The role of development appraisal teams in teacher development in schools.

by

Pragashen Chetty

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Master of Education Degree of the Faculty of Education

University of Kwa-Zulu Natal

SUPERVISOR: S.D BAYENI

DECEMBER 2009

DECLARATION

I, **Pragashen Chetty** do hereby declare that this dissertation is my own work. Where similar dissertations exist is referenced in my dissertation. All references as detailed in the dissertation are complete in terms of all personal communications engaged in and published works consulted.

_____   _____

Student's Signature   Date

_____   _____

Supervisor's Signature   Date

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research to my wife, **SHARMINI CHETTY** for the

encouragement, support and tolerance during my studies.

Most importantly, for sitting up with me during those long hours

and never leaving my side.

Thank you for sacrificing valuable family time.

You are my inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to the following people for their invaluable support and guidance during the course of my studies:

- My supervisor, Mr SD Bayeni for his advice, support and patience during the writing of my dissertation.

- The principals and educators of the participating schools, for allowing me to use their experiences in my research.

- My parents, David and Devrani, for their love and support and instilling in me the values that make me who I am today.

- My daughter, Priya for your love, support and the sacrifice of family time.

- My family, Vernon, Roy, Jay, Saras and Anand, for their encouragement and support.

- My family, friends and colleagues, for their words of encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to research the role the development appraisal teams, namely the staff development team and development support group play in developing educators in schools.

The objectives of this study were to understand the problems or challenges faced by schools in developing educators. Provide training for the School Management Team, Development Support Group and Staff Development Team to enable them to perform their roles of educator development. Evaluate and monitor the development appraisal system and educator development.

The literature reviewed for this study examines key concepts of appraisal across the globe that would help me understand the South African educator appraisal system and critically evaluate it. This was done by *firstly,* looking at the following concepts in both business and education: performance management, performance related pay and staff development. *Secondly,* educator appraisal systems of a few countries are examined, to establish the background and purpose of educator development appraisal in those countries. Why such appraisal systems were introduced? What effect they had on educator development and school improvement? The study also looks at the challenges those countries faced in the implementation of educator developmental appraisal and how they dealt with those challenges.

Thirdly, the guiding principles of the South African developmental appraisal system and the processes of the development appraisal were researched to compare with existing practises at the research sites. Furthermore the study explored the role and responsibilities of developmental appraisal teams, namely the Development Support Groups (DSG), the Staff Development Team (SDT) and the School's Management Team (SMT), to establish how these teams' contribute to educator development.
The methodology used in this study is qualitative in nature. The study takes the form of a case study of 2 schools in the Pinetown district. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 5 participants from each school.

The findings and recommendations of this study reveal 3 strategies that are needed to give schools the support to overcome their difficulties. *Firstly*, develop strategies to support the development appraisal system at schools. This can be done by developing training mechanisms at schools to train school management teams, staff development teams and development support groups to enable these teams to perform their developmental roles. *Secondly*, develop strategies to evaluate and monitor the development appraisal system. This can be done by empowering all school's management teams and staff development teams to be able to monitor and moderate all evaluations taking place during a cycle and asking for documents that support or justify each assessment. *Finally,* develop strategies to compensate for the challenges faced by each school, based on each school's context. This can be done by assessing each school's context prior to assessment being conducted and factoring these contextual issues into each of that school's educator's scores.

Chapter: One

Introduction

This chapter presents the background of the study, the research questions, objectives of the study, the research methodology and chapter division.

1.1 The background of the study

During the apartheid era educator appraisal was conducted by means of the inspection programme. The inspection programme was not user-friendly as a team of subject specialist would, at times, make unannounced visits to evaluate educators. Judgements were made about the educator's effectiveness and capabilities without involving educators. Evaluations were seen by the educators as being judgemental and demotivating. With the introduction of strong unionism in the early 80's, educators questioned the legitimacy of the inspection programme. This led to the inspection programme being suspended in schools.

The democratic government formed in 1994 had to deal with a number of malpractices. Educator accountability was one of them where educators were not made to account for the jobs they did since the early 80's. There was a shared call from all stakeholders for a policy that would evaluate and monitor education at schools. In 1994 the ANC-led government made a series of consultation workshops for the "new appraisal system".

Developmental appraisal was piloted in 93 schools during 1995 and 1996 with the findings of the pilot study being that the policy could be applied in all schools no matter what the contextual conditions were (Lekome, 2007). However the implementation of developmental appraisal in 1999 was not successful since the policy had many constraints (Review Workshop Report, 2000). Areas of concern were deadlines to complete the process, lack of understanding of a complex

process, no monetary rewards and the lack of effective monitoring of the process in all schools (Naidoo, 2006).

Because of these constraints of the developmental appraisal system, the Department of education introduced The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) which deals with different quality management programmes namely the Developmental Appraisal (DAS) informed by Resolution 4 of 1998, the Performance Measurement System (PMS) informed by Resolution 1 of 2003 and Whole School Evaluation (WSE). The main objective of IQMS is to ensure a quality public education system which would constantly improve the quality of teaching and learning (Education Labour Relations Council, 2003).

The Performance Measurement System evaluates the individual educator for salary progression, grade progression and affirmation of promotions. The introduction of the PMS policy is clearly a moderation of the existing policy of developmental appraisal which has a 1% pay progression incentive for those educators receiving a satisfactory score during evaluations. The department recognised that PMS focussed mainly on the individual educator improving and lacked focus on the whole school improvement .This lead to the introduction of Whole School Evaluation (WSE).

The purpose of WSE is to evaluate the effectiveness of a school in the following 9 focus areas: basic functionality; governance and relationships; school safety, security and discipline; school infrastructure; parents and community; leadership, management and communication; quality of teaching and learning; curriculum provision and resources; and learner achievement. (Naidoo, 2006). There are two types of WSE, namely internal WSE and external WSE. Internal WSE is conducted by the SMT and is used to determine if the school is succeeding in achieving its aims and objectives. External WSE is conducted by supervisors appointed by the department who measure the progress of the school based on the targets they set themselves in their school improvement plan.

1.2 The Developmental Appraisal System

The developmental appraisal system is based on the guiding principles of democracy, accountability and transparency. The establishment of a staff development team (SDT) in each school is for the purpose of ensuring that the above principles are adhered to at all times. The staff development team is also responsible for the way in which appraisal panels (development support groups) are set up and how they operate.

1.2.1 The staff development team (SDT)

The staff development team is elected at a staff meeting convened by the principal. The staff development team consists of the principal, WSE co-ordinator, elected members of the school's management team and elected post level 1 educators. The number of members is not stipulated since it is dependent on the size of the school, the number of educators and the work that needs to be done. The staff development team elects a chairperson at their first meeting (Republic of South Africa, 1998).

1.2.1.1 The role of the staff development team

The following are the roles of the staff development team:

- train staff in the procedures of developmental appraisal.
- develop and monitor the management plan for DAS.
- collation of developmental needs of each educator into a school improvement plan.
- monitor of the appraisal process and ensuring that records are filed.
- submission of all records to the district office.
- ensure that professional development needs of all educators are met.
- resolve differences between the appraisee and his or her DSG.

1.2.2 The Development Support Group (DSG)

The developmental appraisal process seeks to ensure that the person being appraised is part of the appraisal process and the final scores are decided on in consultation with an appraisal panel or development support group (DSG). The development support group is a group of educators within an institution responsible for guidance and support of an educator (the appraisee) during the appraisal process (Naidoo, 2004). Each appraisee chooses his or her DSG which consists of 3 people: the appraisee, a peer and a senior (the appraisee's immediate senior).

1.2.2.1 The role of the development support group

The following are the roles of the development support group:
- provide mentoring and support to the educator.
- help the educator develop his or her personal growth plan.
- arrange observation lessons, follow up discussions and compile a report.
- liaise with the SDT to incorporate the educator's development needs into the school improvement plan (SIP).

1.2.3 School improvement plan (SIP)

The school improvement plan is the responsibility of both the school's management team (SMT) and the staff development team (SDT). It is a collation of each educator's developmental needs based on the recommendations of his or her DSG. The school improvement plan must be openly discussed, monitored and evaluated by the SMT to ensure professional development takes place. Improvements are aimed at the whole school level, learning area level and individual educator level. According to Craft (2002), a school improvement plan is focussed on developing practical strategies to change practice. This implies that

areas for improvement are identified and a practical plan of action is mapped out to change practices.

1.3 Rationale of Study

According to the Department of Education (1999) the main purpose of the developmental appraisal system was to promote school performance through approaches characterised by partnership, collaboration, mentoring and guidance. Clearly the above characteristics of the new appraisal system were an attempt to improve the quality of schools through democratic principles. However there was little consultation when the programme was formulated. Also the educators who were the implementers of the programme were not trained to implement it. Hence it was received by educators with skeptism.

The implementation of the developmental appraisal system had marked differences from school to school because of the number interpretations of the developmental appraisal policy. The interpretation of the developmental appraisal policy at my school, in comparison with our neighbouring schools prompted me to question how other schools implemented developmental appraisal. The evaluation process, recording of scores and the feedback experience of colleagues from neighbouring schools seemed to be different from the educators at our school.

My experiences during the appraisal process and the initial negativity of many of our staff members towards the programme made me ask the questions "Are all the other schools following the policy as it is required?" and if the answer is no, as it seemed, the next question is: "Has the developmental appraisal system made a difference in improving the quality of teaching and learning in those schools?"

1.4 The research questions

- What are the challenges faced by schools in the implementation of the Developmental appraisal System?
- How has the Developmental appraisal System been perceived and implemented at the school level?
- How are the Developmental appraisal System teams fulfilling their roles in the development of educators?

1.5 The objectives of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate how the school management team carried out their roles in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system. What are the challenges facing schools in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system? In exploring the role and development objectives of the developmental appraisal system teams, namely the school management team (SMT), the development support group (DSG) and the staff development team (SDT), I would be able to investigate whether or not these teams are meeting their development objectives and if not, what their challenges are.

Embarking on this research study would help the policymakers to understand the magnitude of the problems that schools face. The problems faced by schools researched could be common problems prevailing in other schools as well. Based on the problems identified, policymakers can design new strategies to deal with the problems.

1.5.1 The significance of this study

The findings of the study would be of benefit to the policymakers to:
- understand the problems or challenges faced by schools in developing educators.
- identify gaps in the developmental appraisal system.
- evaluate and monitor the developmental appraisal system and educator development.
- develop new strategies to enhance the implementation of the developmental appraisal system.

1.6 The research methodology

1.6.1 The research paradigm

This research study was qualitative in nature. The qualitative methodology helps to get an in-depth understanding of the educator's actions when the developmental appraisal system was practised. Unlike a quantitative approach, in which questionnaires could elicit responses which would need further clarification, a qualitative approach uses face-to-face interviews which allowed me to probe further any ambiguities in the participant's responses.

The qualitative approach used in this research project was a case study. This allowed me to do an intensive study of the two schools involved in a shorter period of time. I focused on a smaller group of 9 participants.

1.6.2 Sampling

Purposive sampling was used in this study. This type of sampling allowed me to select the participants who were able to describe their role and responsibilities in appraising and developing educators. The research questions required me to

interview the school's management team members, the staff development team members and the developmental support group members.

The principal and DAS co-ordinator were chosen since; first they were both responsible for managing their school's developmental appraisal system. Second they were responsible for drawing up a school improvement plan in consultation with the staff development team. The members of the staff development team were chosen to seek clarification of their roles and responsibilities in the staff development team. The two post level 1 educators were chosen to seek clarification of their roles and responsibilities in the development support group.

1.6.3 Research instrument

The research instrument used was a semi-structured interview which allowed me to clarify ambiguities in the participants responses and allowed the educators to be more open, sharing their feelings and concerns on the topic of educator appraisal and development. The 9 participants interviewed in the two schools included: the principal, Developmental appraisal System (DAS) co-ordinator, one staff development team (SDT) member and two post level one educators. However the total number of participants was 9 since in School B the principal was also the DAS co-ordinator. Each participant was chosen for their role and responsibilities in appraising and developing educators.

1.6.4 The location of the study

The two schools involved in the study are located in an urban area situated in a 20 kilometre radius from each other. Their difference was in their socio-economic context. School A is located in a middle class urban area in Durban with a staff composition of 56 white educators and 14 Indian educators. The learner composition is 440 white learners, 364 African learners, 251 Indian learners and 105 Coloured learners. The socio-economic backgrounds of most learners are

from the middle class. School B is located in a township north of Durban with a staff composition of 28 Indian. The learner composition is 372 Indian learners and 157 African learners. The socio-economic backgrounds of most learners are from the working class.

Though the two schools are situated 20 kilometres away from each other with different socio-economic backgrounds, they both faced similar challenges in how policies, particularly DAS are implemented. The most important common challenges are:

- finding the time to do classroom observation for appraisal.
- monitoring of DSG activities to ensure fairness and transparency.
- receiving support from the district office in respect of the SIP.

The choice of schools was informed by the challenges they faced in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system. Both these school are well resourced in terms of physical and human resources and have the support of the parents of their learners. I established contacts with both the schools principals and some staff members of these schools and discovered that they had experienced similar challenges in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system.

1.6.5 Data analysis

The data was analysed by first transcribing each interview verbatim and each transcript was typed with enough space between lines and margins so that notes could be written on the transcript. The data was then analysed through a process of open coding, grouping and categorising of codes. Based on the categories, themes were identified and reported on. More details to follow in chapter: 3.

1.6.6 Reliability and trustworthiness

The reliability of the data collected was achieved through the use of field notes, interview notes and member check. Throughout the data collection process I recorded field notes in a journal. These notes reflected my observations from the time I drove into the gates of the school to the start of my interviews. The field notes were also useful to make notes on how to handle further interviews during the research. During the interview process I recorded interview notes on an interview schedule which was designed with one question per page. This was done to capture observations that could not be recorded on the tape recorder and to also briefly note the participant's responses to the interview questions. Member checking allowed the participants the opportunity to check my data and interpretation after I transcribed the interview. This procedure not only reassured the participants of my intentions but also helped me to refine my analysis.

1.6.7 Ethical issues

The ethical issues were covered by seeking the permission from the education department to conduct research in the schools. This was done in the form of a letter to the department of education. Permission to do the study was requested from the department of education, principals and participants (Annexure B). Letters of consent to participate in the study were given to each participant seeking their permission to participate in the study and to tape record the interviews (Annexure C). All participants were assured of anonymity since I used pseudonyms to protect their identities and the name of their schools.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

The theory that underpins this study is the incrementalism theory. Incrementalism theory is a model of the decision-making process in government which maintains that decisions are usually made on the basis of relatively small adjustments to

the existing policies. This means that policymakers do not always start from scratch when making new decisions. This equally applied in education when the new policies are made. To make new policies, government tends to make changes or adjustments to existing policies.

This practise was developed by Charles Lindblom in 1959 when he wrote an article titled "The science of muddling through" where he described incrementalism theory as a model used by policy-makers.

Incrementalism views public policy as a continuation of the past government activities or policies with only incremental modifications (Dye, 2005). According to Lindblom, decision-makers do not annually review the range of existing policies against societal goals, research benefits and costs of alternative policies. The constraints of time, information and cost prevent policymakers from identifying the full range of policy alternatives (Dye, 2005).

Incrementalism theory is conservative in that existing programs and policies are considered as the basis for new policies. New policies and new programs are modifications of current policies.

According to Dye (2005), policymakers do this for the following reasons:
- They do not have the time, information and money to investigate all the alternatives to the existing policy.
- They accept the legitimacy of the previous policy over the uncertainty of a new policy.
- There may be heavy investments in the existing policy. Investments like money, buildings, psychological dispositions, administrative practices and organisational structure.
- Avoidance of political tension which reduces conflict maintains stability and preserves the political system (Dye, 2005).

The notion of incrementalism has been practised when new policies are formulated in the Department of education. Many existing policies in education prove to have followed this pattern of incrementalism when made. Since this study is based on policy within education it is found appropriate that incrementalism theory informs this study. This research deals with the policy formulation in terms of educator appraisal and educator development in South Africa.

The current educator appraisal policy of IQMS is clearly an example of an incremental model of policy formulation. The search for a new educator appraisal system in post apartheid schools has seen the policymakers introducing developmental appraisal, performance measurement and whole school evaluation incrementally since 1990.

The practice in policy formulation is that many countries tend to build new policies and laws on the existing ones by sharpening some areas identified as weak or adding some issues to clarify cloudy matters. This is done in the form of incremental changes, the previous system of educator evaluation was done by inspection with no consultation or feedback and was a fault finding exercise. It did not develop the educator's areas of weakness nor did it reinforce the positive aspects of his or her teaching.

DAS and PM policies addressed the above issues by including the educator as part the development support group (DSG), scores are agreed upon by each member of the DSG, areas of weakness are identified by the DSG and referred to the staff development team (SDT) for inclusion into the school improvement plan (SIP). The SDT plans their educator development programme using the SIP, ensuring all their educator's development needs are addressed. The educator is rewarded for his or her strengths by means of scores on the PM document which would be used for a 1% pay progression.

1.8 Chapter division and conclusion

This chapter was a brief introduction of the background of the study, the research questions, objectives of the study, the research methodology which covered the research paradigm, location of the study, research instrument, sampling, data analysis, and reliability of the study, ethical issues and theoretical framework.

Chapter 2 deals with the literature review of: Performance management, performance related pay and staff development, educator appraisal systems from other countries like England, United States of America, Australia, and New Zealand, a background to educator appraisal in South Africa, developmental appraisal, educator development and school improvement. Finally the guiding principles of the South African developmental appraisal system and the roles and responsibilities of the developmental appraisal teams in the South African policy are analysed.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology used in this study. These include the research paradigm, location of the study, research instrument, sampling, data analysis, reliability, ethical issues and limitation of the study.

Chapter 4 deals with the presentation of the findings from the interview process and the analyses thereof.

Chapter 5 explores the recommendations emanating from the study and draws conclusions.

Chapter: Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the literature review on the appraisal of educators in this country and other countries as well. The literature review provides a clear analysis of the educator appraisal programmes initiated in other countries. Educator appraisal programmes initiated in countries like England, United States of America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are examined, to understand how such programmes had been implemented. I looked at the challenges those countries faced in the implementation of educator developmental appraisal and how they dealt with those challenges.

Lessons can be learnt on how those programmes are implemented. What challenges are faced and how they are dealt with? This study also examines key concepts of educator appraisal related to programmes such as performance management, performance related pay and staff development.

2.2 Performance Management

The definition of performance management is not widely agreed-upon from the literature reviewed. According to Andersen, Henriksen and Aarseth (2006) performance management is actively monitoring the school's performance levels with the aim of bringing about school improvement. This clearly roots itself in the areas of continuous performance measurement but in reality would be difficult to practise all the time.

Performance management, according to Hendry, Bradley and Perkins (1997) stresses two dimensions. Performance management is focussed on the

individual or team performance to ensure the organisational goals are achieved. Performance management is also concerned with developing capability.

2.2.1 The background of performance management

The history of formal systems of performance management of work organisations dates back to between the 1950s and 1960s. At that time, the merit-rating system was predominant. This was a system which rated performance, based on a trait rating process which involved making a qualitative judgement on various criteria. The system used between the 1960s and 1970s was the Management by Objectives (MBO) which sought to overcome problems in the merit-rating system, with an emphasis on subordinate's weaknesses (James and Colebourne, 2004). The MBO system encouraged managers to focus on achieving common organisational goals. However in practice this system was just a technical exercise. It failed to recognise the social dimension to work, over emphasized the measurable aspect of performance and ignored the individual's objectives and needs (James and Colebourne, 2004).

Performance appraisal grew from the management by objectives and emerged in the 1970s. This approach to performance management had a wider range of factors that affect job performance. Performance appraisal included the identification of developmental needs and encouraged self appraisal (James and Colebourne, 2004: 47). What is presented by James and Colebourne, (2004) is similar to the developmental appraisal system (DAS) used currently in South African schools. Both systems are similar with respect to self appraisal and identification of developmental needs by means of a personal growth plan (PGP). The personal growth plan is a list of developmental needs of an individual for the up-coming appraisal year or cycle.

2.2.2 The Purpose of Performance Management

The purpose of the performance management process is to assess an individual's performance whereby areas of strengths and weaknesses are identified. Individuals are rewarded for performing well (McKenzie, 2007). The results of their assessments are also used to make decisions involving work assignments, compensation and career advancement. This may not be appropriate in the South African context since assessment of educators in South African schools is practised as a once off event which contradicts the policy. In practice educators are only observed in a once off lesson for assessment. Surely, this cannot be a true reflection of a educator's ability, the educator could present a good or bad lesson depending on contextual factors and therefore using this assessment for deciding on work assignments, compensation and career advancement would be unfair.

Career development programs help to motivate and retain high performers. This involves on the job training that will lead to career advancement (Mckenzie, 2007). The current education system in South Africa does not recognise professional development of its educators. Educators who choose to study further are not compensated by rank or monetary rewards; they do so for personal fulfilment. Therefore, educators are not motivated to join career development programs like honours or master's degree and high performers eventually leave to the private sector where they are rewarded for successfully completing professional development programmes.

2.2.3 The Benefits of Performance Management

According to McNamara (2007) there are four key benefits which will be discussed in detail and the other benefits will be highlighted briefly.

2.2.3.1 The four key benefits of Performance Management

Performance management focuses on results rather than behaviours and activities. The common misconception among performance management supervisors is that behaviours and activities are the same results (McNamara, 2007). An employee that appears busy may not be contributing towards the organisations goals.

I observed in one school that sport is seen as a more important marketing tool than academics. As a result, some educators involved in coaching a sport per term did not meet their teaching requirements yet were given a higher rating for performing their academic responsibilities than they deserved. These educators then qualified for the 1% pay progression.

Performance management aligns the organisational activities and processes to its goals (McNamara, 2007). The processes or stages in performance management ensure that the measurement of the organisations effectiveness is aligned with achieving the organisational goals. It also identifies and analyses the results needed to achieve those goals.

Performance management cultivates a system-wide, long- term view of the organisation. An effective performance improvement process must follow a systems based approach (McNamara, 2007).

Performance management produces meaningful measurements. Performance measurements are useful in benchmarking and setting standards for comparison with the best practices of other organisations (McNamara, 2007). They provide a basis for comparison during the change process. They measure improvement efforts such as training and development courses and quality programmes. They help ensure that employees are rewarded fairly and equitably based on performance.

The following are other benefits of performance management listed by McNamara (2007) adapted from The Field Guide to Consulting and Organisational Development:

Performance management helps the individual to think about what results he/she really want and forces them to be accountable. The process of writing down the areas for development in the appraisal document ensures that the employee will work towards achieving it.

Performance management validates expectations by having measurable results to verify if organisational goals are realistic or not (McNamara, 2007). Any form of assessment must have a guide by which one can measure achievement. The performance management process requires that for every goal set there must be measures attached to judge the success or failure of the goal.

Performance management is viewed as ongoing rather than a once-off event (McNamara, 2007). This ensures that employee's level of commitment and performances are consistent and not just during the review period. Once-off assessments of employees are based on polished or rehearsed performances.

Performance management provides for comparison, direction and planning (McNamara, 2007). Supervisors are able to compare the performances of all employees doing the same job. Based on the comparisons made, the employee and supervisor can plan the direction in which improvement can be achieved.

2.2.4 Disadvantages of Performance Management

There is a need for companies to look closely at their performance management and appraisal systems since many are not always useless, but can actually harm productivity and relationships between employees and managers (Bacal, 1996).

According to Bacal (1996), performance management uses the additive model of measuring organisational performance. The additive model is based on the assumption that the organisation's success is as a result of adding together each individual employee's performances. Whilst this might have been true in the past, the success of an organisation in recent times is as a result of the interaction of people not the adding together of results. In a well managed workplace the parts interact to create the successful organisation. Organisational success is based on synthesis not just adding results (Bacal, 1996).

This is true to one of the schools I researched where school A did not have a school improvement plan (SIP). The school viewed each educator's personal growth plan (PGP) in isolation and never followed the policy that required them to collate all their educator's development needs from their personal growth plans into one school improvement plan.

Performance management assumes that if one's focus is on results there will be no problems and one is more likely to succeed (Bacal, 1996). The employees become so focussed on the result that they neglect the organisational issues that need to be in place for the organisation to be effective. Each employee tries to meet the set target but is less focussed in sustaining the process of quality output. While the results are important, an examination of the process required to achieve the result is even more important (Bacal, 1996). This is further compounded in the South African context were assessment is attached to a monetary reward of 1% pay increase. The fact that money is attached to the

appraisal makes educators give "achievable" developmental needs so as to be judged as meeting those needs at the end of the assessment cycle.

Performance management assumes that one can measure results objectively. Setting standards of performance that are measurable and observable is difficult. Well-written standards have the appearance of objectivity but require subjective judgement (Bacal, 1996). The use of terminology like "outstanding" and "excellent" in the South African performance standards to assess a educator makes it a subjective judgement. The shortcoming is that assessments are conducted by different people in different contexts and is open to subjectivity.

Performance management makes the assumption that a manager can be both evaluator and coach (Bacal, 1996). This is only possible if a high degree of trust exists between senior and employee. However a educator is unlikely to be completely honest and open about his or her incompetence to a senior who could use this information to make future decision about him or her. This implies that areas of weaknesses will be down played to those weaknesses that are unlikely to affect promotablity. Without the correct information regarding a educator's weaknesses, the senior will not be able to help the educator make an improvement and the exercise will be a window dressing.

Performance management is designed to enhance personal responsibility but also implies that the employees are not responsible for the work of others (Bacal, 1996). This focus on the individual reduces the responsibility to the organisation and the activities that are not 'your job'. In successful organisations, there are some employees who have a strong sense of responsibility to every activity and want to assist in every aspect of every team. The achievement of the organisational objectives is more important than an individual employee's objectives.

Performance management systems evaluate employees based on each employee's achievement of their objectives and often to achieve these objectives employees have to compete for resources which could result in the detriment of the achievement of other employees' objectives (Bacal, 1996).

Performance management does not encourage cooperation, teamwork and the "big picture"; it has the tendency to fragment an organisation (Bacal, 1996). Although managers see the importance of cooperation and teamwork they would still like to have a team leader who is accountable for the task. This type of accountability is a way of having someone to blame if things go wrong. Unfortunately, the team leader in a dysfunctional team often ends up doing all the work for the task to be a success.

2.3 Performance Related Pay

2.3.1 Definition

Performance related pay is defined as a means to provide for the periodic increase in pay or the withholding of such increases as a result of the assessment of an individual's performance (Cutler and Waine, 1999). Performance related pay is described as rewards or sanctions for educators based on some form of performance evaluation (Chamberlin, 2002).

From the above definitions one can conclude that the skills or ability of the individual are measured which results in the individual either being rewarded with a pay increase for achieving the standards set or not rewarded.

2.3.2 Types of performance related reward systems

There are three main models of performance related reward systems (McCollum, 2001). The first model is *merit-pay* which involves rewards based on classroom observations and learner performance (McCollum, 2001). The second model is *knowledge and skill based* compensation in which individuals are rewarded for acquired qualifications and demonstrated knowledge and skills believed to increase learner performance (Odden, 2000). The third model is *school-based compensation* which involves group-based rewards based on learner performance (Odden and Kelley, 2002).

According to McCollum (2001), a survey of the merit pay programmes used revealed that individual educators were rewarded through a range of areas of assessment such as educator portfolios, classroom observations and learner performances. The above areas of assessment for educators differ from the South African developmental appraisal system since learner's performance is not used as part of the assessment of a educator. This suggests that the South African learners have many other factors that influence their performances not just their educators. This seems to suggest that though educators' contribution to learner's achievement is important but there are many other factors that influence the learner's achievement.

The evaluations are conducted by a peer, the principal and an external evaluator (McCollum, 2001). The South African developmental appraisal system operates in a similar way, where educator evaluations are conducted by a panel of 3 people, the appraisee, a peer and a immediate senior. The rewards are only for a period of one year and supplement the current salary using a salary scale, if not a single compensation (McCollum, 2001). The rewards in the South Africa system are in the form of a 1% pay increase as per salary scale for an achievement of a satisfactory rating.

Knowledge and skill-based programmes reward individual educators who can display skills and knowledge (Odden, 2000). Assessments are based on the educator demonstrating skills and knowledge that would increase teaching performance. One of the assessment standards in the South African developmental appraisal system evaluates educators according to their professional development. This is further clarified by a set of criteria which evaluates their involvement in professional educator's organisations like Mathematics and Science Associations and further training courses like the Advance Certificate in Education (ACE).

Performance-related rewards are linked to increasing levels of skills and knowledge acquired and compensation is in the form of replacement of salary scales in full or in part (Odden, 2000). This implies that educators would be encouraged to study further thus improving their knowledge and skills which would be rewarded by a salary scale increase. The South African education department does not reward educators for their efforts in increasing their levels of skills and knowledge. The old system of education encouraged educators to study further and educators who completed courses related to the education field were given a salary scale increase. The new system of educator appraisal called developmental appraisal has failed to recognise and reward educators who study further which is a contradiction of the intention of the policy which was to encourage the development of educators.

School-based programmes reward the school which in turn distribute the rewards to all staff (Odden and Kelley, 2002). Assessment is based on the learner performance through *added value* gains to learner scores or absolute learner achievement. Evaluations are conducted by an external review process. Rewards are in the form of an annual bonus shared amongst all staff. This may not be an appropriate in the South African context as it will only suit or reward schools that are in the more affluent areas where resources already exist and

parents are able to pay for extra lessons from private tutors. Therefore learner performances will be higher than those from the under resourced schools.

2.3.3 The performance related pay system in USA schools

The performance related pay system was introduced in the USA schools to improve management and educator productivity and recruit more qualified educators (Podgursky and Springer, 2007). The literature review revealed that performance related pay in the USA has different forms. This chapter looks at the programmes implemented in Denver, Colorado and Florida since these programmes highlight the common features of the USA schools performance related pay systems.

The Denver Public Schools Programme rewarded educators for increasing their learners' achievement and for advancing their knowledge and skills. The educator in consultation with the principal identifies two objectives to be achieved in that year by his or her learners and selects a measure for each objective. The evaluations conducted by the principal would assess the extent to which the two chosen objectives were met. Salary increases are awarded for completion of a professional development course or degree and for participation in district in-service courses. Finally, professional evaluations are done every 3 years and a reward of 3 % salary increase for a satisfactory score. The evaluation tool is designed by administrators and educators assessing different levels of educator performance. The Denver educational authorities commissioned the Community Training and Assistance Center to assess the programme. They found educators who met their two objectives had a higher level of learner achievement. Learner achievement became a focus not only at school level but at district level as well since districts now improved on service delivery.

The Colorado Schools District programme incorporated both the knowledge and skills-based pay system and the group-based performance pay system. The skill

based pay provided an incentive to educators who obtained specific skills identified by the district. The district provided training after school for all educators wanting to develop their skills. Upon completion of the course, educators are given a bonus ranging from $250 to $500 depending on the complexity of the skill. The group based programme involves educators working together towards common goals which impacted directly on learner performance (Kelley, 2000). The group would submit a proposal to a district review committee, clearly stating their objectives, responsibilities and timelines. The successful participants would receive equal share of the bonus. The impact of the Colorado programme can be seen in the enhancement of educator skills as a result of the skill based pay.

The Florida Special Educators Are Rewarded (STAR) Programme was introduced in 2006 to replace the old pay system the E-Comp which rewarded the top 10% of instructional personnel in the best performing districts rather than the best performing educators in all schools (Florida DoE, 2006). Performance pay was not funded by the state, therefore, very few educators received rewards. The STAR programme was introduced to fund state performance pay laws. To receive STAR programme funding the district must submit a performance pay plan. The primary evaluation of a educator must be based on improved learner performance measured over a year. The learners' performance must measure the reading and mathematics achievement based on a state board of education standardised test. The assessment categories for educators are, outstanding, high performance, satisfactory, needs improvement and unsatisfactory. If a educator did not received more than one satisfactory then he or she would not be eligible for a STAR bonus. The impact of the programme was seen when the Florida State Board of Education worked with a number of school districts to revise existing performance plans to meet STAR requirements.

2.3.4 Benefits of Performance related pay

Performance related pay provides the motivation to educators by adequately rewarding productivity (Havey-Beavis, 2003). If the skill of the educator determines the salary then the quality of teaching would improve. For those educators who are not motivated by money, other incentive can be used, like days off from work.

Performance related pay can increase collegiality by rewarding educators for collaboration and cooperation by means of group-based pay (McCollum, 2001). This requires a management style that encourages teamwork and interdependence with group performance rewards.

Performance related pay improves learner outcomes. If educators are paid for achieving increased learner outcomes then this may provide an incentive for all educators to improve. Any method that increases the quality of educators should improve learner outcomes (Odden, 2000). On the other hand, poor performing educators would remain at the same level of pay and would eventually have to tow the line and make the necessary improvement or leave the profession. Finally educators would be able to move beyond their starting salary and be paid at a level comparable to the private sector workforce (Odden and Kelley, 2002).

2.3.5 Disadvantages of Performance related pay

Fair and accurate evaluation is difficult since the complexity of designing a programme for evaluation needs a balance of clarity of goals and clear criteria to measure productivity. Educational achievement is difficult to establish since it includes many actors not just educators (Evans, 2001). In the South African context there are a range of factors that affect educational achievement from the lack of basic amenities like water, sanitation and electricity to unemployment and HIV/AIDS.

The best educators are often given classes that perform poorly and therefore are punished by performance based system (Evans, 2001). How do you judge a educator using their learner's outcomes? The previous educator could have used a different learning technique (Solomon and Podgursky, 2001).

During the evaluation process of performance-related pay, the school's management structure becomes hierarchical. The hierarchical situation is unavoidable because evaluations are conducted by a senior member of staff. Educators use evaluation as a formative process to see how they are performing. On the other hand, administrators use evaluation for summation which they use to gauge a educators worth (Barber and Klein, 1983).

Research conducted by Murnane and Cohen (1986) in the 1980s found that principals in the United States preferred giving higher scores than the educators actually deserved to build trust between the administration and the teaching staff and as a form of formative evaluation. This implied the principals perceived that the functioning relationship between them and the educators would be undermined by the use of performance based rewards (Harvey-Beavis, 2003).

Performance related pay can affect morale since it creates unfair competition between educators (American Federation of Educators, 2001). Some educators, who were not rewarded, questioned the fairness of the evaluation process as there were often no transparent criteria. This could also cause staff in-fighting, staff division and educators being critical of each other. The hierarchy becomes evident amongst the school's management structures in which the administrators now have the power over educators and the curriculum (Holt, 2001).

If money is a significant motivator for educators then, a monetary reward system would have a negative effect causing resentment towards the management, reduced loyalty and a reduction of productivity (Ramirez, 2001). It is common sense that not all educators can be motivated by incentives such as money.

Therefore incentives such as pay progression which in the South African context is equivalent to 1% increments which is termed salary progression may not motivate all educators. In fact there is already evidence that states that educators are not necessarily motivated by a pay rise but by job satisfaction (Ramirez, 2001).

Non-monetary rewards may be better motivators, such as extra holidays (Harvey-Beavis, 2003). Research in Canada has shown that many educators take up this opportunity for unpaid leave (Harvey-Beavis, 2003).

The performance related pay system in the USA was not state funded as already alluded to which means that not all educators are rewarded. The E-Comp programme which was in operation in some states only rewarded 10% to the top instructional personnel in the best performing districts rather than the best performing educators in all schools (Florida DoE, 2006). The performance related pay system resulted in reduced cooperation between educators (Harvey-Beavis, 2003). The performance related pay system was designed towards encouraging competition amongst educators and reduced teamwork.

A United States educator union, the American Federation of Educators (American Federation of Educators, 2001) argues that performance related pay programmes created divisions amongst educators as they classified educators as either winners or losers. Effective teaching and learner success depend on teamwork and cooperation, therefore rewarding individuals for team efforts or team performance results in resentment and division amongst staff. Rewards for the entire group also have a pitfall because of the 'free rider' problem. This happens when some educators, who are not contributing to the outcomes of learners, are rewarded because of other educators' actions (Cutler and Waine, 2000).

The American Federation of Educators (2001) argues that the performance based pay system can create a system where the curriculum is narrowed and 'teaching to the test' becomes evident which restricts the advancement of learners in the areas of the curriculum not tested. Since educators' rewards are based on their learners' outcome, there is a tendency to avoid parts of the curriculum that their learners will have difficulty in responding to in their tests. Test scores are therefore higher and the educators were judged to have achieved better results from their learners. There was an under-emphasis on those subjects that were hard to evaluate, which resulted in the scope of the intellectual activities in a school being narrowed (Holt, 2001). This caused institutional limitations of the curriculum and a downgrading in the importance of certain subjects that are not measured (Chamberlin, 2002).

This was evident in some South African secondary schools who did not offer Mathematics to their senior classes in the old curriculum which resulted in a higher exemption and pass rates. However, this has proven problematic in the new curriculum which requires Mathematics or Mathematics Literacy as compulsory subjects. The narrowing of the curriculum has resulted in these schools not having staff members who are able to teach Mathematics or Mathematics Literacy as a result of the curriculum change.

Performance related pay requires an extensive bureaucracy and an increase in educational revenue (Harvey-Beavis, 2003). The extensive bureaucracy is required to conduct the evaluations and administration of the documentation for every educator. Any reward scheme requires large amounts of money which is difficult to maintain. According to Odden (2000) it would be expensive to adequately evaluate every educator and would require considerable resources if evaluations were to be completed regularly. The human resources required in administering each educator's evaluation and pay increases is not currently available in the South African context; this will be discussed later in this thesis in chapters 4 and 5.

2.4 Staff Development

According to Naicker and Waddy (2003) the responsibility of ensuring continuous improvement and development of all staff, rests with the school's governing body and the school management team. Staff development is one of the key components to managing people as it develops staff to their full potential which in turn results in organisational development.

Staff development is defined as a formal, systematic programme, which is designed to promote both personal and professional growth (Steyn, 2001). It creates opportunities for personal fulfillment and develops skills for effective teaching and learning. If a educator does not gain personally out of the programme the exercise becomes meaningless which impacts negatively on teaching and learning. It is because of the above reason that every staff member needs to be consulted when drawing up the staff development policy and programmes.

2.4.1 The Purpose of Staff Development

A educator must remain a learner because if he or she does not then he or she falls behind and loses his or her efficiency as an educator (Van Der Westhuizen, 1999). The purpose of staff development would be to improve staff performance, develop their skills and empower potential leaders. It creates opportunities for personal fulfillment and job satisfaction. This is especially important when educator morale is at an all-time low.

The overarching aim of staff development is the improvement of teaching and learning in a particular school (Cawood and Gibbon, 1985). The following are specific objectives from Cawood and Gibbon (1985); I will use these objectives to explain the purpose of staff development for staff, learners and the curriculum.

2.4.1.1 Staff

Staff development improves attitudes toward education. Staff that was trained in new concepts and methodology display a positive attitude and teach with vigour and do justice to the concepts (Steyn, 2001). Staff development allows staff to keep pace with change and innovation in education (Steyn, 2001). Staff development in respect of information technology has allowed educators to use Microsoft Excel to do their marks instead of a mark book and when called upon to produce continuous assessment marks for the department of education, there is no need to take out the calculators since Excel spreadsheets can be programmed to produce the final percentages. Similarly staff development programmes in respect of the curriculum has helped introduce outcomes based education in the form of GET and FET.

Staff development opportunities allow for the identification and development of educational leaders. A well-planned staff development programme encourages staff to show their leadership ability (Van Der Westhuizen, 1999). The school's management team must empower their staff during staff development programmes by allowing educators to run workshops themselves and by sending young educators to department run workshops.

Lastly, staff development promotes team building and team spirit. If a programme empowers and invites participation from all staff, then this will build team spirit amongst staff members (Van Der Westhuizen, 1999). The school's management team must include themselves as part of group discussions and activities and not be seen as leaders of groups.

2.4.1.2 Learners

The effect of staff development on learners would be evident in many aspects of the learner's lives. The greatest affect however, should be on improved performance or outcomes (Steyn, 2001). If a educator is developed in his or her area of expertise then he or she delivers a well-planned and up to date subject matter (Van Der Westhuizen, 1999). This improves class discipline since there is no room for disruption in a well planned and executed lesson. The learner has not only improved his performance but is also disciplined.

A well balanced lesson makes learners understand the content and appreciate the efforts of the educator (Steyn, 2001). This builds class spirit where learners are co-operative and participation is encouraged, they feel empowered by their educators. Learners who feel empowered emerge as leaders in this type of atmosphere and there is a sense of healthy competition amongst learners.

2.4.1.3 The Curriculum

Staff development shapes the curriculum in a particular way, by creating and developing subject departments into well-oiled curriculum units whose members work together and develop each other. This develops subject teaching by strengthening resources, both human and physical. New research findings and developments in the field are explored and debated and sometimes introduced into schools.

2.4.2 Identifying Staff Development Needs

According to Everard and Morris (1996), managers should treat people like any other resource by maintaining, improving and adapting the resource as it would be done if it was a building or equipment to ensure that it meets the

organisational needs. This sounds rather inhumane, but managers who ignore staff development needs of their institution run the risk of having staff that are unable to meet the changing needs of the community and the school.

A needs analysis must be conducted, to meet the needs of all stakeholders. Current policy makes reference to this in a school improvement plan (SIP). This plan does not only consider improvement of financial and physical resources but also human resources. Bush (1994) identifies four levels of needs of an institution: individual, institutional, sub-units (subject departments) and external environment needs. Individual needs could range from educators needing computer literacy classes, for internet research or educators registering for the honours programme at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. Institutional needs could be a new computer programme to do learner's reports. Subject departments needs vary from employing a new lab technician to new machines for the woodwork workshops.

Once the identification process is completed, a report back should be given to staff highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the school and its staff. A formal, written policy for staff development must be adopted with the school's mission and vision in mind. Every educator must be given a copy and he or she must sign an acknowledgement to undergo the necessary training and constructively participate in workshops. Short and long term goals for staff development programmes must be decided on, because it is impossible to work on weaknesses in the school throughout the year with workshops as teaching would be disrupted and the financial implication would be great.

2.4.3 Forms of Staff Development

There are various forms of staff development differing from school to school and from individual to individual. Staff development is also dependent on the availability of funding.

In my communication with educators from different schools, many schools do not budget for staff development as they rely on the department to develop their staff. It is my opinion that every school's budget should have a percentage of its budget allocated to staff development.

Schools should encourage their staff to acquire more relevant expertise. For example, computer programmes like Photoshop for art educators or *AutoCAD* for technical drawing educators would develop educators to either produce better quality worksheets and examinations or to train their learners to use the above computer programmes. Educators must participate in formal programmes, like department workshops on Outcomes Based Education (OBE), General Education and Training (GET) or Further Education and Training (FET), as well as school workshops on discipline or Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS).   Educators should be encouraged to attend staff development workshops conducted by educator unions and subject associations so that they can gain more relevant knowledge, to use in teaching their subjects better.

Induction and mentoring programmes are used to help novice educators and experienced educators who are new to the schools to adjust to the new environment, ethos and policy of the school. Mentoring ensures that novice educators are guided, motivated and supported whilst maintaining their level of commitment to the school for a specified period of time. Bush (1994) argues that there is a strong link between mentoring and staff development since the mentoring process couples the expert with the novice educator. The expert trains, guides, monitors and evaluates the novice educator while teaching. The expert is someone who can give feedback, ask questions, share and discuss ideas and guide one through learning.

Should a educator not find the required expertise within the school to help develop his or her skills, then the educator can request assistance from

educators at other schools. Schools should make relevant literature available to their staff on aspects that they would like to improve on.

Lastly, the evaluation of a staff development programme assesses the effectiveness of the programme and allows management an opportunity either to improve on current staff development efforts or to identify other areas for improvement.

2.5 Performance Management, Performance Appraisal and Performance Related Pay systems from selected countries

A literature review shows that performance management, performance appraisal and performance related pay systems for educators have been in place for a number of years in countries like England, United States of America, Australia, and New Zealand. The introduction of these programmes was not smooth since the programmes generated controversy, debates and challenges when they were implemented. This literature review analyses the controversy, debates and challenges of educator performance management, performance appraisal and performance related pay systems in the above selected countries and then compares the systems to the South African educator appraisal system.

2.5.1. The Challenges of Performance Management in English Schools.

According to the research conducted by Brown (2005) the frequently encountered problems associated with performance management in English Schools relate to the following:

I. The performances of schools are judged by the Department for Education using their final year learner's English, Mathematics and Science results in English schools. These results are used to construct league or performance tables. The league table tends to favour schools in the

affluent areas with fewer social problems. The pressure of judging schools using the above criteria makes schools engage in practices which are not in the interest of the majority of their learners and is not educationally sound (Karsten, 2001).

This type of performance management system would not suit the South African context since it favoured schools in affluent areas and these affluent areas were favoured by the past government. This system would further advantage the previously advantaged population and therefore widen the gap between the social classes. The education system in our new democracy is trying to undo the injustices of the past educational systems by creating policies that will encourage equality in education delivery.

II. The performances of schools are judged on the final examination of the final year learners of both primary and secondary schools and neglects prior performances throughout the year. The final year tests are marked externally whilst the previous year tests are marked internally. This could lead to school submitting lower scores for the internally marked tests and in doing so raise the final year value added rating (Brown, 2005).

Whilst similar practices take place in South Africa where schools are judged on their final grade 12 examinations, the performances of learners throughout the year is incorporated into this mark in the form of a continuous assessment mark. The use of the value-added rating system would not suit the South African context since it required nationally set papers to be written and currently grades 9 to 11 write provincially set papers.

III. The use of the academic test scores of learners to measure the performance of educators according to Goldstein (2001) has its limitations including: some educators teach smaller classes than others, some

educators have educator assistants, some parents use part time tutors, learner's home or personal problems and finally learners performances are not based on the majority of the subjects taught.

The above comment by Goldstein (2001) about the English school system mirror the South African context since the inequalities of the past educational system has left some schools well resourced to such an extent that some educators teach smaller classes than others and some educators have educator assistance.

2.5.2. The Challenges of Performance Related Pay in USA Schools

The opposition from educators to the performance-related pay system in the USA led to its failure (Harvey- Beavis, 2003). The reasons for their opposition ranged from the reduction of educator autonomy, fairness of evaluations, educator demotivation and a highly politicised programme to sanctions which increased educator stress levels.

Legislators, school superintendents and school boards had the power to discontinue performance-based rewards in the USA (Ballou, 2001). The above scenario would be possible when supporting legislators left office or in times of economic recession. The costs of these programmes were more easily measured than the benefits in learner outcomes (Chamberlin, 2002).

The poorly designed, planned and implemented systems of the past had created difficulties in implementing new performance pay systems since educators were of the opinion that similar programmes did not work in the past, it will not work in the future (McCollum, 2001: 43). This failure of past systems in other states had cast doubts on any new system based on performance rewards. In comparison with the developmental appraisal system of South Africa, the educators I interviewed in this study echoed similar sentiments to that of McCollum (2001).

Their response to the question on how was the developmental appraisal system received by their school's educators, the participants said that educators were skeptical because similar appraisal systems failed in other countries. This negative attitude towards the system could have lead to the way in which developmental appraisal was implemented in schools.

The problems experienced in developing fair and reliable indicators for evaluation and training of evaluators to apply these indicators fairly and not undermine the fairness of the programme (Storey, 2000). The design of the system relied heavily on the indicators for evaluation and subjectivity of the evaluators. In comparison with DAS, the use of the words "outstanding" and "excellent" in the South African assessment document make the evaluation subjective.

2.5.3 The Challenges of the Performance Recognition Programme in Australia.

Educators in the Australian Performance Recognition Programme see the review process as an additional imposition placed on teaching (Credlin, 1999). The education system in South Africa is ever changing, with new policies being implemented to correct the injustices of the past however this has come at a price. The change in the curriculum to outcomes based education (OBE) has meant that educators had to re-training in areas of teaching methodology and assessments. The lack of adequate training in aspects of the curriculum has placed undue pressure on educators. Therefore educators interviewed in this study have indicated that the timing of the developmental appraisal system was wrong and has impacted on teaching and learning. At a time when educators should be getting to grips with the new curriculum and assessment methods, they are spending it on paperwork for the developmental appraisal system.

Educators interviewed in the Australian Performance Recognition Programme say they are aware of the professional enhancement of the programme should

time and resource be devoted to it (Credlin, 1999). The developmental appraisal system of South Africa encourages the professional development of its educators. However the time allocated to conduct the assessments of educators as well as the resources need to develop those educators requiring help has not been put in place by the education department.

A shortcoming of the Australian programme was the lack experience of the reviewer to perform his or her role of being an assessor (Credlin, 1999). This could have been avoided through proper training of educators on how to conduct an assessment. There was a lack of sufficient incentive for educators at their maximum level of pay and for those who were not on the incremental scale (Credlin, 1999). The inequality in terms of standardisation of pay increase would result in the educator who is receiving a less percentage increment not trying.

The Australian principals were unwilling to allow educators to access more than one level at a time for financial reasons (Credlin, 1999). The fact that the policy allows for educators to access more than one level of pay, should not be blocked on financial grounds. The financial implication of any policy must be reviewed before implementing that policy. No incentive for a young educator to perform better since there was no upward mobility (Credlin, 1999).

According to Credlin (1999), the performance recognition programme has the potential to enhance educator performance and in the long term improve learner outcomes. However the programme was inhibited by the lack of time provided for the implementation of the process. The educators were unanimous in their regret that more time was not available for discussions, to collate and present professional portfolios and for mutually agreed observations.

2.5.4 The Challenges of Educator Performance Appraisal in New Zealand

2.5.4.1 Key issues raised by trustees, principals and senior managers

There were concerns about school's resources, time and expertise needed to introduce and maintain the system (Cardno, 1999). These concerns were also not shared by the South African education department, when they chose to introduce the developmental appraisal system into school that were under resourced and lacked time because of a demanding curriculum.

The policy has a hierarchical approach to appraisal to meet the accountability aspect yet schools are developmental systems which employ a peer appraisal approach (Cardno, 1999). According to Cardno (1999) an appraisal system that incorporates peer appraisal will struggle to meet the accountability aspect. This implies that the South African appraisal system needs put strategies in place to monitor its peer appraisal aspect.

There should be on-going training for all staff as a key priority, which needs to be funded by the education department (Cardno, 1999). The introduction of the developmental appraisal in South Africa saw workshops being held as a once-off, with no follow-up session to clarify practical aspects of the policy.

2.5.4.2 The following recommendations from the facilitators for on-going training programmes were made to the ministry at the end of the project (Cardno, 1999):

- Training of key staff to train and support others should be a priority.
- Funding for schools to release staff to attend on and off site training.
- A flexible and multi-choice approach to the national programme allowing schools to select the most appropriate means to accessing advice and training.
- All change initiatives require a balance between pressure and support.

- There must be a commitment from schools to make funding available for appraisal a priority.
- Training for appraisal should recognise the complexity of this activity and prepare participants to manage dilemmas.

In response to the above recommendations the education ministry trained a further 85 schools in 1998 in the implementation of the mandatory requirements by developing the following skills in framework of dilemma management theory and practice (Cardno, 1999):

- Establishing appraisal systems and documents to record performance expectations and development objectives annually.
- Development of the essential components of classroom observation.
- Self-appraisal
- Techniques for professional dialogue and feedback.
- Appraisal interviews and reporting.

According to Cardno (1999) the structural problems associated with the new appraisal system and policy establishment lends themselves to structural solutions. Once the system moves beyond the initiation phase and institutionalisation of the change, the focus must move to deeper issues. Issues dealing with difficult performance appraisals that impact on the quality of teaching and learning (Cardno, 1999).

2.6 Educator Appraisal in South Africa

In the South African context, during the apartheid era, educators viewed evaluation or appraisal in a negative light as comments and reports made by inspectors were seen as being more judgmental than developmental. To replace the inspection system, a new system of appraisal known as the Developmental appraisal System (DAS) was designed.

The purpose of the Developmental appraisal System is to enhance the competency of educators, through educator professional development. The policy makes provision for a Development Support Group (DSG) which comprised: the appraisee, a peer and his or her immediate senior, who would facilitate the professional development of each educator.

The Staff development team (SDT) which comprises the principal, the whole school evaluation co-ordinator, elected members of the school's management team and elected post level one educators, who would facilitate all Development Support Group activities and the draw up of a school improvement plan (SIP).

The SIP is a comprehensive plan of action to develop the skills of educators and the teaching environment at individual schools. With structures like these in place in most schools, it would be worthwhile to do research to establish whether or not educators are being developed and whether their development leads to improved teaching and learning.

2.7 The purpose of developmental appraisal and educator development

According to van Deventer and Kruger (2003: 21), the aim of developmental appraisal is to facilitate the personal and professional development of educators in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning. A high quality educator development programme is an important means of refreshing, updating and expanding a educator's knowledge and skills. Performance appraisal and educator development inform and strengthen each other without duplication of structure and procedures (van Deventer and Kruger, 2003).

Performance appraisal is the evaluation of people in the workplace with regards to their job performance and potential for further development (Rademan and Vos, 2001: 54). It represents one of the most important interactions between

supervisors and subordinates and can either enhance or reduce the effects of other human resource management activities.

A well-developed appraisal system can be of mutual benefit to the individual, the school and the education department. The benefit to the individual can be seen in a educator's personal and professional development. The benefits of educator development are as follows:

- It enhances the personal and professional lives of educators.
- It sets groundwork for the implementation of the school's aims.
- It promotes shared values, equal opportunities and implements change.

The responsibility of educator development rests with both the individual educator and the school. The school must develop policies that make provision for resources that assist in staff development. This is done by the staff development team after analysing every educator's personal growth plan. Based on each educator's personal growth, a needs priority list is complied and based on this list, a school improvement plan is drawn up.

Each educator has a stake in his/her personal and professional development and should take responsibility for it. Development cannot be imposed on an individual; educators must own the development process or it will not happen (Blandford, 1997:135). This entails the educator identifying areas of strengths and weaknesses honestly so that actual development takes place and not a window dressing for appraisal.

Blandford (1997:206-207) suggests that schools may appoint a educator development co-ordinator who will be responsible for staff development. The Developmental appraisal System policy makes provisions for this in the form of the Whole School Evaluation co-ordinator who manages the processes in the developmental appraisal system and the staff development team. The whole

school evaluation co-ordinator is a member of the senior management team appointed by the principal and is often a deputy principal.

The effective management of educator development will be dependent on the management of the following:

- Information, which should be made available to all staff concerning development.
- Planning and collaboration for all people involved in development.
- Evaluation of all courses, based on a needs analysis for both individual and the school.
- Resources, which includes experts invited from other schools.
- Networking: this entails consulting with other teams and in-service providers.

2.8 School Improvement

The concept of school improvement is described by Hopkins and Lagerweij in Craft (2002:55) as being focussed on developing practical strategies to change practice. It entails developing a school improvement plan, which is concerned with the processes and internal knowledge base of a particular institution. School improvement strategies need to be aimed at the whole school level, the work group level and individual educator.

A school improvement plan consists of the following:

- A commitment to educator development.
- Practical efforts to involve all stakeholders in school policies and decisions.
- Effective coordination strategies.
- Attention to the benefits of enquiry and reflection.
- A commitment to collaborative planning activities.
- Transformational leadership approaches.

The above conditions result in the creation of opportunities for educators to feel more powerful and confident about their work. (Hopkins and Lagerweij in Craft ,2002)

According to Burnham and O'Sullivan (1998:23), school improvement is a direct function of leadership. Any model of improvement, effectiveness and change has its heart in the existence of leadership. The leader is finally accountable for ensuring the success of the school improvement plan.

2.9 The Guiding Principles of the South African Developmental appraisal System

According to van Deventer and Kruger (2003: 211), the developmental appraisal system must take into account the following guiding principles:

- The process of appraisal should be open, transparent and developmental.
- The appraisal of educators is in essence a developmental process which depends upon continuous support. It is designed and intended to entrench strengths, develop potential and overcome weaknesses.
- The process of appraisal should always involve relevant academic and management of staff.
- The appraisal should be inclusive of all stakeholders and its members should be trained to conduct the process of appraisal.
- Educators should be informed of all aspects of the appraisal process, so that they can take the initiative to conduct the process of appraisal.
- Prompt feedback by way of discussions and written communication to those who are being appraised should be one of the indispensable elements of appraisal.
- The appraisee has the right to have access to and respond to the appraisal report.

45

- The instrument for the appraisal should have appropriate criteria to appraise the nature and level of the work performed.

2.10 The South African Developmental appraisal System (DAS) process

The developmental appraisal system process consists of the following major appraisals: self appraisal, peer appraisal, senior appraisal and external appraisal (Gauteng Department of Education, 2003).

2.10.1 Self-Appraisal

Self-appraisal is used as a means of empowering workers, enhancing teamwork and raising awareness of quality (McKenna and Beech, 2002). Self-appraisal occurs when an educator undertakes self-analysis and introspection in terms of his performance, client questionnaire results as well as institutional development plans (Government Gazette, 1998).

Educator self-appraisal is a means to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in the administration and delivery of his lessons. It helps educators to focus on areas of need and identifies areas of their expertise to assist colleagues.

2.10.2 Peer Appraisal

Peer appraisal is the involvement of a colleague in assisting the appraisee to review his or her performance with a view to prioritizing professional development needs (Government Gazette, 1998). The observation of an educator in practice is the process through which a colleague on the appraisal panel will visit the workstation of the appraisee for the sole purpose of observing methods used by the educator and provide the necessary support (Government Gazette, 1998). The appraisal done by a peer involves educators evaluating each other and working together to assist in the areas where problems have

been identified. This could take the form of educators seeking assistance from other educators in the same grade/ school or from other institutions like the universities and the education department.

2.10.3 Senior Appraisal

Senior appraisal is done by first identifying a educator's immediate senior (supervisor or head of department) who is responsible for conducting his or her appraisal (Government Gazette, 1998). The supervisor is in the best position to observe the employee's behaviour and determine whether the employee has reached the specific goals and objectives (Carrell et al, 2000).

In my opinion, the inclusion of a senior appraiser in the Developmental appraisal System is a measure to ensure that the appraisals (peer appraisal and self-appraisal) are not biased and to maintain some control over the appraisee.

2.10.4 External Appraisal

External appraisals are done by people from outside the school which could be department officials for the purpose of whole school evaluation and educators from other schools in the case of a school not having a learning area specialist for a educator, to help with his or her development (Government Gazette, 1998). External appraisals could also be requested when a dispute that cannot be solved by the staff development team or the school's management team arises.

2.11 The roles and responsibilities of developmental appraisal teams in educator development

In exploring the roles and responsibilities of developmental appraisal teams, namely the Development Support Group (DSG), Staff development team (SDT)

and the School Management Team (SMT), I would be able to establish how these teams are contributing to educator development.

2.11.1 The Development Support Group (DSG)

The composition and selection of the development support group, for each educator must consist of:
- The Appraisee
- The educator's immediate senior (senior management person)
- A educator nominated by the appraisee (peer). The peer chosen must be selected on the basis of their expertise related to the educator's prioritised needs.
- Optional: union representative or expert from outside the school (subject advisor, university lecturer, etc) (Government Gazette, 1998).

The main purpose of the development support group is providing mentoring and support to the educator (ELRC, 2003). The development support group is responsible for the development of the educator's personal growth plan (PGP) and for the baseline evaluation of the educator. The development support group works with the staff development team (SDT), to incorporate the educator's plans for development into the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Finally, the development support group must verify the scores provided for the end of year performance measurement.

2.11.2 The School Management Team (SMT) and the Staff development team (SDT)

The composition and selection of the staff development team is made up of:
- The principal
- The whole school evaluation co-ordinator
- Elected members of the school's management team

- Elected post level one educators.

The number of members could be about 6 depending on the size of the school. A chairperson will be elected by the staff development team members at their first meeting (Government Gazette, 1998).

The staff development team (SDT) and school management team (SMT) mutually support each other in all matters relating to the Integrated Quality Management System; therefore share the same roles and responsibilities (ELRC, 2003).

The following are the roles and responsibilities of both the School Management Team and Staff development team:

- Ensures the training of all staff members in the procedures of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS).
- Develops and monitors the management plan for IQMS and the school improvement plan.
- Liaises with the department of education and other relevant service providers in the respect of INSET, short courses and skills programmes.
- Monitors that all records and documents related to IQMS are maintained.
- Completes all documentation necessary for performance measurement and submits these documents including the School Improvement Plan to the district office.
- Resolves differences between appraisees and their Development Support Groups (DSG).
- Liaises with the external Whole School Evaluation (WSE) team to manage the cyclical external WSE process.

2.12 Conclusion

This chapter provided a framework within which the research questions of this study can be answered. The educator appraisal systems of other countries and South Africa are examined to establish the background to the need for educator appraisal. The purpose of developmental appraisal, educator development and school improvement is explored giving me a theoretical framework of the study. The guiding principles of the developmental appraisal system and the processes of developmental appraisal helped me as a researcher to investigate the conditions that exist in the research sites. The role and responsibilities of developmental appraisal teams, namely the Development Support Groups (DSG), the Staff development team (SDT) and the School's Management Team (SMT), help to establish how these teams' are contributing to educator development.

Chapter three will explain the research methodology procedures followed by the researcher.

Chapter: Three
Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter the research methodology procedures are described. These include the research paradigm, location of the study, research instrument, sampling, reliability and ethical issues.

3.2 Research Paradigm

The methodology used in this study was qualitative in nature since the qualitative approach focuses on describing and interpreting actions and behaviour of the participants in their natural setting. Qualitative research makes it possible that the data collected becomes rich by describing the context, circumstances and feelings of the people involved in the study (De Vos et al, 2002). This qualitative study was conducted in the natural setting with the primary aim to get an in-depth description and understanding of actions and events. The study involved a case study of 2 schools in the Pinetown district. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 9 participants. The face-to-face interviews gave me the opportunity to construct a clear picture of perception of each participant and also allowed me to probe further any ambiguities in the participant's answers.

3.2.1 Case Study

A case study is an intensive study of a specific individual or specific context (De Vos et al, 2002). I used a case study because of its *flexibility*. Its design emphasised exploration instead of prescription and prediction. It is flexible in the sense that it allowed the participants to shape the interview process. I started with the broader questions on how developmental appraisal was received by the educators in each school. The participants gave the answers based on their

school's educators' actions. Then as each interview progressed, I narrowed down the questions to suit the context and participant's answers in the way developmental appraisal was received and implemented in each school. Based on each participant's response to my schedule of questions, I responded with a few questions to probe the context of the school's implementation of developmental appraisal. The flexibility of the interview schedule gave the participants the idea that I was not there just for the study but showed a concern for their problems they experienced with DAS.

The *emphasis on the context* allowed me to focus on a smaller group of educators who helped me to yield a "thick description" of each school's context. I chose to interview only those educators and management members involved with the Staff development team and Development Support Group of each school since my topic dealt specifically with the developmental role of teams within the developmental appraisal system. This allowed me to have a firsthand experience of each participant's role and responsibility in each of the teams and their environment.

As a researcher I am aware that there is an inherent subjectivity in using a case study as a methodology. The case study approach relies on the personal interpretation of data and lacks objectivity and rigour (Yin, 1989). To guard against the subjectivity aspect of interpreting the data I had to verify the data collected. I sent the transcripts back to the participants to verify what I had stated were a reflection of what they presented. This allowed me to refine my analysis and check the reliability of my findings.

3.3 The location of the study

The two schools participating in this study are located in an urban area within a radius of 20 kilometres from each other but are different in terms of social context. School A is located in a middle class urban area in Durban with a staff

composition of 56 white educators and 14 Indian educators. The learner composition is 440 white learners, 364 African learners, 251 Indian learners and 105 Coloured learners. The socio-economic backgrounds of most learners are from the middle class. The school has 70 staff members of which, there are the principal, 2 deputy principals, 5 heads of departments, 8 subject heads and 34 educators (this includes 25 governing body employed subject heads and educators).

School B is located in a township north of Durban with a staff composition of 25 Indian educators. The learner composition is 372 Indian learners and 157 African learners. The socio-economic backgrounds of most learners are from the working class.The school has 25 staff members comprising the principal, a deputy principal, 2 heads of departments and 22 educators (this includes 3 governing body employed educators).

The choice of two schools as a case study was informed by the challenges they faced in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system and educator development in general. The common challenges faced by both school are:
- finding the time to do classroom observation for appraisal
- monitoring of DSG activities to ensure fairness and transparency
- receiving support from the district office in respect of the SIP.

I have established a good working relationship with the principals and some staff of these schools over the years. Based on these interactions, I discovered that these 2 schools have experienced similar challenges in the implementation of the Developmental appraisal System and educator development. These schools are all well resourced in terms of physical and human resources and have the capacity to deliver quality education. The logical questions to ask at this point are: why are these schools unable to implement the developmental appraisal system though they have enough resources and capacity to do it? What are the challenges faced by the developmental appraisal teams in each school?

What I found intriguing was that though the schools were 20 km apart, they seemed to experience similar problems in the implementation of developmental appraisal system and educator development. The problems ranged from:

- educators initially being skeptical about the system during its introduction.
- educators not having the time to implement the system according to the policy because of time constraints and excessive workloads which lead to a window dressing and not a developmental exercise.
- educators lacking confidence in the system because of no monitoring or support from the district offices.

3.4 Sampling

The sampling used in this study was purposive. The choice of the participants was informed by their participation in the staff development team (SDT) and development support group (DSG). Their participation in the SDT and DSG made them knowledgeable about the processes, problems, challenges and intricacies in the appraisal proceedings.

The sample chosen consisted of 2 schools in the Pinetown district. In school A, the participants were the principal, the WSE co-ordinator, a member of the staff development team and 2 educators. In school B, the participants were the principal who is also the WSE co-ordinator, a member of the staff development team and 2 educators. The total number of participants in the study was 9. The choice of principal and WSE co-ordinator was informed by their management skills within the school management team and their responsibilities of drawing up the school improvement plan. The members of the staff development team were drawn in to solicit ideas around the issues of the implementation of the DAS policy in respect of guiding and monitoring the process. The post level 1 educators were chosen on the basis of the role they are expected to play in their various development support groups.

3.5 Research instrument

The research instrument used was a semi-structured interview. An interview is defined as a two-person conversation, initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-related information (Cohen and Manion, 1994). I used semi-structured interviews to gain a detailed picture of the participants' views on the implementation of DAS.

I drew up two interview schedules and interview notes pages to guide my discussions during the interview process. The first interview schedule was for the school principals, WSE co-ordinators and staff development team members and the second interview schedule was for the educators. The interview notes allowed me to summarise each participant's response during the interview, which I used later in the data analysis process. I also used the interview notes to write memos to myself for further action, example: find evidence to support participant's response to question 1.

3.5.1 The interviews

i) The interviews at school A

I phoned the principal of school A to set up an appointment for interviews at his school. The dates chosen for the interviews were according to the principal's availability. The interviews with the principal, WSE co-ordinators and staff development team member were conducted in their respective offices whilst the interviews with the educators were conducted in their classrooms. The time chosen for the interviews were in order of seniority which suited my aim which was to interview the management first and then to the educators later. The interviews with the principal of school A and the WSE co-ordinator were conducted in their respective offices. Each interview was an hour long and went on uninterrupted.

The interview with the staff development team member coincided with tea break where learners were playing outside the interview venue. There were interruptions as a result of the noise from the learners. The learners were asked to keep away from the office where the interview conducted. The interview with educator 1 and 2 went well but small disturbances from educators who did not realise that interviews were in progress. I had to accommodate the interruptions by allowing the visiting educator to speak to the participant since it was not their fault as they were not informed of the date of my arrival and which level 1 educator was going to be interviewed.

ii) The interviews at school B

When I phoned the principal of school B for the date of the interview he was more accommodating and told me to come on a day that suited me. I chose the day of my school's speech and awards day which meant I did not miss work with my learners. When I arrived at the school, I was introduced to the staff at the principal's morning staff meeting and I was introduced to the learners at assembly. At which point I had an opportunity to explain the purpose of my visit. The interview with the principal was conducted in his office. While the interview was in progress, the principal received a telephone call, which was about the school fundraising programme to be held 2 days later. The interviews with the staff development team member and both the level 1 educators were conducted in their classrooms. The fact that everyone knew that I was conducting interviews with those 3 staff members meant that all 3 interviews were uninterrupted.

3.5.2 The interview questions

In trying to answer research question 1: *What are the challenges facing schools in implementing DAS*? I asked the participants the following 2 questions: How has DAS contributed or inhibited teaching and learning at your school? and What are the challenges faced by the educators in the implementation of DAS?
Based on each participant's response to the question, I followed up with a new question to probe the context of the challenges the school's faced in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system.

To answer research question 2: *How has DAS been perceived and implemented at the school level?* I asked the participants the following question: How has developmental appraisal been received by your schools educator?

The principals, WSE co-ordinators and SDT members were asked to describe the support given to their educators by the teams involved in DAS namely, their SDT and DSG. The focus was aimed to address research question 3: *How are the DAS teams fulfilling their roles in educator development*? To verify the answers given by the staff development team members, the same questions were asked of their level 1 educators with the aim of establishing whether they received any support from their SDT and DSG.

The principals, WSE co-ordinators and SDT members were asked whether their school had a school improvement plan and if so, how successful the plan had been during the last 2 years. This was done to determine if the SDT knew that one of their developmental roles included the drawing up of a school improvement plan and if the district office monitored the DAS process at their schools. To triangulate the answers from management, I asked the level 1 educators if they had seen their school improvement plan.

The level 1 educators were asked how their Staff development team and Development Support Group were formed, to determine if their schools followed the policy document in constituting each of these teams. This was my final check to see if the implementation of DAS was in accordance with the policy guidelines.

3.6 Conclusion

The research methodology procedures described in this chapter are as follows: the research paradigm used was a qualitative case study. The location of the study was based at 2 schools in the Pinetown district. The research instrument used was a semi-structured interview. The sampling used in this study was purposive sampling since the research questions required that specific members of staff be interviewed. The reliability and trustworthiness of the study was ensured through a process of field notes, interview notes and member checking. The ethical issues were overcome through the use of informed consent.

Chapter 4 will cover the presentation of the findings.

Chapter: Four

Presentation of the Findings

4.1   Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis techniques used in the study and the research findings from the participant's responses. The data was analysed through an inductive process of open coding. The data is presented in a verbal description, in order to present a clear picture of the responses. The actual words of the participants were used to describe the participants lived experiences.

4.2   Data analysis

I transcribed each interview verbatim with each transcript having enough space between lines and a wide margin for the writing of notes and codes. In my reading of the text, I looked for common themes and patterns. Each theme was given a code. The codes were checked to make sure that they were related to the research questions. I read the whole transcript again to check the codes for coherence.

4.3   Presentation of the data

Since there were two sets of interview questions targeting, first, the principals, whole school evaluation co-ordinators, and staff development team members and second, the 4 post level one educators, I categorised their responses into similar two sets. I decided first to, present the questions that were asked and second, followed by the participant's responses. Third, I discussed the implications of the participant's responses.

4.3.1 Responses from the principals, whole school evaluation co-ordinators and staff development team members.

4.3.1.1 How has the developmental appraisal system been received by your school's educators?

The responses to this question varied greatly in accordance with the positions the interviewees occupied. For example, the principals of both schools A and B concurred on the issue of the developmental appraisal being an additional burden for their educators as it made them focus on more than one policy change. They believed that the developmental appraisal system was a good programme, although the timing of the programme clashed with other existing programmes which required their equal attention. In this regard, the most important was the change in curriculum to outcomes based education. The principal of school A said "*it is a good system that came at the wrong time, a time when educators are busy with a new curriculum and other paperwork from the department*".

The number of changes in educational policy came at a rapid pace with the educators at grassroots level not having enough training on how to implement them. Schools did not have the resources or the human capacity to manage the change in curriculum to outcomes based education which led to frustration and anxiety amongst many educators, this was further compounded by a policy on educator developmental appraisal. Therefore the frustration due to the outcomes based education (OBE) policy was redirected to the developmental appraisal system (DAS) policy.

The whole school evaluation co-ordinator of school A was of the view that educators in his school reacted to DAS with skepticism. This opinion was shared with the principal of school B who felt that DAS was received with skepticism as the educators in his school saw it as the return of the old inspectorate system of

evaluating educators using the DAS platform. This notion of it being a return of the inspectorate system of evaluating educators opened old wounds for many educators and caused resistance to its implementation.

This could have been avoided by the Education Department by first making honest consultations and providing training at the grassroots level. The training and consultation done was obviously not enough since the interviews conducted in school A and school B revealed that they were no consulted before the implementation of DAS and that the cascading model used to train them was not effective in training them.

The whole school evaluation co-ordinator of school A and the staff development team member of school B found that educator's reactions to the developmental appraisal system were divided. Some educators regarded the developmental appraisal system as an opportunity to develop themselves to qualify for a 1% pay progression while others viewed the developmental appraisal system as an extra burden on their already busy work schedule. The developmental appraisal system and the performance management (1% pay progression) are two separate processes in IQMS, DAS is meant to develop educators and PM is used for salary or grade progression.

The principal of school A alleged that some educators in his school did not take the process of evaluation and scoring educators seriously as they were of the opinion that the department did not have the capacity to externally monitor the evaluation process or moderate each educator's scores. This opinion was shared with the 2 post level one educator's views at school A. Whilst this may have been true at the stage of implementation, this also shows a weakness in the internal monitoring and moderation process used by the principal of school A and the staff development team of school A. The policy requires that the principal and staff development team members monitor every stage of each educator's appraisal and development.

4.3.1.2 How does the developmental appraisal system contribute or inhibit the teaching and learning in your school level?

All educators and principals interviewed concurred that the developmental appraisal system contributed to teaching and learning in many ways. Educators highlighted that for the first time they were able to reflect on their teaching practice and were able to refine their teaching methods. The principals mentioned that before the introduction of DAS, principals did not know what and how educators were teaching. Now using the data filled in on forms during lesson observations, the principal could understand what was going on in the classrooms.

However the whole school evaluation co-ordinator of school A and principal of school B were also of the opinion that DAS inhibited teaching and learning. The whole school evaluation co-ordinator of school A argued that the developmental appraisal system inhibited teaching and learning since it removed a educator from his or her class to do the assessment of a colleague. In order to do the assessment of her colleagues, the HOD of school B must find another educator or a parent to take care of her class while she does class observations as the senior.

According to the principal of school B, the paperwork needed for the developmental appraisal system can "*tie down a good educator and have a negative effect in the classroom*" since the educator has to find the time to do the extra paperwork required by DAS.

4.3.1.3 What are the challenges and problems faced by the educators in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system?

A common challenge highlighted by all the participants was the lack of time to assess their colleagues since their timetables had not been designed to cater for this.

School B is a primary school where the foundation phase phase educators were unable to do classroom observations as all foundation phase educators remain with their class for the entire day. However, the school principal worked around this by organizing parents to act as relief educators during the time of assessment. From my interactions with other primary school educators over the years, this challenge is not unique to this school but all foundation phase phase educators in South Africa.

School A is a secondary school with a timetabling challenge related to developmental appraisal system since educators teaching in the further education and training phase (grade: 10, 11 and 12) teach the same subject to the same grade at the same time, though in different classes. This means that when a educator is teaching a grade 11 French class, his peer and senior is teaching the same grade and subject in another class. The educators worked around this problem by doing classroom observations only in grade 8 and 9 classes. However this created problems for some educators and heads of departments who only taught grade 10, 11 and 12 classes.

In 2007, Kwazulu Natal educators engaged in a strike for one month demanding a higher salary increase. The principal of school B highlighted the fact that the national educators strike delayed the developmental appraisal system process. Despite this, the department of education did not extend the evaluation submission date. This resulted in some schools making up scores without being evaluated.

4.3.1.4   How have the educators in your school been supported by the teams within the developmental appraisal system, namely development support group and the staff development team?

The responses from participants revealed that both schools had more active development support groups than staff development teams. The development of each educator is the responsibility of both the DSG and SDT. The staff development team of school A played an administrative role whilst the staff development team of school B met as a team and provided developmental workshops where needed. Confirming this practice the principal of school A stated that, "*The staff development team has not been as active as it could be*". This statement was confirmed by the whole school evaluation co-ordinator of school A when he said, "*The staff development team has not functioned well due to time constraints*".

The staff development team member of school A viewed his school's, development support groups as being more active than the staff development team and any support given, was centered at the development support group level. He also said that the staff development team is a more formal structure. In my opinion, the use of the words "formal structure" and the tone in which it was said, leads me to believe that the staff development team was formed to satisfy the policy but in practice did not function.

According to the principal and staff development team member of school B, both the development support group and the staff development team played an active role in the development of educators. The principal of school B stated that the development support group provided developmental support to the individual educator it served whilst the staff development team conducted workshops that helped with classroom discipline, computer training and isiZulu classes.

4.3.1.5   Does your school have a school improvement plan and has it been successful in the last 2 years?

All the participants from school A agreed that they do not have a school improvement plan since their school operates on a "similar plan" called the strategic plan. The governing body, in consultation with all their stakeholders draws this up. When probing this, I found that the strategic plan deals with the upgrade of the facilities and marketing of the school and does cover educator appraisal and development.

When I probed further about the school improvement plan and it being needed by the ward manager, the whole school evaluation co-ordinator of school A said "*We have not submitted a plan for the past 2 years. The ward has not requested a school improvement plan.*" In my opinion, school A was not familiar with the requirements of the policy which required them to draw a school improvement plan based on the developmental needs of their educators. They are then required to implement that plan to ensure the successful development of each educator. The response of the whole school evaluation co-ordinator led me to believe that during the last 2 years, educator development had not taken place or none of their educators needed help. I found the latter hard to believe.

The participants of school B were all familiar with their school improvement plan and were able to show me a copy of their school improvement plan. The staff development team member of school B said that their educators identified a need to learn isiZulu and computer literacy and the SDT organized for these educators to attend courses. The principal of school B praised his SDT for draw up a school improvement plan that met the needs of their educators who wanted to learn computer literacy, now he has competent educators who can type their our worksheets and examinations.

4.3.2 Responses from the post level 1 educators

4.3.2.1   How did the developmental appraisal system help you in teaching and learning at your school?

The responses from all participants revealed that the developmental appraisal system made them examine their teaching practices. It forced all participants to write something down on the form regarding their areas of weakness and once written on paper, they were required to act on it and show improvement in that area.

Educator 1 of school A said "*the developmental appraisal system made me aware of my shortcomings and forced me to solve the problem areas*".

Educator 2 of school A stated that "*it forced me to write something down and to show improvement. I would have never looked at those issues if it was not for the developmental appraisal system*".

Educator 1 of school B admitted that he assumed he knew everything and never evaluated himself, but the developmental appraisal system helped him to evaluate his strengths and weaknesses. The realization only came when he was filling in each criterion in the document.

Educator 2 of school B was grateful for the opportunity to identify weaknesses in his teaching and for the support he received from his peers and management team members.

4.3.2.2 What are the problems that your school has faced in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system?

The responses from all the participants revealed that the problem faced by educators in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system was that of understanding the developmental appraisal policy.

Educator 2 of school A said that he found the paperwork initially confusing since the workshop conducted at school did not explain clearly how to complete the paperwork.

Educator 1 of school B was frustrated with the cascading model of workshops he attended since he believed that these are "watered down" versions of the policy.

4.3.2.3 What problems and challenges face the educators at your school in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system?

The responses from each participant to this question were varied. Educator 1 of school A reported that there was resistance to the system by a few staff members which required staff to buy into the system and a change in mindset.

Educator 2 of school A said that time was a challenge with the introduction of the general education and training (GET) and further education and training (FET), staff had to attend workshops, cover new syllabi and do more assessments which resulted in very little time left to think of the developmental appraisal system.

Educator 1 of school B complained that the stress of completing work according to the work schedule and the context of the school put pressure on their educators to finish their observations and paperwork.

Educator 2 of school B confessed that the filling of the forms was confusing and required staff to be workshopped on, interalia, the rating scale, identification of strengths and weaknesses and the drawing up of personal growth plans.

4.3.2.4 **How were the staff development team and your development support group formed?**

The responses from all participants revealed that both schools' staff development teams were formed by a process of voting at their initial developmental appraisal staff meeting. The individual development support groups were formed differently in each school due to the fact that one is a primary school and the other a secondary school. To ensure that subject specialist were part of each development support, the primary school development support groups were formed within phases (foundation phase and intermediate phase) and the secondary school's development support groups were formed within subject areas.

4.3.2.5 **How are you supported by your development support group and staff development team in your teaching and professional development?**

The responses from the participants in school A reveal that all their support came from their individual development support groups and the support from their staff development team was non-existent.

Educator 1 of school A raised concerns that all his support came from his peer and that the staff development team just collated the paperwork.

Educator 2 of school A concurred with Educator 1 when he said *"there is no support for me or for other staff members from our staff development team".*

The responses from the participants in school B revealed that their staff development team had supported their educators by conducting school workshops on discipline, learner assessment and opportunities for professional development in Computer and isiZulu courses at the local educational resource center.

Educator 1 of school B praised the school for conducting workshops every Tuesdays. Educator 2 of school B reported that he attended computer courses up to level 2 and currently some educators were attending the level 3 course.

4.4   Conclusion

This chapter presented the research findings of the responses of the participants to the interview questions. The findings reveal that some participants are following the developmental appraisal system to the best of their ability based on their context and using it to their advantage to develop themselves whilst other participants see developmental appraisal as an extra burden on their already busy schedule. The implementation of the developmental appraisal system comes at a time when educators are required to implement other change innovations like further education and training. The policy of developmental appraisal does not take into account contextual factors like the timetable and educators driven fundraising.

The findings also reveal that in order for the system to work effectively and not just a paper chase, there must be a more effective monitoring system in place from the school and the department of education.

Chapter 5 will discuss the recommendations and conclusion.

Chapter: Five

Recommendations and Conclusion

5.1   Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide recommendations based on the research findings discussed in chapter 4 and to draw conclusions on the research project. In the research findings it has been clear that schools are not implementing the developmental appraisal system as required by the policy document. To deal with this problem it is important that attention be given to the areas of support from the department of education in the form of training the school's management teams, the school's development teams and educators.

It was also found that department officials did not monitor nor evaluate how developmental appraisal was put into practice. The monitoring and evaluation of any policy is key to a successful policy implementation. It becomes clear that the department officials need to be developed in order to understand their roles in the developmental appraisal process. Monitoring mechanisms need to be introduced, so that department of education can evaluate and monitor the developmental appraisal system at all levels including the ward and district offices.

5.2   Recommendations

5.2.1 Strategies to support the developmental appraisal system at schools

The study found that developmental appraisal teams, namely the staff development team (SDT) and the development support group (DSG) were not adequately trained on how to execute their functions in developmental appraisal, performance management and whole school evaluation. The training mechanism used for this policy was the cascading model which resulted into the policy not

being clearly understood by all educators. The department of education needs to develop strategies that would shape the training programmes in schools. Starting with the school management team (SMT), the staff development team (SDT) and the individual development support groups (DSG). This will probably enable them to perform their developmental roles effectively.

The two schools researched in this study indicated that they provide their own support to their educators. The training provided by the department was not enough and too limited. After this training there were no follow-up workshops on the topic and no departmental support for the training and implementation of the policy.

The suggestion by one of the participants from school: B was that "*the department of education make a DVD that covers all the important aspects of the developmental appraisal system which can be played at the school workshops*". The DVD together with the cascading model is a good way of getting the message of how to implement the developmental appraisal system to the educators at every school.

The research found that members of the staff development team did not actively drive the appraisal system which led to the level 1 educators losing interest in their own appraisal and development. This resulted in the level 1 educators completing their forms for the sake of getting their 1% pay increase. It is my recommendation that to avoid this, the staff development team must meet regularly to check on the progress of each educator's personal growth plan and give feedback (positive or negative) to the educator and his DSG. The department of education must provide training for new educators as well those who need a refresher course before every developmental cycle.

The research found that there was insufficient time to do educator appraisal and development under the current system of timetabling. All participants from the principal to the level 1 educator mentioned time as the major challenge to educator appraisal and educator development. In the foundation phase school, there is a peculiar problem. All HOD's are full time educators with no free periods to do appraisals which means finding a replacement educator for that lesson.

It is my recommendation that a specific time during the school day is set aside for educator development. This time can be used by the staff development team to meet and work on the school improvement plan. Each individual development support group can use this time to provide support to the appraisee. Finally based on the school improvement plan, the staff development team can plan workshops during this time to assist educators to develop areas of weaknesses.

5.2.2 Strategies to evaluate and monitor the developmental appraisal system

The Department of education must develop strategies to evaluate and monitor the developmental appraisal system and educator development at all levels from the school to the district office.

The study revealed that all participants from both schools lacked confidence in the appraisal system since they did not receive feedback or development support from the ward or district office. The fact that the department of education has not given feedback to the schools studied creates the impression that the Department of education does not take educator appraisal seriously.
The management member at school A stated that

> *Some educators see the developmental appraisal system as an extra*
> *burden on their already busy schedule and besides, that we do not receive*
> *feedback from the department of education after submitting our scores.*

This is further confirmed by the comments of the principal of school B who said
We are required to submit our school improvement plan by a certain date to the ward but we have never seen a ward improvement plan or a district improvement plan, why is that so?

To create confidence amongst educators and school management, it is important that the ward managers play a more active role of monitoring and supporting the principal and their staff development teams. This can be done by setting up meetings with all staff to discuss their school improvement plan. The ward manager must provide training workshops tailored to the specific needs of each school.

In my opinion the reward of 1% of salary increase awarded for a satisfactory assessment of a educator, reduces the educator evaluation programme into a money making scheme. Educators conducted assessments to satisfy this criterion rather than having a developmental purpose.

It is my recommendation that the school management team and the staff development team monitor all evaluations taking place during the assessment cycle. This can be done by requesting all development support groups to submit dates for classroom visits and details of the visit after the observation. It is important for the Department of education to rethink the whole programme by removing the salary increase from the scheme.

5.2.3 Strategies to compensate for the challenges faced by each school based on their context

The Department of education must develop new strategies to enhance the implementation of the developmental appraisal system based on the understanding of the challenges faced by individual schools' context.

During the interviews with both the principals, it was found that the problem facing schools is that the policy does not take into consideration the context of each school. The educator strike of 2007 is a good example of how the policy does not consider the context of the situation. The strike lasted a month during which educators were unable to do assessments of each other. However, the due date for the submission of scores to the department of education was not extended to compensate for the time lost. This could have been avoided if the officials from the department of education had the foresight to extend the deadlines to allow educators to implement educator appraisals fairly without any rush.

The study revealed a common challenge faced by both schools of finding the time to do classroom observations. When the scheme is implemented, it means that one post level 1 educator leaves his or her class and goes to another class to evaluate his or her peer. It is my recommendation that the assessment cycle be extended to 2 years to allow for 2 observations to be conducted in the first year and the administration of the scores and educator development programmes in the second year. Over the period of 2 years there will be more time to do appraisals, more free lessons and less time spent out of the class.

In school B it was found that the foundation phase educators had no free periods to evaluate other educators. The head of department of the foundation phase phase in school B says

> One of the challenges I experienced was the fact that in order to assess my educators, I have to leave my learners to do the assessment. The school organises a parent to sit with my learners so that I am made free to do the observation.

It is my recommendation that the Department of education sends a substitute educator who has the expertise in foundation phase teaching to fill in for the

educator who is being evaluated. This substitute educator will have to perform all teaching related activities in the class educator's absence.

The findings from school A revealed that the implementation of the developmental appraisal system came at a time when their educators were required to implement other change innovations like further education and training (FET). The participants in school A, which is a high school, have been bombarded with new curriculum changes. The first curriculum change was the introduction of general education and training (GET) in grades 8 and 9 in 2004 and 2005 respectively and then the second change was the further education and training (FET) in grades 10 and 11 in 2006 and 2007 respectively.

This new curriculum has come with syllabus changes and new assessment criteria which required educators to attend workshops to be trained in the new syllabus and a total overall in most subject areas. Educators have to prepare new notes and new assessments based on the changed syllabus. The developmental appraisal system had come at the same time when the syllabus changes were introduced. This put a further strain on the educators. This situation could have been avoided if the department of education introduced one change at a time.

5.3   Limitations of the study

In KZN, there are about 6000 schools. Obviously, these schools have different contexts which may shape how they deal with educator appraisal. In my study, it was not possible to include all schools, since it is a case study. The advantage of a case study is that it is an intensive study of a specific context (De Vos et al, 2002). The emphasis on the context allowed me to focus on a smaller group of educators who helped me to yield a "thick description" of each school's context. This allowed me to have a firsthand experience of each participant's role and responsibility in each of the teams in their environment.

In this in-depth study, though limited in the number of schools involved, I was able to identify the challenges faced by the schools. Since all schools cannot be accommodated in this study, the limitation of the study is that only two schools from the Pinetown district were involved, with 9 participants. Therefore the findings of the study cannot be generalised.

5.4   Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore to what extent developmental appraisal teams, namely the Development Support Group (DSG), the Staff development team (SDT) and the School Management Team (SMT), contribute to educator development in schools.

In exploring the developmental roles of the DSG, SDT and SMT, I found that these teams lacked the necessary training, support and monitoring from the department of education. As a result the staff development teams were not actively involved in educator appraisals and educator development. This led to educators losing confidence in the system and ended up doing the paperwork for the purpose of receiving their 1% pay progression.

In order for the developmental appraisal system to work effectively, there must be more effective monitoring from the department of education. The scores of every educator must be moderated both internally by the staff development team and externally by the ward and district managers. The scores between wards and districts must also be moderated for consistency across the province. There must be greater support and training given to the developmental appraisal teams of every school to help them fulfill their roles of educator development. Finally there must be accountability at all levels of the developmental appraisal system from the educator to the ward and district managers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Federation of Educators (2001). Merit pay. www.aft.org visited 20/02/2008

Andersen, B; Henriksen, B and Aarseth, W (2006). Holistic performance management: An integrated framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 55*(1), 61-78

Bacal, R (1996). *Performance Management – Why Doesn't It Work?* Performance Management – A Briefcase Book. Ontario: McGraw – Hill

Ballou, D (2001). Pay for Performance in public and private schools. *Economics of Education Review, 20*(2), 51-61

Barber, L and Klein, K (1983). Merit pay and Educator evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappa, 65*(4), 247- 251

Blandford, S (1997). *Middle management in school: How to harmonise managing and teaching for an effective school.* Britain: Pearson Ed. Ltd

Brown, A (2005). Implementing Performance Management in England's primary schools. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 54* (5), 468- 481

Burnham, J and O'Sullivan, F (1998). *Leadership and professional development.* London: Pitman

Bush, T and West-Burnham, J (1994), (Eds). *The Principles of Educational Management.* Longman: Glasgow.

Cardno, C (1999). Appraisal policy and implementation issues for New Zealand schools. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 13*(2), 87-97

Carrell, M.R; Elbert, N.F; Hatfield, R.D; Grobler, P. A; Marx, M and van der Schyf, S (2000). *Human Resource Management in South Africa.* Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa

Cawood, J and Gibbon, J. (1985). *Educational leadership: Staff Development.* National Book Printers – Nasou Ltd: Goodwood.

Chamberlin, R; Wragg, T; Haynes, G and Wragg, C (2002). Performance-related pay and the teaching profession. *Research Papers in Education, 7*(1), 31-49

Cohen, L and Manion, L (1994). *Research methods in education.* 4th edition. London and New York: Routledge

Craft, A (2002). *Continuing professional development.* 2nd edition. USA: Routledge and Falmer

Cutler, T and Waine, B (1999). Rewarding Better Educators: Performance Related Pay in Schools. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 27*(1), 55-70

Cutler, T and Waine, B (2000). Mutual Benefits or Managerial Control? *British Journal of Educational Studies, 48*(2), 170- 182

De Vos, AS; Strydom, H; Fouche,CB; Poggenpoel, M and Schurink, EW (2002). *Research at grassroots. A primer for the caring profession.* Pretoria: van Schaik

Department of Education (1999). *Manual for Developmental appraisal.* Department of Education and Culture. Pretoria: Government Printers

Dye, TR (2005). *Understanding Public Policy.* Pearson: New Jersey

Education Labour Relations Council. (2003). Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003. Integrated Quality Management Systems. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Evans, D (2001). No merit in merit-pay. *American School Journal, 188*(1), 48-50

Everard, K.B. and Morris, G. (1996). *Effective school Management: Managing People.* Paul Chapman Publishing: London.

Florida Department of Education (2006). Florida State Board of Education approves first STAR Plan. Press Release 17 October 2006. www.fldoe.org

Gauteng Department of Education (2003).   *The Developmental Appraisal Process.* Pretoria: Government Printers

Goldstein, H (2001). Using learner performance data for judging schools and educators: Scope and Limitations. *British Educational Research Journal, 27*(4), 433- 442

Harvey-Beavis, O (2003). Performance-Based Rewards for Educators. Attracting, *Developing and Retaining Effective Educators. June 2003*

Hendry, C; Bradley, P and Perkins, S. (1997). Missed a Motivator. *People Management.* May pp 20-25

Holt, M (2001). Performance Pay for Educators: The Standards Movement's Last Stand. *Phi Delta Kappa, 83*(4), 317- 321

James, C and Colebourne, D (2004). Managing the Performance of Staff in LEAs in Wales. *Educational Management Administration Leadership, 32*(1), 45-65

Karsten, S; Visscher, A and De Jong, T (2001). Another side to the coin: The unintended effects of the publication of school performance data in England and France. *Comparative Education,* 37(2), 231-42

Kelley, C (2000). Douglas County Colorado Performance Pay Plan. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin. May 2000*

Lekome, BP (2007). *Professional development of primary school educators through the developmental appraisal system. M. Ed Thesis*. University of Pretoria: South Africa

McCollum, S (2001). How merit pay improves education. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 21-24

McKenzie, C (2007). Linking people, performance and profit**.** *Performance Management, Leadership Training and Development, 34*(1), 34-39

McKenna, E and Beech, N (2002). *Human Resource Management.* London: Prentice Hall

McNamara, C (2007). Performance Management: Benefits and Concerns. Field Guide to Consulting and Organisational Development. www.managementhelp.org visited 19/02/2008

Murnane, R and Cohen, D (1986). Merit Pay and the Evaluation Problem: Why most merit pay plans fail and a few survive? *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(1), 1-17

Naicker, S and Waddy, C. (2003). Managing people in schools. *Towards effective school management: Manual: 7*. Maskew Miller Longman: Natal Printers.

Naidoo, K (2004). *Challenges that come with the implementation of the developmental appraisal system. MBA*: UKZN

Naidoo, DE (2006). *The impact of the integrated quality management on school leadership. Med.* University of Johannesburg: South Africa

Odden, A (2000). Paying Educators for Performance. *School Business Affairs. June*, pp 2-31

Podgursky, MJ and Springer, MG (2007). Educator Performance Pay: A Review. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 26*(4), 909 - 949

Ramirez, A (2001). How merit pay undermines education. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 16- 20

Rademan, DJ and Vos, HD (2001). Performance appraisals in the public sector. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 27*(1), 54-60

Republic of South Africa (1998) Government Gazette: *Employment of Educators Act. No 76 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Solomon, L and Podgursky, M (2001). *The Pros and Cons of Performance-Based Compensation.* Milken Family Foundation, Pascadena

Steyn, G.M. (2001). Theme 1: *Managing Human Resources.* University of South Africa: Pretoria.

Storey, A (2000). A leap of faith? Performance pay for educators. *Journal of Education Policy, 15*(5), 509-523

Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (1999). *Effective Educational Management.* ABC Press: Cape Town.

Van Deventer, I and Kruger, AG (2003). *An educator's guide to school management skills.* Pretoria: van Schaik

Yin, R. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

revision –23.02.10 (21 932 words)

Annexure A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Questions to the principals, whole school evaluation co-ordinators and staff development team members.

1 How has the developmental appraisal system been received by your school's educators?

2 How does the developmental appraisal system contribute or inhibit the teaching and learning in your school level?

3 What are the challenges and problems faced by the educators in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system?

4 How have the educators in your school been supported by the teams within the developmental appraisal system, namely development support group and the staff development team?

5 Does your school have a school improvement plan and has it been successful in the last 2 years?

Questions to the post level 1 educators

1 How did the developmental appraisal system help you in teaching and learning at your school?

2 What are the problems that your school has faced in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system?

3 What problems and challenges face the educators at your school in the implementation of the developmental appraisal system?

4 How were the staff development team and your development support group formed?

5 How are you supported by your development support group and staff development team in your teaching and professional development?

Annexure B

Pragashen Chetty

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Edgewood Campus

Private Bag X03

Ashwood

3605

21 February 2007

The Principal

Dear Sir

Re: Request for permission to do research in your school.

I hereby request your permission to conduct research in your school. My name is Pragashen Chetty and I am a learner at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Edgewood campus in the Faculty of Education. As part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education, I am required to conduct research and to interview principals and educators concerning the role of developmental appraisal teams in educator development in schools.

The objective of my study is to explore to what extent developmental appraisal teams, namely the School Management Team (SMT), the Development Support Group (DSG) and Staff development team (SDT), contribute to educator development in schools. In exploring the role and development objectives of the school management team (SMT), the development support group (DSG) and the staff development team (SDT), I would be able to have a clear understanding whether or not these teams meet their development objectives and whether their development leads to improved teaching and learning.

The research questions are as follows:

1) What are the challenges faced by schools in the implementation of DAS?
2) How is DAS perceived and implemented at the school level?
3) How are the DAS teams satisfying their roles in the development of educators?

The research technique I will use will be the semi-structured interview. The interviews will take 20 minutes for each participant.

The sample will be purposively chosen since:

- The principal and whole school evaluation coordinator are both responsible for advocacy, training and implementing the Developmental appraisal System at school.
- The Staff development team member is responsible for coordinating and monitoring staff development.
- The post level 1 educators, who are part of a DSG, is responsible for the evaluation, mentoring and support of the educator.

The findings from this study will be used in writing my dissertation. The names of the participants and their schools will not be divulged in my dissertation and subsequent writings.

If you have any questions, you may contact me on 0315056731 or 0727515527. You may also contact my supervisor at Edgewood, Mr Sibusiso Bayeni on 0312607026.

Yours faithfully

Pragashen Chetty

Annexure C

Pragashen Chetty

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Edgewood Campus

Private Bag X03

Ashwood

3605

21 February 2007

Dear Participant

Re: Request for your participation in my research project.

My name is Pragashen Chetty and I am a learner at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Edgewood campus in the Faculty of Education. As part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education, I am conducting several interviews with principals and educators concerning the role of developmental appraisal teams in educator development in schools.

The objective of my study is to explore to what extent developmental appraisal teams, namely the School Management Team (SMT), the Development Support Group (DSG) and Staff development team (SDT), contribute to educator development in schools. In exploring the role and development objectives of the school management team (SMT), the development support group (DSG) and the staff development team (SDT), I would be able to have a clear understanding whether or not these teams meet their development objectives and whether their development leads to improved teaching and learning.

The research questions are as follows:
1) What are the challenges faced by schools in the implementation of DAS?
2) How is DAS perceived and implemented at the school level?

3) How are the DAS teams satisfying their roles in the development of educators?

The research technique I will use will be the semi-structured interview. The interviews will take 20 minutes for each participant.

The sample will be purposively chosen since:
- The principal and whole school evaluation coordinator are both responsible for advocacy, training and implementing the Developmental appraisal System at school.
- The Staff development team member is responsible for coordinating and monitoring staff development.
- The post level 1 educators, who are part of a DSG, is responsible for the evaluation, mentoring and support of the educator.

I request you to participate in my research project. I also request that you give me permission to ask you questions and to tape record our discussions, so that I will be able to analyse the information that you give me. Your name and the name of your school will not be will not be linked to any of the information that you provide. The findings from this study will be used in writing my dissertation. You are not obliged to answer all of the questions asked and are free to withdraw from the study at anytime and free to stop the tape-recording at anytime. However your full participation and honest answers will assist me to come up with "true" findings.

If you have any questions, you may contact me on 0315056731 or 0727515527. You may also contact my supervisor at Edgewood, Mr Sibusiso Bayeni on 0312607026.

Yours faithfully
Pragashen Chetty

Annexure D

Annexure E