

CHAPTER 26

MISUSE OF EXAMINATION CENTRES

CHAPTER 26

MISUSE OF EXAMINATION CENTRES

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. Introduction	99
2. Evidence Led	100
2.1 Mr J.J. Coetzee	100
2.2 Mrs M. Johnson	101
2.3 Mr M.J. Rakoma	105
2.4 Mr F. Khomoko	106
2.5 Mr R.M. Ramohoebo	107
2.6 Mr Z.F. Monama	108
3. Evaluation of Evidence	112
4. Recommendations	116
4.1 Mr Z. F.Monama and R.M. Ramohoebo	116
4.2 Mrs M. Johnson	117
4.3 Mr M.J. Rakoma	117
5. General Recommendations	118
6. Recommendations on Disciplinary Inquiries	118

CHAPTER 26

MISUSE OF EXAMINATION CENTRES

1. INTRODUCTION

Departmental policies and rules, even if they appear to be trivial, serve the vital function in a correctional facility of maintaining order and discipline. Officials of the Department should never flout such policies and rules or apply them on an *ad hoc* basis.

At the same time policies and rules are of no value and serve no purpose if they are not properly communicated by the Department to the officials designated to implement such policies at a lower level.

It is against this background that the Commission in this chapter focuses on the non-adherence to policy of the Department relating to examination centres at individual prisons.

This Chapter will also highlight the absence in the Department of efficient procedures to ensure that policies of the Department are communicated to members at the lower levels.¹

In terms of Departmental policy, examination centres are to be used only by inmates. The evidence will show that certain members and individuals from outside prison were allowed to write examinations at the examination centre at Pretoria Central Prison.

¹ See also section dealing with Management of Information in Chapter One and in Management Areas of this report.

2. EVIDENCE LED

The evidence of the officials in charge of education in prison and other senior officials is set out below.

2.1 Mr Jacobus Johannes Coetzee

Mr Coetzee holds the rank of a Director for formal education and also performs duties of Acting Director for Skills Development, Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture. He joined the Department in 1996 and he holds a doctorate in Education. He has worked at various centres in different capacities and has been dealing with education in prison since he joined the Department.

He outlined the objectives of the Correctional Services Act in providing education for prisoners, the qualifications frameworks set by the relevant qualifications bodies, the subjects prisoners should be able to study, and the manner in which they should be taught and examined.

Up to the year 2000, apart from prisoners registered for the Grade 12 examinations, officials in the Department and other private candidates who were writing their Grade 12 examinations, were also allowed to register to write at examination centres in Correctional Services. However, in 2000 examination irregularities were reported and after thorough investigation, a directive was issued that no one except prisoners registered for Grade 12 would be allowed to write their Grade 12 examinations at examination centres in Correctional Centres. This directive is still operative.²

This directive has been brought to the attention of Provincial Commissioners and Department Functional Services and Provincial Heads in Education and Training. Mr Coetzee conceded in cross-examination that people on the ground

² See Pretoria Exhibit 'AAAA1'.

may not have been advised of this directive. He also conceded that there is no system for acknowledging receipt of the policy document by each member involved. He conceded further that there was no mechanism for ensuring that the policy documents are actually received by members.

He could not deny that any registered student may apply to write exams at the nearest examination centre and that the examination material is provided by the Department of Education. He also admitted that before 1 January 2001, members were allowed to write their examinations in the prison centres.

Mr Luvo Mgweba is one of the outsiders who was allowed to write matric examinations at the Pretoria Central Prison examination centre. He was not an inmate, nor was he a member of the Department. He is the son of Mrs Valencia Nomaxesibe Mgweba, who is employed by the Department as an Assistant Director at Pretoria Central Prison.

With his mother's assistance, he registered for two Grade 12 subjects, namely English and Xhosa, at the prison school. He was assisted by a member, Mr Ramohoebo, with his registration. He did not attend any classes during the course of the year nor was he supplied with books and stationery by the members of the prison school. He bought his own books and stationery. He wrote his examinations on 21 and 23 October 2003, respectively.

2.2 Mrs Marion Johnson

Mrs Johnson is an Acting Co-Ordinator: Education and Training, stationed at Pretoria Central Prison since September 2003. She was previously nominated to act in this post from February 2002 to March 2003. From April 2003 to January 2004, Mr Ramohoebo also acted in the post. From July 2003 until mid-September 2003, Mr W.P Ackerman also acted in this position.

At each prison training college, a Divisional Head: Development is appointed. Heads of the respective Correctional centres are responsible for the registration of students at the various institutions.

While she was still in the Acting post, Mrs Johnson did not come across the directive (Exhibit AAAA1), which stipulates that as from 1 January 2001 no personnel or other persons besides registered offender students will be allowed to write examinations at prisons. This document was later given to her by a colleague.

She was, however, aware of a communication which emanated from the Department of Education prohibiting persons other than offenders to write examinations at Correctional centres.

In her view this was, however, not in line with the Education Act in that education is a right and a student must write exams at the nearest centre. There were, however, communication problems between the Department of Education and the Department. This problem is being addressed in that the Internet is now being used but there are still loopholes in the system.

The Educationists make use of the B-Orders 5, chapter 3, part 1, to guide them in decision-making. Communication: Reference: 1/4/3/2, dated 30 November 2000³ regarding examination irregularities gives the education division direct instructions regarding personnel writing examinations.

In terms of this communication, no member or any other person who is not a prisoner is allowed to enroll or sit for examinations at Correctional centres. The Correctional centres are exclusively for prisoners, people on probation or parolees.

³ See Pretoria Exhibit 'AAAA1'.

Mrs Johnson became aware of Exhibit AAAA1 during the course of September 2003. A further communication dated 15 October 2003, which also prohibits personnel and outsiders other than registered offenders from writing examinations at Correctional centres, was also distributed and she became aware of this communication towards the end of October 2003. She communicated this document to Mr Ramohoebo while he was acting in the post. The document was also communicated to all other educators under her control.

However, private candidates or students had already registered to write examinations when she became aware of this document prohibiting outsiders and members from writing examinations at Correctional centres.

At the time Mr Ramohoebo was appointed by the Department of Education and Training as an invigilator, they could not stop the students who had already registered from writing the examinations at the Correctional centres.

He knew the policy by September 2003, but nothing was done. Private students were allowed to write examinations in prison despite the policy prohibiting them from writing examinations at such centres.

Examinations by private persons who were not prisoners went ahead with their knowledge, including that of Mr Ramohoebo, despite the policy.

In paragraph 24 of her affidavit⁴ Mrs Johnson states that they as educationists were aware of the policies regarding enrolling students at their institutions. Their control educationist, then Mr B. Khoza, informed all educationists about a memorandum from the national office sent to management areas in 2001 (Exhibit AAAA1).

⁴ See Pretoria Exhibit 'CCCC'.

However, in her oral testimony she stated that she had made a mistake in paragraph 24 of her affidavit; it was not Mr Khoza who had given them the memorandum but she had obtained it from a colleague. She then stated that the contents of paragraph 24 of her affidavit were not true, as Mr Khoza did not inform others about this memorandum. She denied that she was trying to protect other educationists. She stated that when she signed the affidavit she understood its contents and that she has a Bachelor of Arts degree qualification.

She testified further that in June 2003 she did not know that it was against the policy to register non-offenders to write examinations. However, when she was confronted with the contents of paragraphs 27 and 32 of her affidavit she stated that she knew of the policy.

In paragraph 27 of her affidavit she states that during June 2000 she asked Mr Ramohoebo why he was registering people who were not prisoners in a Correctional centre.

In paragraph 32 of her affidavit she states that the private candidates who were writing examinations were Mr Titus, Mr Mgweba and a member, Mr Johannes Lesiba Tjikane. She did not stop them from writing because it was not their fault that they registered at their centre. The private candidates were writing Grade 12 examinations and she was also confronted by Mr Rakoma, the Assistant Head of the Prison, about these irregularities.

In cross-examination she conceded that nowhere in the B-Orders is it stated that outside students could not write examinations inside the prison. She also conceded that the memorandum prohibiting non-offenders from writing examinations inside prison may not have been communicated to Mr Ramohoebo.

She also stated that there were no policies at this stage and confirmed the evidence given by Mr Coetzee that the policies dealing with the examinations in prison are still being formulated.

2.3 Mr Moalusi Johannes Rakoma

Mr Rakoma holds the rank of an Assistant Director and is the Divisional Head: Operational Support Services, i.e. Assistant Head of the Prison.

He is familiar with Exhibit AAAA1 dated 30 November 2000, but could not recall when he received this document. There had been some adjustments to the examination policy since 1995 and he became aware of the document during 2003.

He could also not recall when he became aware of the document dated 15 October 2003, also dealing with the examination policy. He did, however, state that he became aware of this document two to three weeks after its date of publication. He was also aware of a further document with the heading "Action Plan for the Final Examination Grade 12 and Level 4 and Tertiary Students Central Prison for the year 2003", which comprises the last two pages of Exhibit AAAA1. He also stated that the comments on the last page of this document are in his handwriting and that he signed this document on 12 August 2003.

During the October-November 2003 examinations he received information that Mr Steven Basil Hill of the education section was seen escorting private persons into the Central Prison to write examinations. As Correctional examination centres are security risks one cannot just allow people to go unaccompanied to these centres.

After receiving information about Mr Hill, he confronted Mrs Johnson about this incident to find out what was happening. Mrs Johnson told him the matter was being handled by Mr Ramohoebo as he was appointed as an invigilator.

He then informed Mr Hlalethoa, the Head of Prison, and they appointed Mr Mashapa to investigate the matter.

Mr Mashapa submitted the memorandum of the investigation to him on 2 September 2003 for further processing.⁵

In cross-examination Mr Rakoma stated that the memorandum indicated that outsiders should not write examinations in prison centres. He did not know who outsiders. According to him outsiders might have meant people from Community Corrections or even warders. He made sure that the policy was distributed to all directors who came to his office. When he asked Mrs Johnson about the outsiders, she told him that some of his colleagues and members were writing exams. He then ordered the investigations as referred to above.

2.4 Mr Frans Khomoko

Mr Khomoko is an Educationist at the Engineering Section at Pretoria Central Prison. He took over as Head of the Section in January 2002.

His understanding of the B-Orders is that the prison education school is meant solely for prisoners. No member or outsiders are allowed to register or sit for examinations in Correctional examination centres.

In January 2002 Mrs Johnson told him that she had a mandate from the Area Manager, Mr Monama, that members from a workshop must be allowed to sit for examinations at the school for offenders, and he started registering them. The first group was registered between January and April 2002, and the second from May to July/August 2002. Mr Monama left the office before the August examinations. When Mr Monama left the area they stopped registering members because it was irregular. They only registered them because of the instructions of Mr Monama, who was a senior official. There are now no

⁵ This investigation report is annexed to Mr Rakoma's affidavit.

members registering or sitting for examinations in the engineering section. However, in his evidence, Mr Monama denied giving a mandate allowing members to write examinations at Correctional centres.

In cross-examination Mr Khomoko stated that he was not aware of the policy that from 1 November 2001, no member should register for examinations at the Correctional centre. He only became aware of the policy dated 30 November 2000 during the Jali Commission hearings. He conceded that there is a communication breakdown when it comes down to the dissemination of Departmental policies.

2.5 Mr Remember Moyahabo Ramohoebo

Mr Ramohoebo is an Educationist at Pretoria Central Prison and is in charge of mainstream, i.e. Grade 10 to 12.

On 31 October 2003 he had a consultation with the Jali Commission's investigator, Mr Halam, who interviewed him about the enrolment and the sitting for examinations by students in the mainstream. After 31 October 2003, no outsiders wrote examinations at the Correctional centres. He first saw Exhibit AAAA1 and a further document dated 15 October 2003 prohibiting members and outsiders from writing examinations at the Correctional centres when he was served with documents by the Jali Commission. Before he saw these documents, he never knew that it was not permitted to register outsiders or members to write examinations at the Correctional centres.

As a teacher, he saw the standard of examinations by prisoners, especially Grade 12, gradually dropping and also found that the inmates were querying the examination papers as not being genuine. He informed the inmates that the examination papers were the same as those used by outside schools. He then came up with an idea of allowing outside students to write examinations with the prisoners inside the Correctional centres.

Before allowing outsiders and members to write their examinations at Correctional centres, he contacted the Gauteng Department of Education and asked if he could bring a few people from outside to write with prisoners at their centres. The Gauteng Department of Education encourages everybody to write examinations, and so gave a verbal go-ahead.

During 2003, he enrolled Mr Luvo Mgweba, the son of Mrs Mgweba, who is the Assistant Director of Pretoria Central Prison. He was also approached by Miss Maria Motaung who is working at C-Max as an Educationist, who asked if he could enroll Miss Priscilla Titus for Grade 12. Miss Titus is also an outside person and he registered her together with prisoners. Both Miss Titus and Mr Mgweba sat for the October-November 2003 examinations.

After consultation with the investigator of the Jali Commission he went to Mrs Johnson who then gave him a circular dated 30 November 2000 (Exhibit AAAA1). He read through the circular and realised that people whom he had enrolled or allowed to sit for examinations were not allowed to write examinations at the Correctional centre. When he asked Mrs Johnson where the circular had been all along, because it was never communicated to him, she did not respond.

The circular prohibiting both outsiders and members to write examinations together at Correctional centres had never been communicated to him before this day. He had meetings with Mrs Johnson, as his supervisor, during 2001, and during their meetings none of these directives was ever discussed.

Mr B. Khoza, the Control Educationist never informed him about the contents of Exhibit AAAA1, as claimed by Mrs Johnson.

2.6 Mr Zeblon Felufefe Monama

Mr Monama was appointed an Area Manager of Pretoria Management Area on 1 April 1997. He joined the Department on 5 March 1984 at Pretoria Local

Prison. He has worked at various Management Areas occupying different positions until he attained the rank of Director.

He is now working as Regional Head: Corporate Services for the Free State and the Northern Cape regions. He could neither deny nor admit that Exhibit AAAA1 was ever received at the Pretoria Management Area. He raised the following possibilities.

- The circular was received but no copy was placed on file.
- It was given directly to the Control Educationist who never brought it to the attention of all Educationists.
- It was given to the Control Educationist at a meeting/seminar/workshop and he never sent a copy to the Area Manager's office.
- It was not received at all at the Pretoria Management Area.

He confirmed the evidence by Mr Coetzee that the Head Office has no policy in this regard and that the Department is still working on one.

He saw Exhibit AAAA1 for the first time on 18 May 2004 as it was attached to Mrs Johnson's affidavit when he was served with the document by the Jali Commission. He then requested Mr Wilkinson at the Pretoria Management Area to make a copy of the whole file from 1 January 2000 to 18 May 2004. There is no trace of this policy in Exhibit AAAA1 in the documents copied. The full file was opened on 14 June 1995 and closed in accordance with the registration policy on 15 March 2003. The new file was opened on 25 June 2003 and it is not yet full. He therefore could not say that the circular was received at the Pretoria Management Area during his term as an Area Manager and that it was given to the Control Educationist, who at the time was Mr Brian Khoza, an Assistant Director, or that the circular was never received.

He started restructuring the Pretoria Management Area on 7 June 1999 to address imbalances in different sections. For example, there were sections in which the majority of personnel were white. One of these was the Pretoria workshop, where there were sixty seven (67) officials, of whom sixty three (63) were white males and females.

The restructuring plan clearly indicated that there was a need for Africans in the workshop section. A needs analysis was done and all officials were informed about the restructuring plan, which clearly indicated the gaps. A request was extended to all African officials who were interested in being trained as artisans, and seventeen (17) came forward.

During September 1999, seventeen (17) officials were shifted from different sections to the workshop, and placed according to their interests, eg welding, electrical, cabinet making, etc.

After about six (6) months, the Acting Workshop Manager, Mr Nethengwe, indicated that it would be advisable to appoint a qualified artisan to provide training to these officials as some of them were struggling to cope with the production. Mr Nethengwe then appointed Mr J. Botha as a training officer on 9 September 2000.

During October 2001, Mr Nethengwe informed Mr Monama that the officials were not progressing well, especially with their theory towards the N-courses, and indicated that Mr Botha was not assisting them in this regard.

Mr Nethengwe informed him that some officials had informally discussed their problems with Mr Moloko and Mr Buys, who were both technical educationists in the Pretoria Management Area. He indicated that the two officials were prepared to offer their assistance. He expressed his concern to Mr Nethengwe that they must not sacrifice the main objective of the Department of training prisoners and focus on those officials whose condition of placement in the workshop was made clear to them during September 1999, when they were

first placed. The condition was that they were supposed to study privately for their own courses and during the day in the workshop they would be part of the production team and gain on-the-job training.

Mr Monama asked Mr Nethengwe to arrange for Mr Buys and Mr Moloko to come to his office, so that he could talk to them about their willingness to train the officials.

On 12 February 2001, he, Mr Nethengwe and Mr Rakoma, who was his second-in-charge (Head Management Services) had a meeting with Mr Moloko and Mr Buys in his office. Mr Buys and Mr Moloko said their 2002 programme would be drafted in such a way that maybe once or twice a week for an hour they would attend to the officials. Mr Nethengwe was instructed to inform the officials and make it clear to them that they would not sit in the class the whole day like the prisoners.

After discussing this matter with Mr Buys and Mr Moloko, his secretary typed letters and his instructions were made clear to these officials. The two letters are dated 12 October 2001 and are addressed individually to both Mr Buys and Mr Moloko. They read as follows:

“Training Officer: Yourself.

In terms of the Skills Development Act 1998 (Act No. 97 of 1998) every employer is obliged to provide the necessary training to learners (personnel and prisoners) in specific fields.

As a technical educationist you are hereby appointed permanently to facilitate the necessary training in the Pretoria Workshop to learner officials and prisoners in the specific field of theoretical training in woodwork, metalwork, electrical work and motor mechanic. Training must be carried out in terms of the abovementioned Act and it is expected from you to comply with the said Act.

It is trusted that you will carry out this important task with the necessary responsibility and enthusiasm.

Yours faithfully

MR MONAMA Z.K.”

The two letters are Annexures D to Mr Monama's presentation.⁶

It is clear from the letters that no mention of registration and examinations was made. Mr Buys and Mr Moloko were only supposed to do as stipulated in their letters. The reason why Mr Buys became involved with the officials' registration and examinations was never communicated back to him by Mr Nethengwe, Mr Buys or Mr Moloko.

Members did not have to write exams with prisoners.

It was only during the Commission hearings that he saw for the first time the list of members who wrote examinations at the Correctional centre. He was then given only the results of the prisoners and not those of members. According to him, the members who wrote the examinations at the Correctional centres were not authorised by him and they did so without his knowledge.

3. EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE

The document, which emanated from Head Office dated 30 November 2000 (Exhibit AAAA1) highlighted serious irregularities, which appeared at the Examination centres at Correctional centres. The document clearly stipulates that as from 1 January 2001, no personnel or other persons besides registered offender students would be allowed to write examinations at prisons. It clearly

⁶ See Pretoria Exhibit 'GGGG'.

states that personnel should write their examinations at a registered residential college or other venue for private candidates.

The evidence leader, Mr Barlow, conceded, correctly in our view, that this directive may not have been properly disseminated. He submitted that the Department should ensure that directives from Head Office are properly communicated to the people on the ground. The Department should have a system of accountability that clearly indicates the receipt of such policies from Head Office.

He also conceded, quite correctly in our view, that Mr Ramohoebo may not have received this communication.

Mrs Johnson, an Acting Co-Ordinator: Education and Training, worked in this position in the years 2000 and 2003 respectively. Her evidence suggested that she and other educationists were aware of this policy prohibiting outsiders and members to write examinations at Correctional centres. This is confirmed in her affidavit, where she states in paragraph 17:

“No member or any other person who is not a prisoner is allowed to enroll or sit for examinations at Correctional centres. The Correctional centre/Prison is exclusively for prisoners/people on probation/ parolees (who had registered whilst still incarcerated).”

The policy prohibiting such conduct dated 30 November 2000 is annexed to her affidavit. In her evidence she did not suggest that she and other officials who were educationists were not aware of this policy. She knew the policy and she was in possession of this document. The investigators of the Commission actually received the policy document from her.

In paragraph 24 of her affidavit she states:

“We, the educationists, were aware of the policies regarding enrolment of students at our institution. Our Control Educationist, then Mr B Khoza, informed all educationists about the memorandum sent to the Management Areas in 2001: Reference 1/4/3/2 dated November 2000 from National Head Office.”

When she gave evidence, she withdrew the contents of this paragraph and stated that it was a mistake. In this regard, Mrs Johnson appeared to have made a false declaration regarding an employer/employee situation.

In paragraph 27 of her affidavit she states:

“During June 2003, I again spoke to Mr Ramohobae (sic) about registering students that are not offenders. In fact, I was asking as to why he was registering people who are not offenders in the Correctional centre.”

In paragraph 28, she states:

“His answer was that he was guided by the Gauteng Department of Education regarding registration of students. During that time frame Mr Ramohobae (sic) was Acting Head of Education and Training”.

The evidence of Mr Ramohoebo is that he was not aware of this policy. He only became aware of it when Advocate Halam of the Commission gave him the directive prohibiting outsiders from writing examinations at Correctional centres. Before that he never knew that it was not allowed to register outside students or members at Correctional centres. This is contrary to the evidence given by Mrs Johnson.

Mr Ramohoeba further testified that no directive was brought to his attention during 2001 by Mrs Johnson, who was his supervisor. They also had meetings but no directives were discussed during them. His evidence also reveals that

the B-Orders mainly deal with education and not with the writing of examinations. He also denied that Mr Khoza told him anything about this directive.

Mr Ramohoebo gave evidence in a clear and straightforward manner and there is no reason to doubt him.

What is apparent from the evidence is that the directive or communication prohibiting outsiders and members from writing examinations at the Correctional centres was received by Mrs Johnson, who failed to communicate its contents to her subordinate and other members in the Department.

The document in question was annexed to her affidavit (Exhibit CCCC), which clearly shows that she had received the document. However, in her evidence, she stated that she was given this document by a colleague and later stated that she received it from the Department.

Even the then Area Manager, Mr Monama, never saw this document. According to his evidence he only saw it when he was served with it by members of the Jali Commission annexed to Mrs Johnson's affidavit. He presented documentary evidence that the file where such a document would have been kept had no record of it ever having been received by the Pretoria Management Area.

A further allegation made by Mrs Johnson against Mr Monama is that he allowed members to write examinations at the Correctional centres and at the time she knew that members were not allowed to. She said she allowed this because it was an instruction from Mr Monama, but Mr Monama denied that he ever gave any instruction or authority to allow members to write their examinations at Correctional centres. According to his evidence these members were allowed by their instructors, Mr Buys and Mr Moloko, to register and write examinations at the Correctional centres without his knowledge. The evidence of Mrs Johnson and Mr Khomoko that they were instructed by Mr

Monama to allow members to write examinations at the Correctional centres cannot be correct. Mr Monama gave evidence in a clear and straightforward manner and there is no reason to doubt him. On the other hand Mrs Johnson was not a good or reliable witness; she contradicted her evidence and retracted paragraph 24 of her affidavit where it is alleged that Mr Khoza discussed the directive with all other educationists. What is apparent from her evidence is that she failed to disseminate the contents of the directive to her subordinates and other members on the ground.

Insofar as Mr Rakoma as Acting Head of the Prison is concerned, there is clear evidence that he was, in fact, aware of the contents of this directive. He cannot hide behind the claim that he did not know the definition of an “outsider”. He knew very well that members and outsiders are not allowed to write examinations at Correctional centres.

In the light of the above, the conduct of both Mr Rakoma and Mrs Johnson amounts to a breach of Departmental policy. The Commission will be making recommendations against them. However, it is clear from the evidence that both Mr Monama and Mr Ramohoebo that they were not aware of this policy and this policy had never been communicated to either of them. The Commission accepts their evidence. It is also clear that the evidence against Mr Monama, that he instructed officials to allow members to write their examinations at the Correctional examination centre, is false and that it should be rejected. No recommendations will be made against Mr Ramohoebo or Mr Monama.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Mr Zeblon Monama and Mr Moyahabo Romohoebo

There is insufficient proof to justify any conclusions that they are in breach of the Departmental policy and no recommendations are made against them.

4.2 Mrs Marion Johnson

There is sufficient proof that Mrs Johnson was in possession of, and well knew, the Departmental policy prohibiting outsiders and members from writing examinations at Correctional centres. Mrs Johnson failed to disseminate this information to other officials. There is also sufficient proof that Mrs Johnson furnished a false statement to the Commission when she testified regarding the communication of the policy to other members. Her conduct amounts to a breach of the Department's Disciplinary Code.

Accordingly, the Commission recommends that:

4.2.1 She be charged with contravening:

- (a) Clause 4.3 column A of the Department's Disciplinary Code – Furnishing a false statement.
- (b) Clause 2.1 column A alternatively, Clause 2.1. column B of the Department's Disciplinary Code – Unsatisfactory work performance.

4.3 Mr Moalusi Johannes Rakoma

There is sufficient proof that Mr Rakoma, as Assistant Head of Prison, knew that outsiders and members were not allowed to write examinations in the Correctional centres. As an Assistant Head of Prison, he should have known who were the outsiders and he should have been able to identify them.

Mr Rakoma's conduct amounts to a breach of the Departmental policy.

4.3.1 Accordingly, the Commission recommends that Mr Rakoma be charged with contravening clause 2.1 column A of the Department's Disciplinary Code – Unsatisfactory work performance.

5. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Evidence has established that there is no clear procedure for disseminating policy documents from Head Office to the staff on the ground. If the Area Manager and high ranking officials in the Education section within the Department are not aware of the policy dealing with the writing of examinations, this shows a serious lack of proper communication within the Department. The Commission recommends that the Department should establish a system of accountability whereby documents from Head Office, especially policy documents, are properly acknowledged and recorded when they are received by various officials.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS ON DISCIPLINARY INQUIRIES

For the reasons set out in the previous interim reports already filed, the disciplinary inquiries against Mrs Johnson and Mr Rakoma should be conducted by a Special Task Team contemplated by the Commission in its various reports.