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The following abbreviations are used in this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADRI</td>
<td>Approach-Deployment-Results-Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Business Assessment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Council on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>City University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFQM</td>
<td>European Foundation of Quality Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETQA</td>
<td>Education and Training Quality Assurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FET</td>
<td>Further Education and Training Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAI</td>
<td>Historical Advantaged Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBI</td>
<td>Historical Black Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Historical Disadvantaged Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEQC</td>
<td>Higher Education Quality Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Organisation for Standardisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICHEFAP</td>
<td>International Comparative Higher Education Finance and Accessibility Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBNQA</td>
<td>Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHE</td>
<td>National Commission on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPI</td>
<td>National Education Policy Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQF</td>
<td>National Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSFAS</td>
<td>National Student Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWU</td>
<td>North West University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDCA</td>
<td>Plan-Do-Check-Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRI</td>
<td>Plan-Implement-Review-Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PraIRI</td>
<td>Planning-resource allocation-Implementation-Review-Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Resource Allocation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAEM</td>
<td>South African Excellence Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPSE</td>
<td>South African Post-Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQA</td>
<td>South African Quality Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUVCA</td>
<td>South African Universities Vice-Chancellors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBVC</td>
<td>Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, Ciskei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFSA</td>
<td>Tertiary Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQM</td>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDUSA</td>
<td>Union of Democratic University Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USUD</td>
<td>United States University Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUT</td>
<td>Vaal University of Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutions of higher learning in South Africa should establish and sustain their own quality management systems. These systems should improve quality of the core business of higher education i.e. teaching and learning, research and community engagement. It should yield reliable information for internal planning as well as external monitoring purposes. The integration of quality management with planning and resource allocation within a framework of continuous improvement is viewed as fundamental elements for successful quality management of institutions of higher learning.

A key assumption of this research is that quality management models should be underpinned by the systems theory in order to enhance the integration of quality management, planning and resource allocation on institutional strategic, tactical and operational levels. This study utilised the key elements and phases of the PDCA and ADRI models to develop a model for the integration of quality management, planning and resource allocation within a context of continuous improvement. This model will be suitable for implementation by one of the institutions of higher learning in South Africa that fails, according to its latest HEQC audit to integrate quality management, planning and resource allocation. It offers also a conceptual framework for any institution of higher learning that fails to integrate quality management, planning and resource allocation.
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The following can be regarded as key words that are utilised in this study:

Academic freedom, accountability, autonomy, continuous improvement, planning in higher education, resource allocation, reviews, self-evaluation, silo management, systems theory, Total Quality Management.
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