

✓

**EXPLORING MANAGEMENT MEMBERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE
DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM**

BY

M NAIDOO

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE**

OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AT THE

UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN—WESTVILLE

SUPERVISOR: DR R SOOKRAJH

JANUARY 2002



DECLARATION

I declare that "Exploring Management Members' Attitudes towards the Developmental Appraisal System" is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



M. NAIDOO

202-04-18

DATE:

ABSTRACT

The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) replaces an autocratic, judgemental and summative system which did not take into account the differing contextual factors that affect an educator's work. Often an inspector would arrive unannounced, observe a lesson, judge the educator and leave without offering any feedback. There was also very little understanding that ongoing professional development should be a part of all educators' lives. As a result educators feared and mistrusted the evaluation process.

When this form of control was rejected, very little replaced it in the form of making sure that quality teaching and learning was taking place in the classroom.

The post – apartheid government has put into place a number of policies and strategies to ensure that quality education takes place in our schools. One of the most important has been the developmental appraisal system. This system allows the educator to identify his own development needs through a democratic and formative process together with the participation of education managers, peers and experts. It is one of the tools that, if supported by the establishment of structure and systems, can have a major impact on our present education system.

This case study is a qualitative study of the attitudes of the management members of Clairwood Secondary School towards the Developmental Appraisal System. The study aims to capture to some extent the views, feelings, attitudes and perceptions of the school's management towards DAS. The interviews with members of management has provided me with direct evidence of management's attitudes towards DAS.

The overall impression gained from the study was that all members of management were favourably disposed towards DAS. DAS was found to be a good system and that it would definitely have a positive impact on whole school development.

DAS allowed educators to talk about, review and reflect on their work, and to receive helpful and supportive advice and guidance.

The DAS approach is developmental and it is important at the planning stage to build in time for reflection and for developing strategies for improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to the following:

Dr R Sookrajh, my supervisor, for her invaluable advice and guidance throughout this study. Without the assistance from Dr Sookrajh I would not have been able to complete this study.

I am indeed grateful to the members of management of Clairwood Secondary School for participating in this project. All members of management of the school formed the sample of the study.

To my wife, Priscilla Naidoo, and son Clinton Naidoo all for the encouragement and moral support during the completion of the study.

To Mrs D Pillay (Molly) for all the assistance in the typing of the dissertation.

To all my colleagues who assisted me directly or indirectly in the study, thank you. Your support has helped me to keep focused on the goal of completing this research study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CHAPTER ONE

AIM, CRITICAL QUESTION AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Aim of the study and the Critical Question	2
1.3	Rationale	2
1.4	Research Method	2
1.5	Qualitative Research	3
1.6	The Limitations of the Research	4
1.7	Conclusion	4

2. CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1	Introduction	6
2.2	The Historical Development of the New Developmental Appraisal System	7
2.2.1	Staff Development and Training	7
2.3	Initiating a New System of Appraisal	10
2.4	The Assumptions that underpin the notion of “appraisal”	12
2.4.1	The Judgemental Approach	12
2.4.2	The Developmental Approach	13
2.5	Policy Formulation and Implementation	15
2.6	Conclusion	16

3. CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1	Introduction	17
3.2	Findings of the Interviews	17
3.2.1	Understandings of DAS policy at school	18
3.2.2	Conclusion	25
3.2.3	Evaluation Issues	25
3.2.4	Conclusion	28
3.2.5	Professional Development	28
3.2.6	Conclusion	32
3.2.7	Management Involvement	32
3.2.8	Conclusion	35
3.2.9	Implementation Issues	35
3.2.10	Conclusion	38
3.3	Conclusion	38

4. CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1	Introduction	40
4.2	Significance of Findings	40
4.2.1	Understandings of DAS policy at school	40
4.2.2	Evaluation Issues	41
4.2.3	Professional Development	41
4.2.4	Management Involvement	41
4.2.5	Implementation Issues	41
4.3	Conclusion	42
4.4	Recommendations	42
4.5	Conclusion	43

BIBLIOGRAPHY	44
---------------------	----

APPENDIX	47
-----------------	----

LIST OF TERMS/ACRONYMS

DAS: Developmental Appraisal System

DOE: Department of Education

SADTU: South African Democratic Teachers' Union

DET: Department of Education and Training

ELRC: Education Labour Relations council

WITS EPU: Education Policy Unit of the University of Witwatersrand

SACE: South African Council of Educators

KASTE: Kwa-Zulu Natal Association of Science and Technology Education

AMESA: Association of Mathematics Educators of South Africa

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) may be viewed as part of a suite of policies (eg. The Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Skills Development Act, Whole School Evaluation and Development, Quality Assurance etc.) adopted by the new government to transform education. As a process DAS is meant to be supportive and developmental rather than punitive and judgemental. It has as its intention to facilitate support and improvement of school performance using approaches of collaboration, mentoring and guidance. The Developmental Appraisal System is not an end in itself but it is the first step in a long process of school improvement and quality enhancement.

The developmental appraisal policy has been introduced for the first time in Kwa-Zulu Natal in 1998. With resistance from teachers and backed by strong teacher union action, the previous system of assessment and evaluation was replaced with the present developmental appraisal system (DAS). DAS signifies a reconceptualisation of the need for monitoring and evaluation. It is cast within a developmental framework including participatory conceptions which is currently a dominant discourse embracing change as we recognise and develop a new and emerging democracy. While the intentions are laudable and widely accepted by both teachers and unions, the success of DAS lies in the implementation phase. This means that we need to explore all aspects of the implementation process. The study hopes to illuminate the schools managers' role in the process of implementation. Within the paradigm shift from "inspection" to quality assurance, the aim of "teacher appraisal" is to control, maintain standards and evaluate performance and advise and support teachers in their continual efforts to improve their performance.

1.2 AIM OF STUDY AND THE CRITICAL QUESTION

With this in mind the purpose of the study is to explore the attitudes of school managers towards the Policy of Developmental Appraisal at a selected school site. The critical question asked in this study is “what are the attitudes of the school managers towards the developmental appraisal system at Clairwood Secondary School?”

1.3 RATIONALE

Implementation of DAS has occurred at some schools while others are preparing for its implementation. Research on the influence and impact of DAS is crucial to make alignment with its intention. Thus far numerous studies (Hopkins *et al*, 1994; Balkaran, 2000) focused on level one educators attitudes towards DAS. This seems biased as there are other role players in this process. School managers’ roles are crucial and research needs to focus on their roles in this process. This study therefore attempts to investigate managers’ attitudes towards DAS.

Presently the researcher holds the post of Deputy Principal in a secondary school. As such he/she is expected to become involved in this process of appraisal at school. The study will provide me with insight on the influence of managers’ attitudes towards the appraisal system and as such I will be able to understand my own role in this process.

The study will inform and benefit policymakers in the Department of Education, management members of schools, educators and other stakeholders. This study would also provide valuable information and insight into how the policy is being interpreted and implemented at school level and the barriers one could expect in the implementation phase.

1.4 RESEARCH METHOD

The research method is a qualitative study which intends to examine the attitudes of school managers towards DAS.

1.5 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Qualitative researchers view themselves as a primary instrument for collecting data. They rely partly or entirely on their feelings, impressions and judgement in collecting data and they also rely heavily on their own interpretation in understanding the meaning of their data. This study employed the interview technique. Their findings often are reported in the form of verbal description (Borg & Gall, 1989). According to Seidman (1991: 72)

Interviewing is both a research methodology and a social relationship that must be nurtured, sustained and then ended gracefully.

The interview as a research method is unique in that it involves the collection of data through direct verbal interaction between individuals. Perhaps its principle advantage is its adaptability. The interview permits one to follow up leads and thus obtain more data and greater clarity (Borg & Gall, 1989).

The researcher believes that “ to work most reliable with the words of participants, the researcher has to transform those spoken words into written texts to study. The primary method of creating texts from interviews is to tape record the interviews and to transcribe them. Each word a participant speaks reflects his/her consciousness “(Vygotsky in Seidman, 1991: 87).

These interviews were conducted at my own school. All members of management, ie. the principal, the deputy principal and the five heads of department formed the sample of the study. The interviews provide information about their feelings, thoughts and attitudes towards DAS and the recommendations they can make in the implementation process.

The interviews will enable me to find out attitudes and perceptions towards developmental appraisal and also to find out more information about interpretation and implementation of the

policy. The interviews will also provide direct evidence of management’s attitudes towards the policy. The interview schedule is made up of five sections. The first section explores the respondents’ understandings of the DAS policy at school. The next section deals with

evaluation issues where respondents must compare the old evaluation system to the new developmental approach. The third section deals with professional development. The fourth section deals with management involvement in the developmental appraisal system. The last section of the interview schedule probes implementation of the DAS policy at site.

1.6 THE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A more comprehensive exploration of managements' attitudes and perceptions would have been possible if the attitudes of subject advisors and district heads had been investigated as well. Because of the immensity of such a task, the present research has been subjected to the following constraints:

- the study was restricted to a case study of Clairwood Secondary School situated in the City of Durban District.
- the researcher has confined the study to only the school management of Clairwood Secondary School. The study excluded level one educators' attitudes towards DAS.

1.7 CONCLUSION

According to the Department of Education(DOE) the model for the developmental appraisal has the following features:

- simplicity: it is easy to understand and applies to all educators.
- feasibility: it can be administered within different types of institutions.
- legitimacy: the teacher unions were involved in its formulation.
- flexibility: it is used for the development and confirmation of probationers.

In order to achieve the aims of developmental appraisal, the following requirements, must be met:

- democratic organisational climate
- learning culture at institutions
- commitment of educators to development and
- openness and trust.

The primary responsibility for development lies with the educator and the primary site for development is the school. The aim of DAS is to facilitate the personal and professional development of educators in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management.

In this section of the study, the aim, critical questions and the rationale for the study was undertaken. The methodology used in the study was explained and possible limitations declared.

In the next section a selected literature review is undertaken and the DAS policy document is examined.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides a literature review on the developmental appraisal policy, staff development and related topics and will also include a discussion on policy formulation and implementation of DAS. A study of the literature is necessary as it provides a basis for the conceptual framework within which an appraisal system could be analysed. It will also provide an understanding of the intention behind policy formulation and the link between policy formulation and implementation. Therefore the literature review will focus on:

- the historical background of the development of the new appraisal system.
- the philosophical assumptions that underpin its guiding principles.
- the policy formulation and implementation process.

Some of the selected literature reviewed cover the following areas:

- shortcomings of self-appraisal (Trethowan, 1987).
- formative appraisal is concerned with the professional development, the improvement of practice by identifying strengths, weaknesses, needs and interests (Turner & Clift, 1988).
- the contrast between the managerial relations of inspection, domination and quality control, versus the educative relations of collegiality, reflection and empowerment (Gitlin and Smith, 1989).
- observation involving teachers observing each other's teaching for developmental purposes (Hopkins et al, 1994).

- evaluation has largely come to be seen as a threatening, judgemental, summative exercise while appraisal is regarded as a positive developmental and formative process (Quinlan & Davidoff, 1997).
- 360 degree feedback – teachers receive inputs from six sources (Black, 1998).
- exploration of teachers' attitudes towards the policy of developmental appraisal (Balkaran, 2000). This study is different in that it explores only level one educators' attitudes towards DAS.

The next section explores literature in the context of the developmental approach used in the developmental appraisal system, namely staff development and training.

2.2 THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

2.2.1 STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

A brief review of the literature would reveal that staff development and training issues resonate with the developmental appraisal policy.

Burke, Heideman & Heideman (1990) suggest that in-service training is not synonymous with staff development. In-service education is only one component of staff development, being almost exclusively informational in nature. Staff development involves adaptations to change with the purpose of modifying instructional activities, changing teacher attitudes and improving student achievement. Staff development is therefore concerned with personal as well as professional and organizational needs.

Most definitions of staff development have as their ultimate goal personal and professional growth, competence and renewal of skills, knowledge, abilities and interests of participants (Hendee, 1976; Dillon-Peterson, 1981; Caldwell and Marshall, 1982; dale, 1982; Newton and Tarrant, 1992).

Loucks-Horsley et al (1987) refer to the engagement of teachers in a wide variety of opportunities for growth in knowledge and skills within the education profession as professional development.

Shaw's (1992) definition best sums up teacher development when he states that:

This begins on the first day and continues to the last day. It encompasses the first experience learned at the "chalk face" and in-service training attended by the individual, professional reading, good practice in teaching and management learnt from other colleagues both consciously and unconsciously, as well as individual and team staff development gained in meetings with other teachers to discuss matters of common concern.

Joyce and Showers (1980) identify three messages from research for the training of teachers to be effective:

- teachers are wonderful learners – nearly all can acquire new skills that “fine tune” their competence.
- teachers can learn a considerable repertoire of teaching strategies that are new to them.
- to be most effective, training should include theory, demonstration, practice, feedback and classroom application.

Wood and Thompson (1980) suggest that for the basis of future in service educators need to first to look into the nature of adult learning, generally ignored by those responsible for staff development.

According to Newton and Tarrant (1992) staff development programmes should be school based and should at best eliminate the effectiveness of promoting change from within and of fostering commitment and ownership.

The impetus for the historical development of the new developmental appraisal system has been linked to the breakdown of the inspectorate and subject advisory services in the majority

of schools in South Africa. Between 1985 and 1990 it became almost impossible for inspectors and subject advisors to go into schools. Some Education Departments were characterized by conflicts and unhealthy relationships between teachers on the one hand, and principals, inspectors and subject advisors on the other hand. Teachers were mainly unhappy with the manner in which the evaluation system was conducted. There often were no prior arrangements between the schools and the departmental officials; the officials would simply visit the schools unannounced.

Such a mode of evaluation, which often had its focus on quantity rather than quality of work done by the teacher was viewed as unacceptable. The system implied that teachers did not have anything of value to contribute to the process and this assumption tended to undermine their professional integrity. The system thus prevented teachers from using the opportunity to recognize those aspects of their work they would have liked to improve. Teachers were often not informed of the outcome of the actual assessment; no evaluation criteria for improvement and no process for staff development were given to them.

In 1991 the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) embarked on a national defiance campaign against such inspection and teacher appraisal systems. Many Department of Education and Training (DET) officials were thus barred from entering school premises. To many this seemed to be a contributing factor to the collapsing culture of learning that characterized DET schools during the late 1980s.

Around 1992 SADTU argued for a completely new approach to appraisal and initiated a process of negotiations between teacher organizations (SADTU and NAPTOSA) and the former DET. The Education Policy Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits EPU, 1993) was commissioned to assist in developing an alternative form of educator appraisal.

In 1993 negotiations began in earnest and SADTU's approach to negotiations was that teachers should play the central role in defining the principles, process and procedures of a new system of evaluation. This process resulted in setting up, in 1995, a National Teacher

Appraisal project. The pilot project resulted in a new appraisal instrument for all educators including inspectors and subject advisors. The principles underpinning the new appraisal system are as follows:

- openness, inclusivity, transparency and democracy
- developmental rather than judgemental
- continuous assessment and development
- respect for all persons and their professionalism

These important principles form the basis that inform the new appraisal system.

2.3 INITIATING A NEW SYSTEM OF APPRAISAL

The Research Committee of the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC), established, among other teams, a National Appraisal Team (renamed as the Training, Retraining and Development Team). The team was mandated to generate a document that would have a specific aim of educator development. A *Manual for Developmental Appraisal* was tabled in the ELRC at the beginning of 1998 for adoption. The instrument used in developmental appraisal is directly linked to the job descriptions and workloads of educators (ELRC, 1998).

Within the organized teaching profession the need was felt to develop an appraisal instrument which would be acceptable to all stakeholders and would enhance the development of competency of educators and the quality of public education in South Africa. Through negotiations, research and piloting of the various proposals in which teacher unions participated, a document which represents the good faith which exists between various stakeholders, and embraces the democratization that is prevalent in education in South Africa today was finalized. The need to restore an appraisal system for educators was, thus, a concern shared by all teacher formations and ex-departments of education.

By 1993, all teacher organizations and unions and all ex-departments of education were involved in these negotiations which sought to address the principles, process and procedure for the new appraisal system. Various consultative workshops were held at a national level by each of the organizations/departments that were involved. These led to the formulation of the “guiding principles” that ought to inform the new appraisal system and the “appraisal

instrument” to be used. By 1994, a general agreement on both of these was reached.

In October 1994, a conference on School Management, Teacher Development and Support, hosted by the Education Policy Unit of the University of Witwatersrand, was held at Eskom centre in Midrand, Johannesburg. The newly constituted national and provincial departments and all teacher unions/organizations were represented. At this conference, the following key issues of the new appraisal system were resolved:

- General agreement of the guiding principles;
- Overall consensus on the nature of the instrument;
- General agreement on the need to pilot the new appraisal system with post level 1 educators before it may be implemented.

On the basis of these decisions, the Education Policy Unit of the University of Witwatersrand conducted a pilot of the new appraisal system. This pilot study was undertaken between 1995 and 1996; the report documenting its findings was released in July 1997.

The pilot study covered a representative sample of 93 schools throughout the country, with Kwa-Zulu Natal being the only province which did not participate in the pilot study due to a range of difficulties that could not be resolved within the scope of the pilot project. The findings of the pilot study revealed that there was unanimous support for the nature and processes of the new teacher appraisal system. It also showed that it could be applied in all schools in South Africa no matter what their contextual conditions may be. It also pointed to the centrality of training in the process so that school based educators are equipped with the necessary knowledge to actually implement the new appraisal system. The pilot study indicated that the nature of the new appraisal system contributed significantly to facilitate relations between teachers and school management, and between schools and department offices. The pilot study, thus, validated empirically the nature, philosophy, processes and instrument of the new appraisal system (Wits EPU. 1994).

Simultaneously, while the pilot study was being conducted, further discussions and negotiations around the new appraisal system were taking place in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) in which teacher unions/organizations, provincial departments and

the National Department of Education were involved. On 28th July 1998 a final agreement was reached within the ELRC on the implementation of the new developmental appraisal system. This agreement is reflected in Resolution Number 4 of 1998. The following was agreed upon by the ELRC:

- it was agreed that the overall nature of the appraisal system that was piloted be maintained. This entails the “guiding principles”, the nature of the appraisal process and the use of “appraisal panels”.
- it was agreed that the “instrument” to be implemented is one that is “developmental” in nature only and will be conducted with all levels of personnel within education, in and outside of schools, excluding education therapists and psychologists.
- it was agreed that the appraisal will be tied to the nature of job descriptions of the specific level of post to which a person may be attached (ELRC, 1998).

In terms of this ELRC resolution the new developmental appraisal system is expected to be implemented by 1999, with all structural and other arrangements being put in place within 1998. The effectiveness of the system will be monitored throughout the implementation process. The developmental appraisal system will be reviewed in April 2000 (ELRC, 1998).

2.4 THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT UNDERPIN THE NOTION OF “APPRAISAL”.

There are mainly two types of appraisal. These are the judgemental and the developmental approaches in the new document.

2.4.1 The Judgemental Approach

There are a range of concepts that have been used in education both locally and internationally to describe the ways in which the performance of educators has been viewed. These include concepts such as “inspection”, “assessment” and “evaluation”. The one thing that runs consistently through these types of concepts is that they all rest on the same assumption, and that is that educators’ performances need to be “judged”. In this approach, the “judgemental approach”, there is an overall tendency to find fault, to be negative in reports that are written

and not to acknowledge the positive things that educators do (ELRC, 1998). Also of significance in this “judgemental approach”, there is an overall tendency not to involve the person who is being “judged” in the processes within which decisions about the “judgement” are made. This rests on the belief that people, on their own, are not likely to give critical assessment of their own performances. They tend to only point to the positive and not negative aspects of their performances. The “judgemental approach” is, thus, clearly a way of “inspecting” , and some would also argue “policing” educators’ performances. Summative forms of evaluation tend to use the “judgemental approach’. They also tend to be quantitative in nature and concerned about outputs or products. Being influenced by the “judgemental approach” , summative forms of evaluation look at what educators do in so far as achieving what is required of them. In this educators are inspected and their performances tend to be quantitatively evaluated by focusing on aspects of teaching and learning that may be counted (Quinlan & Davidoff, 1997).

2.4.2 The Developmental Approach

The notion of “appraisal” is starkly different from the “judgemental approach”. The notion of “appraisal” is aimed essentially at an acknowledgement of the positive aspects of educators’ performances. It rests on the belief that nobody is just full of faults. No-one is only and totally negative. Assessments of educators’ performances, therefore, also need to note the things that they do that are good, the positive aspects of their practices. Thus, the notion of “appraisal” is tied decidedly to a more “developmental approach”, as opposed to a “judgemental” one. In contrast, the formative form of evaluation is one that is quantitatively framed and emphasizes process rather than products. The formative form of evaluation is linked to the “developmental approach” and does not only focus on what the educator does not do right, but also on what the educator does right. In this form of appraisal, there is recognition of the fact that teaching and learning are complex processes, and the reasons why desirable results may not be achieved may be due to various reasons. When observing an educator’s performance, the appraiser in the formative form of evaluation, will look at ways in which the work occurs, how and why. The focus will be on the quality of the pedagogical processes.

Due to “appraisal” being located within a “developmental approach” it seeks to build on the strengths that educators have. Using what positively exists in educators’ performances, the “developmental approach” attempts to erode the negative aspects of an educator’s performance by providing ways in which such negative aspects may be responded to in a “developmental” way on the basis of strengths that exist. In this process, the “developmental approach” ensures that the person being “appraised” is part of the appraisal process, and that the person is able to contribute to decisions about the person’s performance and ways in which it may be improved (Quinlan & Davidoff, 1997).

Thus, although the “developmental approach” to which the notion of “appraisal” is tied, is one that is not “judgemental”, is more positively oriented and one that acknowledges people’s strengths, it does not mean that the “developmental approach” is blind to the negative aspects that may exist in educators’ performances. Rather it notes such negative aspects, if they exist. Instead of blaming the educator in a faultfinding way, the “developmental approach” tries to find ways in which such negative aspects may be responded to within “developmental” programmes that would enable the educator to improve his/her performance in that area. It, thus, acknowledges that such an educator also has positive aspects to his/her performance which are not in need of immediate improvements and upon which further “professional development” may be based (Chisholm, 1994).

2.5 Policy Formulation and Implementation

The literature review has revealed that members of the government admit that South Africa has good policies but knows little about policy implementation (Christie, 1997). At the risk of oversimplifying the approach of separating policy formulation from implementation is exemplified in the rationalist tradition of policy, which views policy as a set of logically distinct activities in a cycle which progresses from problem definition, through policy formulation, adoption, advocacy and implementation to evaluation and reformulation. This approach has been powerfully criticized and counter-posed by a contingency approach, which views policy as inherently political activity in the “authoritative allocation of values” involving compromises, trade-offs and settlements (Fulcher, 1989; Ball, 1990; Taylor et al, 1997). A strong version of this position contends that policies are best understood in terms of practices on the ground, rather than idealist statements of intention or blueprints for action (Christie, 1997). The epistemological differences between these two approaches to policy are highlighted by the need to explain decades of experience that policies are seldom implemented as designed. From the rationalist perspective, the “problem” lies with the implementers who are variously seen to be lacking in capacity or will. From the contingency perspective, the “problem” lies in nature of policy is itself which is contested and uncertain (Kemmis & Rizvi, 1987).

Whether from a rationalist or a contingency perspective, the neglect of implementation issues in the new developmental appraisal policy is a fundamental flaw which has severely compromised the capacity of this policy to deliver change. One of the major difficulties in state-led reform initiatives is that education systems operate through many levels. As Elmore and Sykes (1992) note “policy includes not just the intentions of policymakers embodied in law and regulation but the stream of actions that follow from those intentions” (1992, p. 118). Policies formulated at national and provincial levels pass through education bureaucracies to the complex contexts of schools. Sustaining a reform thrust through these levels is often impossible. There are many legitimate policy actors in the education policy process, and they inevitably shape policy-as-practice. It is not simply a matter of planning for policies to reach through layers of implementers; as Fullan (1991) points out, it is very difficult for policies to

mandate what matters. Mandating quality of teaching and learning in classrooms cannot be done even by the best organized of policymakers. In spite of limitations of state reform policies, it is important to recognize what they can achieve. As Fuhrman notes, they may be important in leveraging changes in organization and management and in institutional and individual capacity. As well as setting directions within which schools and civil society groups may act, they are able to resource these directions and actions. In Heneveld's (1992) words, national level state policy "is a necessary but fairly blunt instrument in the improvement of educational quality."

In the face of implementation difficulties, Elmore and Sykes (1979/80) suggest a "backward mapping" approach, which challenges policymakers to start at the point of implementation and work backwards, rather than starting at the point of policy formulation and working forwards to implementation. Elmore and Sykes argue that the forward mapping approach commonly favoured by policymakers mistakenly assumes that policymakers are able to control the complex political, organizational and technical factors that affect implementation, particularly at school level. Given the complexity of these factors, they suggest that policymakers should isolate and work with one or two that have a decisive influence on the problem and its solution. As stated, "one begins at the point of the problem and tries to find the most parsimonious way of reaching it (Elmore & Sykes, 1979-80: 52). It goes without saying that the more knowledge that planners and policymakers have of the actual conditions in schools, the more likely it is that their policies will be sensitive to them.

2.6 CONCLUSION

In this section a selected literature review of appraisal was undertaken. The historical development of the present DAS policy was profiled and the DAS policy was presented. This was done within the context of policy formulation.

In the next section, the findings of the study are presented in response to the critical question asked in the study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter a selected literature review of appraisal was undertaken. The historical development of the appraisal system was traced and the two approaches to appraisal was presented.

This section of the study responds to the critical question, *“What are the attitudes of the school managers towards the developmental appraisal system at Clairwood Secondary School.”* The study is done through the use of interviews conducted with the seven managers of the selected school.

The respondents in the interviews were each asked to respond to questions that were divided into five categories. These categories were:

- Understandings of DAS at School
- Evaluation Issues
- Professional Development
- Management Involvement
- Implementation Issues

3.2 FINDINGS OF THE INTERVIEW

The response of the managers are presented according to the negotiated categories.

3.2.1 UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL POLICY AT SCHOOL

In the first category, understandings of DAS policy at school, respondents were asked to respond to eight questions. The aim in this area was to gauge the depth of understanding of the DAS policy by managers at school. In respect of the first question (Question 1), *Is there a need for appraisal at schools?*, the following responses were noted.

The principal and the deputy principal agreed that there was a definite need for appraisal at school. The other managers also agreed that there was a need for appraisal. The English head of department's view was:

I think in terms of the way the school runs it, is necessary to have appraisal simply so that all stakeholders, in this case the educators, the management and in a sense the union representatives will be able to have a sense of how well the school is performing and it will give an opportunity to look at both the strengths and weaknesses of the school and particular subject areas.

Likewise, the Afrikaans as well as the Science heads of departments believed that appraisal was essential to improve in all areas.

The Human and Social Sciences head of department provided two reasons for the need for appraisal and these were for

accountability and for the total development of an educator – every educator needs to be developed.

All seven management members agreed that there was a definite need for appraisal at schools for the following reasons:

- for measuring performance
- for improvement
- for accountability
- for the total development of the educator.

In response to the second question : *Are you familiar with the DAS instrument design? and what is your opinion of the DAS instrument?* (Question 2), the following responses were noted.

The principal's view was :

Yes, I am familiar with the DAS instrument. It is a good instrument if applied religiously and consistently. The panel must be able to portray the true facts so that the appraisee benefits from the exercise.

The deputy principal, however expressed some reservation.

I am not totally familiar with the DAS instrument design, but I do have an idea of what it is about. It is beneficial to both educators as well as learners.

The English head of department's view was:

The DAS instrument has been designed and has come through a process of consultation involving educators themselves in designing an instrument which takes into account the great dynamics that operate in the classroom. The DAS instrument offers the educator an opportunity to appraise himself, it offers the opportunity of peers to be involved as well as union representatives as well as a manager. In that way it becomes a corporate venture and in that sense it allows for the person that is being appraised to look at strengths and weaknesses and to make suggestions personally in terms of strengths and weaknesses of himself or herself.

The Afrikaans head of department believed that it was extremely suitable.

You can choose whoever you want to appraise you – you are choosing somebody you know and trust, so whatever they say to you – if there are any shortcomings, will not be seen as nasty – it will be taken as constructive criticism.

The Science head of department was familiar with the DAS instrument design but was not so

certain about the finer details but thought it was a good instrument, perhaps there were areas that needed to be improved.

The rest of the heads of department were familiar with the DAS instrument design and their opinion was that generally it was a good instrument. All members of management were familiar with the DAS instrument design.

The most frequently mentioned responses to this question were

- it is a good instrument
- it is beneficial
- it must be applied consistently
- it is a corporate venture
- shortcomings of educators will be seen as constructive criticism
- the DAS instrument plays a major role in appraisal
- it must be implemented across the board.

The responses indicated that that appraisal was well received by all managers.

With regard to implementation issues the question, *Are you familiar with how DAS must be conducted or implemented?* (Question 3), was responded to in the following way:

The principal was familiar with the implementation of DAS. The deputy principal had a reasonable knowledge of how it must be conducted or implemented. All seven managers agreed that they were familiar with how DAS must be conducted or implemented.

In the next question , *Do you see DAS as impacting on educational change and democracy?* (Question4), required the respondents to examine the impact of DAS on educational change and democracy.

The principal and the deputy principal agreed that DAS would have a great impact on educational change and democracy if all role players fulfilled their obligations. The English, Afrikaans, Science and the Human and Social Sciences heads of department argued that the whole system of appraisal had come through the process of democracy that emerged in our

country and it has come through with the knowledge that the systems of appraisals that took place in the past were inadequate to meet the demands of education in a participatory democracy and that it is relevant for educational change.

The Technical head of department believed that in the new system of appraisal the individual was given a chance to justify assessments – there would be a major impact towards the positive side of the educator in question. All seven respondents felt very strongly that DAS would impact positively on educational change and democracy and typical of the positive comments were the following:

- the policy has come about through a process of consultation with all stakeholders
- all stakeholders could feel part of the process
- DAS will make a constructive contribution towards educational change
- the individual educator is given a chance to justify assessments.

The process of appraisal should be open and transparent.

Question 5 asked about the strengths and weaknesses of the policy.

Both the principal and the deputy principal agreed that the instrument tended to highlight the strengths of the appraisee and somewhat ignored the weaknesses. One weakness of the policy pointed out by the deputy principal was that of

time frames – the policy is too time consuming to implement – educators require more time to implement the policy.

Positive comments received by the other respondents in respect of the strengths of the policy were the following:

- DAS analyses the strengths and weaknesses of educators – criticisms are not only negative but also positive. Great stress is placed on not only pointing out weaknesses but also on ways of improving areas of weaknesses.

- since the policy was arrived at through a process of consultation and negotiation with all stakeholders including teacher unions, they are interested and involved in educational issues, they have an interest in making sure that education develops and benefits the whole country.
- since educators are involved throughout the whole process, the process is therefore subject to recourse for educators; and it is developmental – whatever the strengths and weaknesses are can be discussed and rectified.
- educators know where they stand as far as their capabilities and strengths are and they will accept constructive criticisms more readily.
- educators will become more accountable for their teaching practice and this will lead to better educators.
- DAS takes into account contextual factors which impacts on teaching and learning.
- DAS prevents generalizations in the evaluation of an educator.
- Assessments can be justified. There is an affirmation of positive values and a programme can be instituted to remedy weak areas or areas of concern.

DAS in essence is a developmental process which should depend on continuous support and guidance.

Negative comments in the form of weaknesses were characterized by the following:

- The administration of DAS is too time consuming to implement – educators and managers require more time to implement this policy.
- If an educator is going to select somebody who is just going to mention only positive aspects, then no change or improvements will take place.
- Certain members of the panel will tend to overrate their friends. There is also ample scope for nepotism.
- The policy is not understood very well by all educators and managers.

All seven members agreed that the strengths of the policy far outweighed the weaknesses.

The next question on the structured interview schedule asked about the impact that DAS would have on the culture of learning and teaching at schools (Question 6).

The respondents were unanimous that DAS would positively impact the culture of learning and teaching at school. Without positive or negative criticisms educators may tend to “vegetate” in the sense that no growth or development would take place – thus appraisal is necessary for updating and for improving in all aspects of an educator’s practice. This was the deputy principal’s view. The English head of department’s view was that:

The whole culture of teaching and learning is not one dimensional – it does not involve a teacher and a learner in a one dimensional relationship in a classroom. It also involves the educator developing in terms of his subject expertise. The appraisal system goes a long way in trying to address the culture of teaching and learning in that it puts into perspective for the educator exactly where he or she stands in terms of his/her subject area. It starts to give direction to the educator - arising out of all this it can only improve the culture of teaching and learning. The learner himself in the classroom who is exposed to this kind of system will realize that efforts are being made by educators themselves to try and address weaknesses in the classroom and it can only start to have a positive impact on the teaching and learning climate in the school.

Another view was that DAS would bring about improvement in teaching practice; teaching would be very effective in the classroom and this would lead to a better calibre of learners that would be turned out in the school. Teaching and learning went together – if there were better teachers, then we would turn out better learners. All seven management members responded positively that DAS did impact the culture of learning and teaching at schools.

In the next question respondents were asked for the relationship that exists between DAS and Whole School Evaluation and Development. Respondents were also asked to respond to the question :*Do you see DAS being a part of Whole School Evaluation?* (Question 7).

One view was that

DAS involves appraisal of the individual and this will soon affect the evaluation of the whole school so much so that everyone strives for excellence. Staff and learners will be involved regularly and this involvement can only improve the atmosphere at school. Educators and learners will always give off their best and this augurs well for the school at large.

Another view was that DAS was seen as apart of Whole School Evaluation.

Because teaching and learning does not only exist in the classroom but involves the entire culture at school – so with positive points coming out of DAS in the classroom, it will permeate throughout the whole school.

The English head of department's view was that the notion of whole school evaluation was very important because unlike before, the focus was not only on one or two aspects of school life. There was a realisation that education was a multi-faceted process and it was these multi – faceted processes that needed to be attended to. So while one may have looked at whether there was a need for furniture and textbooks and whether classrooms had windows, it was at the same time very important that the educator who was one of the stakeholders, was being given the opportunity to re-examine his or her teaching practice and in so doing would impact positively on whole School Evaluation.

All seven members were in agreement that DAS was an integral part of Whole School Evaluation and development. With the implementation of DAS there would be a general all round improvement in the entire teaching and learning environment in school.

The final question in the category asked if managers had any training in the implementation of the DAS policy(Question 8).

The senior managers did undergo training that was conducted by the department and were therefore familiar with the implementation of DAS. The rest of the managers at school did undergo some kind of training through a workshop that was held at school. We can therefore

conclude that all 7 managers did have training of some kind in the implementation of the DAS policy.

3.2.2 CONCLUSION

The comments indicated that DAS was well received by all managers. It was felt that the policy was positive and valuable. It allowed maximum accountability on the part of all educators. In general the comments indicated that managers were well satisfied with the process and procedures of DAS. DAS allowed educators to talk about, review and reflect on their work, and to receive helpful and supportive advice and guidance.

3.2.3 EVALUATION ISSUES

In terms of the evaluation issues raised in the interview schedule respondents were asked to respond to 3 questions. To the first question, *What is your view of the old judgemental approach to educator evaluation?* (Question 1), the following responses were received.

The principal's view was:

The old judgemental approach was one sided. The supervisor would pounce on the unsuspecting educator and he would be on a fault-finding mission. The teacher would be nervous and the pupils tense. It was a relief when the lesson was over and when the supervisor left. The lesson was not discussed on a one to one basis with the educator. The educator received a favourable or unfavourable report. He was however allowed to comment on the report if he wished to.

The deputy principal held the view that it was very judgemental and educators viewed it negatively. More often than not only negative points of the educator were highlighted. The English head of department's response was that it fitted in with the old apartheid era when everything was given in a top-down approach by the education department. It was not a system that was popular and it did not work because it was imposed on teachers and teachers had no recourse to any inputs that were made in terms of their own development. It became very

judgemental in the sense that the judgement of the one superintendent or manager meant that was the final evaluation of the educator. It did not serve the purpose for which it was intended. The Afrikaans head of department felt quite strongly that the old judgemental approach was very negative.

Educators had a hard time as far as that approach was concerned. A number of educators were affected emotionally, physically and mentally because people felt you were either right or wrong – they did not see your point of view. You had to do what they wanted you to do and if you did not do so you were defaulting. So this destroyed a number of people.

Equally strong was the Science head of department's view.

The old approach was one that educators really dreaded because at any time anyone would just walk into your classroom and really put you under a lot of pressure. People could not really perform to their best because of being under so much of stress. Supervisors picked more on the weaknesses of teachers than their strengths.

According to the Human and Social Sciences head of department the old approach was autocratic, faultfinding and demoralizing with no room for the development of the teacher. The Technology head of department's view was:

The old judgemental approach was more of an inspection type of evaluation where educators actually despised the approach – it opened doors to a lot of animosity. The old approach is not one that can be applied in a modern day scenario.

All seven respondents agreed that old judgemental approach was extremely negative. Their views can be summarized as follows:

- it was one sided
- it was very judgemental and educators viewed it negatively
- mainly negative points of the educators were highlighted
- it was given in a top-down manner and imposed on teachers

- it effected teachers emotionally, physically and mentally
- it was dreaded by teachers
- it put teachers under a lot of stress and pressure
- the old judgemental approach was autocratic, faultfinding and demoralising
- it bred a lot of animosity

Hence, the DAS marked a shift from the old evaluation system.

Respondents were asked to react to the question: *Do you think the developmental approach to the Appraisal System that is presently in place is an improvement on the old system of educator evaluation?* (Question 2).

The following responses were received. The principal felt that the approach was democratic.

An appointment is made with the educator as to when he would like to be appraised.

The deputy principal's response was :

Yes, definitely – it is evident that with the new system the positive points of educators are also reinforced and evaluation is not seen as something negative but rather as the holistic development of the teacher.

The other heads of department's views were similar in that they all agreed that it was an improvement on the old system. There was need for appraisal in the school system, to be able to evaluate the progress, pace and the level at which a school and its educators were operating. All seven respondents definitely agreed that it was an improvement on the old system of evaluation.

To the final question in this category: *Does DAS influence learner development?* (Question 3), the following responses were received:

The principal felt that DAS did encourage learner development. It had a positive effect on learners. The deputy principal's view was:

Yes if a teacher feels positive about himself, this will rub off onto learners.

The English, Afrikaans and Science heads of department views were that any educator who was starting to improve his/her own practice could only have a positive influence on the learning environment in the classroom and therefore influenced learner development. So it was an on going process of improving our whole education system in a democracy.

The Human and Social Sciences and Technical heads of department also confirmed that with DAS an educator tended to strive towards improvement and this improvement in practice would definitely impact on learners positively. There was total agreement with all management members that DAS did influence learner development in a positive manner.

3.2.4 CONCLUSION

In terms of evaluation issues raised, the old approach had a negative impact on teacher morale and consequently on teacher growth and development. It emerged quite clearly that the old approach was dreaded and disliked quite strongly not only by educators but by management members themselves. Thus there was a strong need to move away from this type of evaluation to the new system. DAS marked a significant shift towards teacher growth and development.

3.2.5 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

With regard to Professional Development, 5 questions were asked of the interviewees.

The first question involved the setting up of the Staff Development Team. To question one: *Do you think the setting up of the staff development team will contribute to professional development?*, the following responses were noted.

The principal believed that it would benefit the staff since every staff member participated actively in the workshop and in the formation of the different panels. The deputy principal's view was:

Yes, it will because it will give the school an opportunity to put into place structures; and the whole development process will contribute to professional development.

The others felt that it offered staff members an opportunity to also get involved in the process at school in a more responsible and constructive way. The Technical head of department believed that the staff development team would form a major stakeholder in the professional development of educators at large. All management members agreed that the setting up of the staff development team would contribute positively to professional development.

The second question asked: *what is your opinion on the setting up of panels for DAS by the staff?* (Question 2), the following responses were noted.

Both the principal and the deputy principal believed that the staff member cannot have any grouses with his/her panel since he/she participated actively in its formation. Colleagues were represented on the panel and therefore staff members would be happy to co-operate fully with its implementation.

The English head of department believed that the whole question of the panel did have some administrative weaknesses in the sense that it could lead to too many panels being set up; it could mean that too many people were being involved in the process and this could be an administrative problem. Staff members themselves must understand and realize that it would not be necessary for all teams to be fully represented and in certain instances they may choose to use the peer as a Union Representative also.

The Science as well as the Technology heads of department believed that panels were chosen by the educators democratically, although there might have been a fear sometimes that a person would choose his/her own friend for ulterior motives.

Generally, management members were in favour of staff members setting up panels for DAS for the following reasons:

- since educators are involved in the system they would want to co-operate and make a success of it.

- the policy allows the educator free choice as to whom he/she would want on the panel – thus giving the educator freedom of choice.

However, the fear that an individual may choose somebody for ulterior motives was also expressed.

To the third question: *Do you think it is necessary to regulate the professional development of educators?* (Question 3), the following responses were noted.

The comments offered by the senior management were positive; they felt that it was necessary to regulate the professional development of educators. The comments offered by the heads of department could be characterized by the following quote by the English head of department:

It is vitally important and in a departure from the past where professional development maybe only rested on the educational qualifications of an educator and in a one off evaluation visit by the superintendent. Professional development needs to be regulated because in a democracy one is faced with a whole range of demands, and it is only fair that professional development is also put under the spotlight – whether you look at the South African Council of Educators (SACE) as a representative of the professionalism of educators or whether you look at it in terms of the DAS policy – these things are only instruments – but the important thing is how these instruments are put to use-there is a hope that these systems will not be abused but rather used very constructively so that educators themselves, once they realize that these exercises are giving some kind of positive feedback, can only grow professionally and can only benefit from this to the ultimate benefit of the child in the classroom.

All seven respondents agreed that it was necessary to regulate the professional development of educators.

DAS, by being developmental is intended to enhance strengths, develop potential and overcome weaknesses. It is to enhance the further professional development of educators. It is meant to be supportive of educator's professional growth. It is to give educators more confidence, to recognize their professional abilities and develop their potential. The appraisee



is seen as a professional whose performance is appraised in formative and supportive ways in order to facilitate further professional and personal growth and development.

The fourth question : *the aim of DAS is the growth and development of the individual educator. What are your views?* (Question 4), respondents answered as follows:

The principal's view was that a person who stopped developing would stagnate and this may be detrimental to his/her progress as a teacher.

Both language heads of department believed that:

this instrument does have capacity to provide for that kind of growth and development for the very reason that it involves the educator and the educator himself/herself assesses his/her own self in conjunction with his/her other colleagues that are involved in the process – they are able to start looking at strengths and weaknesses of the educator-so I think it goes a long way for the professional growth and development of the individual educator.

All respondents offered positive responses, some of which were:

- DAS has capacity for growth and development
- there is continuous development all the time
- DAS is the yardstick by which educators can gauge how well they are performing.

The last question asked in this category was: *do you think that DAS influences the professional development of educators?* (Question 5). Respondents were asked to comment and give details.

The principal believed that DAS would influence the educator because he/she would be aware of his/her shortcomings or weaknesses. On the advice of his/her panel, he/she would endeavour to eradicate his/her shortcomings or weaknesses so that he/she would be a better educator.

The deputy principal extended on this view by suggesting that: *it does because with constant professional development, an educator will be exposed to new ideas and new subject content.*

The Science head of department's view was that DAS did allow for an educator to develop professionally because he would know what his strengths and weaknesses were. He would also learn about developing professionally in school and he would also want to belong to professional bodies like KASTE and AMESA – so this would definitely lead them to become better educators. The Human and Social Sciences head of department believed that DAS gave the teacher an opportunity to do some introspection, which was very important. DAS also allowed educators to get meaningful and constructive advice from others instead of simply focusing on weaknesses. The other heads of department's views were similar – they also believed that DAS influenced the professional development of educators in a positive manner.

3.2.6 CONCLUSION

Emerging from the views expressed, it can be seen quite clearly that DAS has a positive impact on the professional development of the educator. DAS has capacity for growth and development. The implementation of DAS would bring about optimal personal development of educators and thereby enhance the quality of the education system as a whole.

3.2.7 MANAGEMENT INVOLVEMENT

A category entitled, *Management Involvement* was used to ask four questions related to DAS.

To the first question: *what is the attitude of school managers towards DAS? What do you think?*, the following responses were noted:

The principal's view was the school managers have adopted DAS positively and if it was applied correctly it would only benefit the educators and learners. The deputy principal's view was that it was positive because managers felt that they had a duty in terms of professional development. The English head of department's view was that DAS should not only be implemented purely as an administrative process but educators themselves should and must be able to see some kind of returns or rewards out of the system. The Science head of department's view was that the school managers were looking forward to the implementation of DAS because teachers in their departments would be able to develop professionally – they would be better teachers and it would make life easier for school managers as well if teachers

are performing as they should be. The Technology head of department's view was that school managers played a pivotal part of being one of the stakeholders in the whole process of appraisal. However, the Human and Social Sciences head of department's view differed somewhat from the others – he believed that because it was not compulsory many management members were adopting a lackadaisical attitude towards it.

Six management members believed that school managers had a positive attitude towards it and one member felt that because it was not compulsory, management members were not taking DAS seriously.

The second question asked: *Do you think DAS is being interpreted by managers correctly?* (Question 2). The following responses were noted.

All managers believed that DAS was being interpreted by school managers correctly. The essence of the head of department's view could be captured in the words of the English head of department:

I think by and large there has been a positive interpretation by managers of the system and am sure they themselves will try and assist the process as far as they can.

The general consensus was that school managers were interpreting DAS correctly.

To the third question: *Do you like to be involved in the appraisal of your sub-ordinates?* (Question 3), the following responses were noted:

All senior managers and heads of department indicated that they would definitely like to be involved in the appraisal of their subordinates. The principal's view came out quite strongly that his experience could only assist his teachers. The Science head of department's response was:

Yes, we are learning from each other and I am sure that teachers don't mind finding out what their faults are and what their strengths are.

In the final question in this category, respondents were asked to respond to the statement: *Appraisal means controlling educators*(Question 4).

All managers strongly disagreed with this statement. The following were the typical negative responses that were received:

- *definitely not, managers would rather agree with the view that appraisal leads to the general professional development of educators and enhances a healthy relationship between educators, learners and the panel was the principal's view.*
- *appraisal should be a more meaningful task, in the sense that the system should point out weaknesses as well as strengths of educators was the deputy principal's view.*
- *managers need to be able to present the positive aspect of this system in that a professionally satisfied educator in the classroom will also become a professionally satisfied educator in every other aspect of school life – it can mean improving whole school performance was the view of the English head of department.*

The Science head of department's view could be summed up as:

if you are controlling someone then you are not allowing them to be democratic, to think for themselves. Appraisal would mean trying to assist them find out their strengths and weaknesses and help them along – if there are any weaknesses, your job is to assist them. I disagree with controlling.

Appraisal does not mean controlling educators. Appraisal means assisting educators towards development was the Human and Social Sciences head of department's view.

I disagree with the statement – it means actually assessing the educator on his positive attributes and looking at areas of weakness and recommending measures to improve areas of weaknesses was the Technical head of department's view.

All managers strongly disagreed with the statement that appraisal means controlling educators.

3.2.8 CONCLUSION

DAS would be beneficial to both learners and educators and thus have a positive influence on the school at large. Appraisal would not be seen as a process that has a controlling effect on educators but rather as a system that identifies weaknesses and then develops strategies to remedy them.

3.2.9 IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

In addressing Implementation Issues, three questions were raised at the interviews with managers. In question one, respondents were asked: *What are the advantages and disadvantages of the implementation of DAS at schools?*

Arising from the responses received, the following advantages were noted:

- educators would be able confide in their peers
- educators would approach lessons confidently
- DAS ensures staff development, thereby upholding the culture of learning and teaching at school
- it gives educators opportunity to start evaluating their teaching practice in school
- it involves all stakeholders
- it is not a one dimensional process
- it is an ongoing process means that evaluation and constant feedback can only start to have a positive effect on teachers
- it can be done at anytime in the school day
- peers are going to access you and it would be easier to take criticisms from peers
- it provides checks and balances – it is a very simple method of having checks and balances without impinging negatively on educators
- DAS is the approach of the times – it gives the individual the ability to be involved in his/her own assessment or appraisal
- it allows the individual to justify the assessment achieved

- the individual is informed of areas of weaknesses and recommendations to remedy these weaknesses are provided.

The advantages of the implementation of DAS is that the policy impacts positively on all areas of school development.

The following disadvantages were noted:

- time constraints – it is time consuming – more time should be made available for the system to be implemented
- the capacity of the school to be able to administer the whole process
- some educators may take it seriously whilst others may not-this may create a problem
- some schools may be implementing DAS because of pressure from the department, thereby going through the exercise merely to meet departmental deadlines.

The weakness or disadvantage cited by the majority of the respondents was that of time constraints. As can be seen, the advantages of the implementation of DAS at school far outweighed the disadvantages.

Respondents were asked to respond to the second question:

What in your view are the implementation problems experienced by most school managers?

The principal cited the problem of time constraints and the availability of the various members of the panel as the main problem. In a large school it was difficult to complete appraisal within the time allocated. He stated that many classes were left unattended when the panel was involved in appraisal.

One head of department believed that:

I think the school manager is faced with that challenge but I don't think it is a challenge that is insurmountable.

The Afrikaans head of department mentioned the problem of educator attitude towards the implementation of DAS. She said:

I think teachers don't want to be assessed or appraised because they feel that they know what they are doing and they can do it without anyone interfering in their normal functioning in the classroom.

The Science head of department cited a problem generally peculiar to large schools such as Clairwood Secondary. She said:

School managers have big departments – 15 in my department – so I am going to have a bit of problem going out to each teacher and making sure that every part of this policy is completed during the implementation phase. Time is the most important problem here.

The problem of time constraints was the major problem cited by all managers in the implementation of DAS.

The final question asked in this category was:

What can be done to improve the implementation of DAS?(Question 3).

The principal cited the following:

- individual guidance must be possible if and when the need arises
- while educators are involved in the panel, some strategy must be devised to keep pupils occupied – it may not be possible to send a relief teacher due to several factors
- most of the appraisals completed were very good – in the exercise completed, most of the educators received a B symbol – this would mean that educators have little or no areas of improvement. This is untrue. Teachers must be sincere in their approach and unfortunately this is not so in the classroom.

The deputy principal cited the time factor as the most important:

If time can be made available for the system to be implemented, it will help

tremendously.

The English head of department's view was:

The whole system of DAS has to be linked up with Whole School Evaluation. For an educator in the classroom, if he/she is involved integrally in trying to improve his/her own professional development, then for the school as a whole one needs to be able to see other areas of improvement as well because an educator needs to see an improvement in school across the board.

For the Afrikaans head of department the most importance attribute was trust.

Everyone needs to know that DAS is put in place not to see you in bad light, to go on a fault-finding mission-they just need to know that everybody is doing it because they have one mission.

The Human and Social Sciences head of department cited changing teacher attitudes towards DAS as being the most important. He believed that DAS is there to develop a teacher and not for fault-finding. If they can internalize this value then every educator will try to look up to DAS and this will improve the implementation of DAS.

3.2.10 CONCLUSION

Several managers commented on the time consuming nature of the policy. Arranging time for a colleague to be free to carry out a classroom visit had been very difficult. These were the main concerns. The advantages of the implementation of the DAS policy were wide ranging and far reaching and impacted positively on every aspect of school development.

3.3 CONCLUSION

In terms of Understandings of DAS policy at school, there was no problem with the understanding and interpretation of the policy at site. In terms of Evaluation issues, managers felt that there was an urgent need to move away from the old approach as it was seen to be doing more harm than good. DAS has the capacity to develop the educator professionally and

thus impact the school at large. In general feelings of satisfaction were felt with the implementation of the policy. Educators felt that their work was formally recognized and acknowledged. The experience with DAS has been positive, affirming and valuable.

CHAPTER 4

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter the findings of the research were presented according to the five categories. In this chapter the significance of the findings will be presented.

4.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS

It needs to be emphasized that this research was only a case study of the management's view of the developmental appraisal system in Clairwood Secondary School and so the findings cannot be taken necessarily to represent accurately the broader view of management members in all schools. With this in mind, the following may be taken to summarise the main findings of the case study.

4.2.1 Understanding of DAS at school

It is obvious that all managers agreed that DAS had a place in school. Managers at Clairwood Secondary School site were generally familiar with the DAS instrument design and with how DAS must be conducted or implemented. With respect to the impact of DAS on educational change and democracy, all managers were in agreement that Das made a positive impact on educational change and democracy by improving the culture of learning and teaching at site. DAS also affected Whole School Evaluation in a positive way. With regard to the strengths of DAS – the main strengths was that DAS analysed the strengths and weaknesses of educators and that great stress was placed on a programme to attend to areas of weaknesses. This would help an educator to grow and develop professionally. With respect to the weaknesses, the issue of time constraints to implement DAS was cited as a major weakness by managers.

4.2.2 Evaluation Issues

In terms of evaluation issues, the present DAS was a great improvement on the old judgemental approach and the feeling was that educators had accepted DAS more readily because Das focused on growth and development of the practitioner. DAS also made a positive impact on learners development.

4.2.3 Professional Development

DAS had a positive impact on the professional development of educators. In terms of the setting up of the staff development teams, the staff of Clairwood Secondary was in agreement with procedures of the policy. The findings showed that the main aim of DAS was the growth and development of educators ie. DAS influences the professional development of educators.

4.2.4 Management Involvement

The attitudes of Clairwood Secondary School managers towards DAS were good and positive. They felt that DAS would help the educators in their departments to grow professionally. The interpretation of the policy document was correct. All managers disagreed quite strongly that DAS means controlling educators. All managers indicated that they would like to be involved in the appraisal of their sub-ordinates.

4.2.5 Implementation Issues

With respect to the advantages and disadvantages of DAS, all managers agreed that the advantages far outweighed the disadvantages. The main disadvantage cited was that of time not being set aside to implement DAS. This was considered to be the main problem in the implementation of DAS. In the face of implementation difficulties, Elmore and Sykes (1979/80) suggests a *backward mapping* approach which challenges policy makers to start at the point of implementation and work backwards, rather than starting at the point of policy formulation and working forwards to implementation. They argue that the forward mapping

approach commonly favoured by policymakers mistakenly assumes that policymakers are able to control the complex political, organizational and technical factors that affect implementation, particularly at school level (Elmore and Sykes, 1979/80).

4.3 CONCLUSION

The findings are qualitative in nature and are intended to illuminate management's attitudes towards DAS. Based on the comments of the management members, the following general comments can be made. What was an important finding was the revelation of the depth of concern for the problem of time constraints for the implementation of DAS. It was also agreed that this problem was not insurmountable. Factors which contribute to the decline of the culture of teaching and learning would be clearly identified and addressed accordingly. Developmental Appraisal is based on the principle of life-long learning and development. It aims to promote the personal and professional growth of educators in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning at school.

4.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings of this research, the following recommendations are made:

- educators need to be workshopped on where the DAS policy is coming from, its historical background and its advantages – the policy needs to be *sold* to educators so that it would be more readily acceptable. This would help educators to realize that DAS was formulated for their own development and upliftment.
- educators should be informed on all aspects of the appraisal process, so that they can take the initiative to conduct the process of appraisal.
- appraisal should be inclusive of all stakeholders and its members should be trained to conduct the process of appraisal.
- the DAS approach is developmental and it is important at the planning stage to build in time for reflection and for developing strategies for improvement.

4.5 Conclusion

The overall impression gained from the interviews was that all the respondents were favourably disposed towards DAS. DAS was found to be a good and valuable system and that it would definitely have a positive impact on the school at large. However the problem of making time available for the implementation of DAS was found to be main stumbling block. Although this was found to be the major area of concern, I am sure the department of education would find ways of addressing this problem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrew, T.E & Barnes, S. 1990. Assessment of Teaching.
In. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. Houston, R. (Ed). New York. Macmillan.
- Balkaran, N. 2000. *Evaluation Teacher Appraisal*.
An Exploration of Teacher's Attitudes Towards the Policy of Developmental Appraisal.
University of Durban Westville.
- Ball, S.J. 1994. *A Critical and Post-structural Approach*
Britain: ST. Edmundsbury Press
- Bissetty, K. & SAPA. *Teacher appraisal Plan Approved*.
The Daily News, 1 September 1998: 8.
- Black, S Taking Teachers' Measure. In: *American School Board Journal*. (1998)
Vol. 185: pp. 39-42
- Bollington, R. Hopkins, D & West, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal*.
Trowbridge. Dotesios Printers
- Borg, W.R & Gall, M.D. 1989. *Educational Research: An Introduction*. New York.
Longman
- Burke, P. Heodeman, R. & Heideman C. 1990. *Programming for Staff Development*.
New York: The Falmer Press.
- Cladwell, S.D. & Marshall, J.C. 1982. Staff development- Four approaches described,
assessed for practitioner; theoeretician. *NASSP Bulletin*. 66(45) 25-35
- Carron, G. 1994. Inspection and Supervision: Reflections on International Experience.
In. *School Management. Teacher Development and Support*. (Ed.) Swartz, R.

University of Witwatersrand: Education Policy Unit. Pp 37-54.

Chisholm, L. 1997. Preface In *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report..* (Eds).

Mokagalane, E. Carrim, N. Gardiner, M. & Chisholm, L. University of Witwatersrand:EPU

Christie, P. 1997. "Global Trends in Local Contexts: a South African perspective on Competence debates". *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education.* 18(1), pp 55-69

Dillon-Peterson, B. 1981. Staff Development/Organisation Development. In Betty Dillon-Peretson (ED.) *Staff Development/Organisation Development.* Pp. 1-10 Alexandria, V.A: ASCD.

Elmore, R. 1979/1980. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions". *Political Science Quarterly.* 94(4), pp. 601-616

Elmore, R. & Sykes G. 1992. "Curriculum Policy". In P.W. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Curriculum.* New York and Toronto: Macmillan Publishing Company, pp. 185-215.

ELRC. 1998. *Development Appraisal for Educators.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

Fuhrman, S. 1995. Introduction: Recent Research on Education Reform. *Educational Researcher,* 24(9), pp. 4-5.

Fullan, M. with Stiegelbauer, S. 1991. *The New Meaning of Educational Change.* New York, Teachers College Press.

Gitlin, A & Smyth, J. 1989. *Teacher Evaluation. Educative Alternatives.* London: Falmer Press.

Handee, R.E. 1976. Toward Effective Staff Development Plans and Programmes. *Educational Leadership.* 34(3) 163-164

- Hopkins, D. Ainscow, M. & West, M 1994. *School Improvement in an Era of Change*. Great Britain: Redwood Books
- Joyce, B. & Showers, B. 1980. Improving in Service Training: The messages of research. *NASSP Bulletin*, 37(5) 379-382.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C.K, Arbuckle, M.A., Murray, L.B., Dubea, C & Williams, M.K. 1987. *Continuing to Learn*. Oxford: National Staff Development Council.
- Quinlan, O. & Davidoff, S. 1997. *Valuing Teachers through Appraisal*. Pretoria: Via Afrika.
- Schreuder, JH., du Toit, PJ., Roesch, NC & Shah, CG. 1993. *Professional Development: Practical Activities for the Principal and Teacher*. Durban.
- Seidman, I.E. 1991. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A guide for research in education And the social science*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Trethowan, D. 1987. *Appraisal and Target Setting: A Handbook for Teacher Development*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Tuner, G. & Clift, P. 1998. *Studies in Teacher Appraisal*. Sussex: Falmer Press.
- Vithal, R. & Jansen, J. 1997. *Designing your first Research Proposal*. Kenwyn. Juta & Co. Ltd.

APPENDIX

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. UNDERSTANDING OF DAS POLICY AT SCHOOL

1. Is there a need for appraisal at schools?
2. Are you familiar with the DAS instrument design? What is your opinion of the DAS instrument?
3. Are you familiar with how DAS must be conducted or implemented?
4. Do you see DAS as impacting on educational changes and democracy?
5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the policy?
6. Does DAS impact on the culture of learning and teaching at schools? Respond.
7. What is the relationship between DAS and Whole School Evaluation? Comment.
8. Did you have training in the implementation of the DAS policy?

2. EVALUATION ISSUES

1. What is your view of the old judgemental approach to educator evaluation?
2. Do you think the developmental approach to the Appraisal System that is presently in place is an improvement on the old system of educator evaluation?
3. Does DAS influence learner development? Comment.

3. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Setting up of SDT: Do you think the setting up of the staff development team will contribute to professional development?
2. What is your opinion on the setting up of panels for DAS by the staff.
3. Do you think it is necessary to regulate the professional development of educators?
4. The aim of DAS is the growth and development of the individual educator. What are

your views?

5. Do you think that DAS influences the professional development of educators?
Comment and give details.

4. **MANAGEMENT INVOLVEMENT**

1. What is the attitude of school managers towards DAS? What do you think?
2. Do you think DAS is being interpreted by managers correctly?
3. Do you like to be involved in the appraisal of your sub-ordinates?
4. Appraisal means controlling educators. Respond to this statement.

5. **IMPLEMENTATION ISSUE**

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the implementation of DAS at schools?
2. What in your view are the implementation problems experienced by most school Managers?
3. What can be done to improve the implementation of DAS?