development monitoring and evaluating policy?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.47 Does the department have the training and development monitoring and evaluation (T&D M&E) policy regarding before, during and after training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.48 Are you satisfied with the department T&D M&E policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.32.1 State the reason for the choice made above.

1.49 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to the employees?

1.50 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to Provincial Public Service Training Academy?

1.51 Is the department aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy T&D M&E policy regarding before, during after training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Yes | No |
1.52 Have you attended any workshop organised by Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding T&D M&E policy?

| Yes | No |

1.53 Are you satisfied about the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

| Yes | No |

1.37.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.54 What do you think can improve the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

| Yes | No |

1.37.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thank you for your participation
ANNEXURE E4:
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TRAINEES
MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE TRAINEE

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS
1. Please tick on the box provided below to indicate whether you are employed within one of the Kwazulu-Natal provincial departments.

   Yes
   No

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

   ___________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bracket</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

1.1 Please tick below one of the following training programmes provided by the PPSTA that you have attended during 2013/14 financial year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairing of Meeting Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Administrative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course on Facilitating Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Management Principles for Junior Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 How did you get to know about the course that you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you get to know about the course?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was told by a colleague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read about it from PPSTA website or directory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had researched it myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor suggested it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Did you request training using the following documents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Are you happy with the process followed that led to you attending the training programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy with the process?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.1 State the reasons for choice made above

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

1.5 How long was duration of the training programme?

________________________________________________________________________

1.6 Did you finish the training programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.6.1 Explain the reasons that prompted you to finish or not to finish the training programme.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

1.7 Did you write any assessment during the training programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.8 Did you write any assessment after the training programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.9 Did you finish your assessment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.10 Did you fill the evaluation form?

Yes | No

1.11 If the above answer is yes, were you found competent after submitting your assessment?

Yes | No

SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

1.12 What benefits has the training programme brought to the organisation? Explain.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.13 What benefits did attending the training programme brought to yourself? Explain.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.14 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what was the level of your performance before attending the course? Please tick on the category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor performance</th>
<th>Poor performance</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good Performance</th>
<th>Excellent Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.14.1 Please explain the reasons of the choice you have made above.

1.15 Please tick your rating outcome of the Employee Performance Management Development System (EPMDS) before attending the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Unacceptable performance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance not fully effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fully effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance significantly above expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outstanding performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.16 On scale of 1-5, one (1) being very poor performance and five (5) being excellent performance, what level do you think you are at after attending the training programme? Please tick, make a cross or circle on the category chosen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Very poor performance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.16.1 Please explain the reasons of the choice you have made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.17 Please tick your rating outcome of the Employee Performance Management Development System (EPMDS) after the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Unacceptable performance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Performance not fully effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fully effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Performance significantly above expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Outstanding performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.18 Do you think you were allowed space by you department to implement newly acquired your training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.18.1 Explain the reasons that prompted you to choose YES or NO above.

1.19 On a scale of 1-5, one (1) being negative change and five (5) being directorate positive change or more, what change do you think you have made to the organisation?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Negative change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Little change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sub-directorate significant change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Directorate positive change and more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.19.1 Explain the reasons of choice made above.

1.20 What areas that did you like most in the training programme?
1.21 What areas did you like least in the training programme?

1.22 On a scale of 1-5, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree would you recommend the training programme to another colleague?

1.23 What would you recommend in order for the training programme to be more effective in the workplace?

1.24 Are you aware of the process followed that led to your training being implemented?
1.25 What do you think can be improved from the system to increase the impact of training?

SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

1.26 Please indicate whether you are aware of the department training and development monitoring and evaluating policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.27 How is the department T&D M&E policy communicated to the employees?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.28 State whether you are satisfied with the department training and development monitoring and evaluating policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.28.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.29 Are you aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy T&D M&E policy regarding before, during after training?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.30 Are you satisfied about the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.30.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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1.31 What do you think can improve the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.31.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thank you for your participation.
ANNEXURE E5:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PPSTA MANAGEMENT AND TRAINERS

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCIAL PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING ACADEMY (PPSTA) MANAGEMENT AND TRAINERS

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Please tick on the box provided below to indicate whether you are employed or contracted with Provincial Public Service Training Academy.

   Yes [ ]

   No [ ]

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the directorate or sub-directorate you are employed in.

   ____________________________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

   0-3 years [ ]

   3-5 years [ ]

   5-10 years [ ]

   10-15 years [ ]

   15-20 years [ ]

   20 years or more [ ]

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

   Operational [ ]

   Supervisory [ ]

   Junior Management [ ]

   Middle Management [ ]

   Senior Management [ ]
SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

1.4 Please indicate by using a tick whether you are aware of the system used by the provincial departments to determine the training needs.

| 1. Aware of all provincial departments training needs determination system |
| 2. Aware of some provincial departments training needs determination system |
| 3. Unaware of any provincial departments training needs determination system |

1.5 Please use the tick to choose the tools or systems used by provincial departments to determine training needs.

| 1. Personal Development Plan |
| 2. Surveys |
| 3. Employee Performance Management Development System (EPMDS) |
| 4. Other |
| 5. All of the above |
| 6. None of the above |

1.6 What other tools or systems that are used by departments to determine their training needs?

|                                                                                          |
|                                                                                          |
|                                                                                          |
|                                                                                          |
|                                                                                          |

1.4 Do you think the system used by departments to determine training needs is sufficient?
Tick your answer.

| Yes | |
| No  | |
1.4.1 Please provide reasons for the choice made above

-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------

1.5 Are you aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining the training needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Do you think Provincial Public Service Training Academy system of determining training needs is effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6.1 Explain the reasons for the choice made above.

-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------
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1.7 What systems or tools used by PPSTA to determine their training needs?

1.8 What are the areas do you think the Provincial Public Service Training Academy needs to improve on in determining your training needs?

SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

1.9 Please tick below to indicate whether you are aware of the provincial departments “during training” monitoring system.

| Aware of all departments monitoring systems |       |
| Aware of some of departments monitoring systems |       |
| Unaware of any department monitoring system |       |

1.9.1 Please explain how the “during training” monitoring system works.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.10 Please tick below to indicate whether you are aware of departments “after training” system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware of all departments “after training” evaluation system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of some of the departments “after training” evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of any department “after training” evaluation system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10.1 Please explain how the “after training” evaluation system works.

1.11 Please indicate by using a tick whether provincial departments have a designated monitoring and evaluation person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments have M&amp;E person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments don’t have M&amp;E person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all the departments have M&amp;E person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.12 Please indicate by using a tick whether departments have a designated monitoring and evaluation person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments have M&amp;E person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments don’t have M&amp;E person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all the departments have M&amp;E person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.13 Please tick below to indicate whether the Provincial Public Service Training Academy has “during training” monitoring system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.13.1 Please explain how the “during training” monitoring system works.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.14 Please tick below to indicate whether Provincial Public Service Training Academy has “after training” system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.14.1 Please explain how the “after training” evaluation system works.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.15 Please indicate by using a tick whether PPSTA has a designated monitoring and evaluation person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.16 Please indicate by using a tick whether PPSTA during and after training monitoring system is effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.16.1 Please explain the reasons for the choice above.

1.17 Do you think PPSTA and departments *during and after* training M&E systems should improve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.17.1 Please explain the reasons for the choice above.

SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

1.18 Please tick below to indicate whether you are aware of departments have *post-training* impact assessment evaluation reporting templates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments have <em>post-training</em> assessment evaluation report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments don’t have <em>post-training</em> assessment evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all the departments have <em>post-training</em> assessment evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not aware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.19  Briefly explain, what has been the feedback received in relation to the *post-training* impact assessment evaluation reporting template in relation to the PPSTA training.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.20  Please indicate by using a tick to indicate whether PPSTA conducts follow-ups to investigate on the employees implement newly acquired training?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.20.1 Explain the reasons that prompted the answer made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.21.  Do you think that PPSTA training programmes have impact in the workplace?

Tick your response in the provided column.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.21.1 Explain the reasons behind the choice you made above.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.22 Please tick below to indicate whether PPSTA has *post-training* impact assessment evaluation reporting system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.23 How effective is PPSTA has *post-training* impact assessment evaluation reporting system?

1.24 What could be areas of improvement regarding PPSTA post-training impact assessment evaluation reporting system?
SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

1.25 Please indicate whether Provincial Public Service Training Academy has a training and development monitoring and evaluating policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

| Yes | No |

1.26 Have you attended any workshop, training or meetings facilitated by the Provincial Public Service Training Academy regarding before, during and after training programmes training and development monitoring and evaluation policy?

| Yes | No |

1.27 State whether you are satisfied with the Provincial Public Service Training Academy training and development monitoring and evaluation policy regarding before, during and after the training programmes?

| Yes | No |

1.27.1 State the reasons for the choice made above.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1.28 What are the areas do you think PPSTA needs to improve on regarding training and development monitoring and evaluating policy?

1.29 Are you satisfied with the departments T&D M&E policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.29.1 State the reason for the choice made above.

1.30 How is the PPSTA T&D M&E policy communicated to departments?
1.31 How are the departments T&D M&E policies communicated to Provincial Public Service Training Academy?

1.32 Would you agree that the departments are aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy T&D M&E policy regarding before, during after training?

Yes
No

1.33 Have you facilitated any workshop regarding Provincial Public Service Training Academy and departments T&D M&E policy?

Yes
No

1.34 Are you satisfied about the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

Yes
No

1.35 What do you think can improve the level of alignment of T&D M&E policies and systems between Provincial Public Service Training Academy and the provincial departments?

Yes
No
1.35.1 Explain the reasons of the choice you made above.

Thank you for your participation.
ANNEXURE F:
LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT: QUESTIONNAIRES

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL
School of Management, IT and Governance

Dear Respondent,

MPA Research Project
Researcher: Thando Sithole (083 349 8807)
Supervisor: Prof. M. Subban (031 260 7763)
Research Office: Mrs. M. Snyman (031 260 8350)
Ethical Clearance Number: HSS/1353/016M

I am a Masters student, at the School of Management, IT and Governance, of the University of KwaZulu-Natal. You are invited to participate in the survey for the research study entitled: Monitoring and Evaluation of the training and development programmes of the Office of the Premier, KwaZulu-Natal. The aim of this study is to: conduct a scientific study on the outcome of training and development provided by the Office of the Premier Human Resource Development Chief Directorate called Provincial Public Service Training Academy to KZN Provincial departments.

Participation in this survey assists the study to determine whether there is impact or outcome in the training programmes provided by the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) during 2013/14 financial year. The results of the survey are intended for the determination of the impact or outcome of the training programmes provided by the PPSTA.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the project at any time with no negative consequence. There will be no monetary gain from participating in this survey. Confidentiality and anonymity of records identifying you as a participant will be maintained by the School of Management, IT and Governance, UKZN.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about participating in this study, you may contact me or my supervisor at the numbers listed above.

The survey should take you about 15-20 minutes to complete. I hope you will take the time to complete this survey.

Sincerely

Investigator’s signature____________________________________ Date_________________

______________________________________________________________________________
CONSENT

I……………………………………………………………………………………………….(full names of participant) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project.

I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT  DATE

............................................................................................................................
ANNEXURE G1:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SDFs

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SKILLS DEVELOPMENT FACILITATOR

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

PLEASE MARK WITH AN (X) IN THE BOX APPLICABLE TO YOU

1. Are you employed within one of the Kwazulu-Natal provincial departments?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

______________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Interval</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Employment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION B: TRAINING NEED IDENTIFICATION**

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The department has the training needs identification system.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department identified the training needs using the Personal Development Plan in the Employee Performance Management Development System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department used other methods beyond the Personal Development Plans to identify the training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department Skills Development Committee is aware of the department training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department has the training needs identification system that’s communicated to the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended meeting/s facilitated by PPSTA where the training needs identification system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in the facilitation of the department’s meeting/s regarding PPSTA training needs identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department Skills Development Committee is aware of the PPSTA’s training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the departments’ management of the <em>during and after</em> training monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has a responsible person/s for training monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has a “<em>during training</em>” monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has an “<em>after training</em>” evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has a “<em>post-training</em>” evaluation report templates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” monitoring and evaluating system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, training or meetings facilitated by PPSTA on the PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes - monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department’s HRD directorate or sub-directorate conducts workshops, training or meetings on PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with department system of monitoring and evaluating “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA system of monitoring and evaluating “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department has training and development monitoring and evaluation (T&amp;D M&amp;E) system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system, the employees have partially implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system, the employees have fully implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system reports, the employees employee/s have not implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system reports, the employees were not awarded an opportunity to implement what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has a training evaluation reporting template for the employees that attends training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system reports, trainees filled the evaluation form after the PPSTA training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system reports, training programme has made a positive impact in the sub-directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system reports, training programme has made a positive impact in the directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the T&amp;D M&amp;E system reports, training programme has made a positive impact in the branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the T&D M&E system reports, training programme has made a positive impact in the department

Based on the T&D M&E system reports, training programme has made no impact in the department

The training programme is aligned to the Strategic Plan of the department
SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department has training and development monitoring and evaluation (T&amp;D M&amp;E) or before, during and after training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department’s HRD directorate or sub-directorate has held department meetings regarding T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended meetings regarding PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware how department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy links with PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA and the provincial department T&amp;D M&amp;E policies needs to be aligned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END

Thank you for taking time to fill in this questionnaire, your responses are valuable to the study.
ANNEXURE G2:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HRD MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PROVINCIAL HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

PLEASE MARK WITH AN (X) IN THE BOX APPLICABLE TO YOU

1. Are you employed within one of the Kwazulu-Natal provincial departments?

   Yes  
   No  

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

   __________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

   0-3 years  
   3-5 years  
   5-10 years  
   10-15 years  
   15-20 years  
   20 years or more  

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

   Operational  
   Supervisory  
   Junior Management  
   Middle Management  
   Senior Management
### SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated the department’s needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated training programme for the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees requested training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both trainee and immediate supervisor requested training programme using the Personal Development Plan in the Employee Performance Management and Development System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department uses other methods beyond Personal Development Plans and Employee Performance Management Development System to determine training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated departmental meeting where the department needs identification system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with departments training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Provincial Public Service Training Academy training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended on behalf of my department meetings where the PPSTA training need identification system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA needs identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated the departments’ management system to monitor and evaluate <em>during and after</em> training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has a responsible person/s for training monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has a &quot;<em>during training</em>” monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has an &quot;<em>after training</em>” evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy “<em>during and after</em>” monitoring and evaluating system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, training or meetings facilitated by PPSTA on the PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes - monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s HRD directorate or sub-directorate conducts workshops, training or meetings for the department on PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with department system of monitoring and evaluating “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA system of monitoring and evaluating “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has <em>after-training</em> evaluation reporting template for the employees that attends training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with the HRD employee/s under my supervision held on ensuring the implementation of the attended training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has <em>after-training</em> monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the <em>after-training</em> evaluation reporting template, the employees have partially implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the <em>after-training</em> evaluation reporting template, the employees have fully implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the <em>after-training</em> evaluation reporting template, the employees have not implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have not been awarded an opportunity to implement what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided trainees with relevant skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees perform better after training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees filled the evaluation form after the PPSTA training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the sub-directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the directorate</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made no impact in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme attended is aligned to the Strategic Plan of the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS**

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department has monitoring and evaluation policy regarding <em>before, during and after training</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s HRD directorate or sub-directorate has held department meetings regarding <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware how department’s <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy links with Provincial Public Service Training Academy before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy needs improvement</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Public Service Training Academy <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy needs improvement</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Public Service Training Academy and department <em>before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policies needs improvement</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provincial Public Service Training Academy and department before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policies needs to be aligned.

Thank you for taking time to fill in this questionnaire, your responses are valuable to the study.
ANNEXURE G3:

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISORS

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

PLEASE MARK WITH AN (X) IN THE BOX APPLICABLE TO YOU

1. Are you employed within one of the Kwazulu-Natal provincial departments?

| Yes | No |

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.

____________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

| 0-3 years | 3-5 years | 5-10 years | 10-15 years | 15-20 years | 20 years or more |

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

| Operational | Supervisory | Junior Management | Middle Management | Senior Management |
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**SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION**

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated the department’s training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested training programme for the employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee requested the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both trainee and immediate supervisor requested training programme using</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Personal Development Plan in the Employee Performance Management and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department uses other methods beyond Personal Development Plans and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance Management Development System to determine training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended departmental meeting where needs the department identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Provincial Public Service Training Academy training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended the department’s meeting where the PPSTA training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA needs identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of departments management system to monitor and evaluate <em>during and after training</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate has a responsible person/s for training monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has a “<em>during training</em>” monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has an “<em>after training</em>” evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has a “<em>post-training</em>” evaluation report template</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy “<em>during and after</em>” monitoring and evaluating system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, training or meetings facilitated by PPSTA on the PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes - monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department HRD directorate or sub-directorate conducts workshops, training or meetings for the department on PPSTA “<em>during and after</em>” M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with department system a of monitoring and evaluating “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA system of monitoring and evaluating “<em>during and after</em>” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The directorate or sub-directorate has the “post-training” reporting template for the employees that attend training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with the employee under my supervision held to implement the attended training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate or sub-directorate has after-training and development monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the after-training and development monitoring and evaluation system, the employees have partially implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the after-training and development monitoring and evaluation system, the employees have fully implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the after-training and development monitoring and evaluation system, the employees have not implemented what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have not been awarded an opportunity to implement what they have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided trainees with relevant skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees performs better after attending the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees filled the evaluation form after the PPSTA training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the sub-directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made a positive impact in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme has made no impact in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme attended is aligned to the Strategic Plan of the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department has monitoring and evaluation policy regarding before, during and after training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s HRD directorate or sub-directorate has held department meetings regarding before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware how the department’s before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy links with Provincial Public Service Training Academy before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department’s before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Public Service Training Academy before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policy needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Public Service Training Academy and department’s before, during and after training monitoring and evaluation policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
need to be aligned to the department’s *before, during and after* training monitoring and evaluation policies.

*Thank you for taking time to fill in this questionnaire, your responses are valuable to the study.*
ANNEXURE G4:

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR TRAINEES

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TRAINEE

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

PLEASE MARK WITH AN (X) IN THE BOX APPLICABLE TO YOU

1. Are you employed within one of the KwaZulu-Natal provincial departments?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the provincial department you are employed in.
   ____________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?
   0-3 years [ ]
   3-5 years [ ]
   5-10 years [ ]
   10-15 years [ ]
   15-20 years [ ]

4. What is your level of employment in the department?
   Operational [ ]
   Supervisory [ ]
   Junior Management [ ]
   Middle Management [ ]
   Senior Management [ ]
SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainee requested the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee researched the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee and immediate supervisor requested the training programme using</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Personal Development Plan in the Employee Performance Management and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to determine the training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the department’s needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the departments training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the PPSTA training needs identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended my department meeting where the PPSTA training need identification process was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA needs identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrote all assessments during the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote assessments after the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted the portfolio of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the course to my work prompted me to finish the assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled the evaluation form after the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrote evaluation report after the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with my immediate supervisor held on how to implement what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially implemented what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully implemented what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not implemented what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made an positive impact in my professional life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the sub-directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme has made positive impact in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training programme had made no impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not awarded an opportunity to implement what I have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recommend the course to a colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

**INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Training and Development Monitoring and Evaluation (T&amp;D M&amp;E) policy or before, during and after training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended HRD directorate or sub-directorate meeting regarding the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the meetings regarding KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Public Service Training Academy (PPSTA) T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware how department’s T&amp;D M&amp;E policy links with PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA T&amp;D M&amp;E policy needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA and the department T&amp;D M&amp;E policies needs to be aligned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END**

Thank you for taking time to fill in this questionnaire, your responses are valuable to the study.
ANNEXURE G5:

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR PPSTA MANAGEMENT AND TRAINERS

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PREMIER, KWAZULU-NATAL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE
KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCIAL PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING ACADEMY (PPSTA) MANAGEMENT AND TRAINERS

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

PLEASE MARK WITH AN (X) IN THE BOX APPLICABLE TO YOU

1. Please tick on the box provided below to indicate whether you are employed within Provincial Public Service Training Academy.

   Yes
   No

2. If the answer above is yes, please state the directorate or sub-directorate you are employed in.
   ______________________________________________

3. How long have you been employed?

   0-3 years
   3-5 years
   5-10 years
   10-15 years
   15-20 years
   20 years or more

4. What is your level of employment in the department?

   Operational
   Supervisory
   Junior Management
   Middle Management
   Senior Management
SECTION B: TRAINING NEEDS DETERMINATION

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated /Aware of Provincial Public Service Training Academy training needs identification system for the provincial departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Provincial Public Service Training Academy staff meeting/s where departments training needs identification system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in the facilitation of provincial departments meeting/s where the PPSTA training needs identification system was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of PPSTA and provincial departments meeting/s where the PPSTA training needs identification process was explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provincial departments Skills Development Committees (SDCs) are aware of the PPSTA training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the PPSTA’s departments training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of provincial departments training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know the provincial departments needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the provincial departments training needs identification system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS DURING AND AFTER TRAINING

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the provincial departments’ during and after training monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each provincial department has a responsible person/s that for M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments have a “during training” monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments have an “after training” evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provincial departments have a “post-training” evaluation report reporting tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with departments’ during and after training monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the Provincial Public Service Training Academy monitoring and evaluating system regarding “during and after” training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, training or meetings facilitated by PPSTA regarding their “during and after” training programmes - monitoring and evaluating system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the workshops, training or meetings facilitated by PPSTA regarding PPSTA “during and after” the training programmes - monitoring and evaluating system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPSTA has a responsible person for monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

283
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied with the PPSTA M&amp;E “during and after” training programmes system</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SECTION D: TRAINING IMPACT

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the provincial departments’ <em>post-training</em> impact assessment monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provincial departments’ <em>post-training</em> impact assessment monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system is partially implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provincial departments’ <em>post-training</em> impact assessment monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system is fully implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the provincial departments’ <em>post-training</em> impact assessment M&amp;E evaluation system the training programmes provided by PPSTA have impacted positively to the trainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provincial departments’ <em>post-training</em> impact assessment monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system is not implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the provincial departments <em>post-training</em> impact assessment M&amp;E evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trainees fills the evaluation form after attending the PPSTA training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the PPSTA the <em>post-training</em> impact assessment monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the PPSTA *post-training* impact assessment M&E system the employees have partially implemented what they have learned.

Based on the PPSTA *post-training* impact assessment M&E evaluation system the employees have fully implemented most of what they have learned.

Based on the PPSTA *post-training* impact assessment M&E evaluation system, tools and processes the employees have not implemented what they have learned.

Based on the PPSTA *post-training* impact assessment M&E evaluation system the training programmes provided by PPSTA have impacted positively to the provincial departments.

Satisfied with the PPSTA the *post-training* impact assessment monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system.
SECTION E: ALIGNMENT OF M&E POLICIES BETWEEN PPSTA AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS

INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY MARKING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX USING THE SCALE BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the provincial departments <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy or training and development monitoring and evaluation (T&amp;D M&amp;E) policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, meetings or trainings where <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy for departments was tabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, meetings or trainings facilitated by PPSTA where departments tabled <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the provincial departments <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the PPSTA: <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended workshops, meetings or trainings where Provincial Public Service Training Academy’s <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy was tabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of how departments’ <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy aligns with Provincial Public Service Training Academy’s <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with how PPSTA <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy aligns with departments’ <em>before, during and after</em> training M&amp;E policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provincial Public Service Training Academy before, during and after training M&E policy and departments’ before, during and after training M&E policy alignment needs improvement

Thank you for taking time to fill in this questionnaire, your responses are valuable to the study.
## ANNEXURE H1:

### CROSS TABS AT 0.017

Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs

*How long have you been employed?*

NB. At 0.017 from the Fisher's Exact Test Score presented a significant relationship between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstab</th>
<th>How long have you been employed?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How long have you been employed?</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How long have you been employed?</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How long have you been employed?</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How long have you been employed?</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How long have you been employed?</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Trainee and immediate supervisor used other methods beyond PDPs and EPMDS to determine the training needs</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How long have you been employed?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>25.642a</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>29.288</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Exact Test</td>
<td>23.491</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.322b</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 23 cells (92.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .35.

b. The standardized statistic is .567.
ANNEXURE H2:
CROSS TAB AT 0.804

Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf * What is your level of employment in the department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What is your level of employment in the department?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Supervisory Junior Management Middle Management Senior Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Count 3 1 2 0 1 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td>42.9% 14.3% 28.6% 0.0% 14.3% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within What is your level of employment in the department?</td>
<td>12.5% 10.0% 18.2% 0.0% 50.0% 14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.1% 2.0% 4.1% 0.0% 2.0% 14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count 4 4 1 0 0 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td>44.4% 44.4% 11.1% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within What is your level of employment in the department?</td>
<td>16.7% 40.0% 9.1% 0.0% 0.0% 18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.2% 8.2% 2.0% 0.0% 0.0% 18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Count 2 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td>100.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within What is your level of employment in the department?</td>
<td>8.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count 12 4 8 2 1 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td>44.4% 14.8% 29.6% 7.4% 3.7% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within What is your level of employment in the department?</td>
<td>50.0% 40.0% 72.7% 100.0% 50.0% 55.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>24.5% 8.2% 16.3% 4.1% 2.0% 55.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Count 3 1 0 0 0 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf</td>
<td>75.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within What is your level of employment in the department?</td>
<td>12.5% 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.1% 2.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf * What is your level of employment in the department?

% within Training programme was requested on trainee’s behalf

Operational Supervisory Junior Management Middle Management Senior Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Junior Management</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th>Senior Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: At 0.804 The Fisher’s Test Exact Score revealed no significant relationship between the variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
<th>Point Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.997</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.551</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisher's Exact Test</strong></td>
<td>12.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 22 cells (88.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08.

b. The standardized statistic is -.330.
ANNEXURE I:

CORRELATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Trainee</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*