

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION, WITH
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO A PILOT SCHOOL IN THE UMLAZI SOUTH DISTRICT OF THE
KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE**

BY

LINTON. S. NAIDOO

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF EDUCATION [EDUCATION MANAGEMENT]**

IN THE

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL

DURBAN

FEBRUARY

2003


DECLARATION

I HEREBY DECLARE 'AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO A PILOT SCHOOL IN THE UMLAZI SOUTH DISTRICT OF THE KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE' IS MY OWN WORK AND THAT ALL SOURCES CONSULTED AND QUOTED HAVE BEEN INDICATED AND ACKNOWLEDGED BY MEANS OF COMPLETE REFERENCES. THE OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN THIS STUDY ARE THOSE OF THE WRITER AND ARE NOT THOSE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NATAL OR THE KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE.

.....
L.S.NAIDOO

STATEMENT BY THE SUPERVISOR

THIS MINI-DISSERTATION IS SUBMITTED WITH / ~~WITHOUT~~ MY APPROVAL.



.....
PROFESSOR M THURLOW
(SUPERVISOR)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this research study would have been impossible without the efficient assistance, unceasing motivation and competent support of many people. I therefore express my appreciation and gratitude to the following who found time to assist :

Shanta, my wife, and daughters, Rasaleka and Kriosha, who inspired and supported me throughout my studies.

Prof. M. Thurlow, my supervisor, for his guidance, patience and wisdom.

My colleagues at school, who were positively critical and inspirational.

The participants at the pilot school, whose responses were so critical to the project.

This has been truly an interesting journey and I trust you find it worthwhile.

Linton S Naidoo

ABSTRACT

Evaluation is not unfamiliar : educators in classrooms use constant feedback from learners as the basis for self-evaluation. What may be less familiar is for groups of educators in a school to carry out a self-evaluation or experience a whole-school evaluation process, which in the latter case means more than a single educator. Whether familiar or not school evaluation has increased in importance in recent years, particularly at the level of the whole school.

The introduction of WSE, notwithstanding its worthy intentions, has proved to be a contentious issue for educator unions, which expressed considerable reservation both about which led to the introduction of WSE and the underlying purposes of the process. In addition, there is no widely available, if any, assessment of the success or failure of the pilot project. Within this broad context, this small-scale research project, subject to limitations, attempts to investigate the experiences and reactions of one school in which an attempt has been made to implement the process.

Based upon the responses of the participants in this research study, it became clear that there is a desire to be involved in the traditions of 'school improvement'. If one assumes that the sample group is representative of stakeholders at the pilot school, then this study believes that some important principle of WSE are implicit in the way things are now being done and thought of at the school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	I
STATEMENT BY THE SUPERVISOR	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VII

CHAPTER ONE

ORIENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY	1
1.3	THE PILOT SCHOOL – A HISTORICAL SURVEY	2
1.4	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	4
1.5	PRINCIPLE THEORIES THAT INFORM THIS STUDY	5
1.6	SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY	5
1.7	STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY	7
1.8	CONCLUSION	7

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	INTRODUCTION	9
2.2	AN UNDERSTANDING OF EVALUATION IN EDUCATION	9
2.3	WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE	10
2.4	EVALUATION FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT	11
2.5	CHANGE AND CHANGE PROCESSES	13
2.6	EVALUATION, SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT	15
2.7	CONCLUSION	18

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1	INTRODUCTION	19
3.2	PRELIMINARY SURVEY	19
3.3	THE APPROACH OF THE MAIN SURVEY	19
3.4	THE RESEARCH QUESTION	20
3.5	THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	20
3.6	SAMPLING	22
3.7	ACCESS TO THE SITE	22
3.8	CONCLUSION	22

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS OF THE MAIN SURVEY

4.1	INTRODUCTION	24
4.2	FINDINGS OF THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY	24
4.3	FINDINGS OF THE MAIN SURVEY	25
4.3.1	THE 'OFFICIAL' INTENTION OF WSE PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHERS IN THE PILOT SCHOOL	25
4.3.2	EXPERIENCES OF WSE AT THE PILOT SCHOOL	26
4.3.3	THE PROCESSES OF WSE AT THE PILOT SCHOOL	28
4.3.4	THE OVERALL PERCEPTION OF WSE IN TERMS OF ITS UTILITY	29
4.3.5	THE GOVERNING BODY AND WSE : POTENTIAL FOR EMPOWERMENT	30
4.4	DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	32
4.4.1	THE INTENTION OF WSE	32
4.4.2	EXPERIENCES OF WSE AT THE PILOT SCHOOL	33
4.4.3	THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION IN THE PILOT SCHOOL	33
4.4.4	THE OVERALL PERCEPTION OF WSE IN TERMS OF ITS UTILITY	34
4.4.5	THE GOVERNING BODY – A NEW ROLE	34
4.5	CONCLUSION	35

CHAPTER FIVE
RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION

5.1	INTRODUCTION	36
5.2	SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS	36
5.3	CONCLUSION	37

REFERENCES	39
-------------------	-----------

APPENDIX A.1 : GUIDELINES FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

APPENDIX A.2 : SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B.1 : LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL OF THE PILOT SCHOOL

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DAS	DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM
DoE	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WSE	WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

CHAPTER ONE

ORIENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This opening chapter embodies the theme of the study : **Whole-School Evaluation** (WSE). The sole intention of this opening chapter is to provide an impetus for the study.

1.2 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

The South African Ministry of Education has set quality assurance of the education system as its overriding goal. In this connection, through the national Department of Education, a plethora of quality assurance initiatives have been put in place. These include:

- The Assessment Policy, gazetted in December 1998, which provides for systemic evaluation at the key transitional stages (grades 3,6,9);
- The Further Education and Training Act (98 of 1998), which sets out obligations for assessment and reporting on the quality of education provided in the FET band;
- The South African Qualification Authority Act (1995) which provides for quality assurance bodies to be established for monitoring and auditing achievements in terms of national standards and qualifications; and
- The DAS and the educator load of 80 hours development time, gazetted in 1999, which is aimed at improving the quality of teaching through a process of evaluation of educators for development purposes.

In addition to the above, the more recently introduced national policy on WSE, which is intended to complement the other initiatives and has been carried out according to an agreed national model. The new WSE approach claims to be radically different from the previous school inspection system

carried out variously, under the apartheid regime. This model is intended to be 'less punitive and more supportive and developmental, with feedback mechanism which enables schools and their support structures to agree on improvement targets and developmental plans' (Minister Kader Asmal in his foreword to the national policy document, June 2000).

The new approach includes school self-evaluation, ongoing district-based support, monitoring and development and external evaluations conducted by supervisory units. National policy on WSE was published in August 2001, together with supporting materials related to evaluation guidelines and criteria for evaluations, and a set of instruments for school evaluations and self-evaluation. During the same year, training modules were produced to prepare for the implementation of WSE. In 2002, throughout the country, schools were encouraged to undertake the self-evaluation element of WSE, and in each provincial education department, a relatively small number of schools identified as pilot schools in 2001, and carried on into the early part of 2002.

The introduction of WSE, notwithstanding its worthy intentions, has proved to be a contentious issue for educator unions, which expressed considerable reservation both about which led to the introduction of WSE and the underlying purposes of the process. In addition, there is no widely available, if any, assessment of the success or failure of the pilot project. Within this broad context, this small-scale research project, subject to limitations, attempts to investigate the experiences and reactions of one school in which an attempt has been made to implement the process.

1.3 THE PILOT SCHOOL – A HISTORICAL SURVEY

The school, one of the limited number of pilot schools in KwaZulu-Natal, is a primary school in the Umlazi District of the KZN Department of Education and Culture. The school is in the 21st year of its existence. That it has undergone various policy changes and forms of inspections over the years is obvious.

However, whether it has come to terms with the new changes in the way schools are to be managed in South Africa may be answered by it having undergone the WSE process. The concern is whether it is still caught in the 'old ways of operating'.

The school has a pupil enrolment of 800, drawn mostly from local community. It is situated in a largely economic-housing suburb. It is a very well resourced school and the teaching staff comprises 20 teachers. The staff comprises the principal and deputy principal (both of whom have been at the school for about 15 years prior to assuming their current positions), four head of departments and fourteen level one teachers. All staff members have at least a three-year teaching diploma. In addition to this, there are 14 staff members who are university graduates. The major slice of the staff had never experienced an inspection of any sort, because they had entered the profession after the unions had successfully prevented any type of inspection to be instituted. The school has, however, engaged in the DAS over the past three years.

The pilot school had at times been commended by the District Office, as well as its peers for the 'quality' of its work and by paging through some of its brochures, the school proudly professes to have consistently produced excellent academic, sports and cultural achievers.

However, as this school had displayed success under the old culture "of the control and dependency model, the inspection model" (Bush and West-Burnham, 1994:173), recent changes in South African education has been problematic for many schools. Many are struggling to meet the demands of providing appropriate services and products. By failing to improve and develop on a continuous basis, schools are falling by the wayside. The pilot school and the WSE exercise (which is steeped in the school improvement tradition), may be an opportunity to build-on.

1.4 PURPOSE FOR THE STUDY

A great deal of research effort has been directed at an attempt to improve education. There is a need, however, to effectively manage large-scale reforms that are taking place in our education systems. This study expects to examine the deeper and more complex understandings of roles of teachers as interpreters and enactors of the WSE policy.

Policy-makers at national level usually produce policies and schools and teachers remain in the background. Although teacher unions may represent them at policy level, teachers' voices are seldom heard. It seems that the emphasis is on education policy production (see, *Bowe et al.*, 1992:6) and to a lesser extent on the implementation of policy, which are mainly seen as two separate processes.

Despite the vast literature on educational policy change, relatively little empirical studies on the experiences of teachers' in South Africa exists. Sikes (1992:194) is of the view that teachers have to implement policies, even though they are unlikely to have been involved in their formulation. They are required to change themselves and what they do, to meet specifications laid down by policy makers who neither know them or the contexts in which they work. Therefore, the time has come to involve teachers, who are called upon to participate fully in the educational changes.

Against this background and in view of the limited scale of this study, the purpose of this study is to address the following researchable questions :

- (i) What appears to be the 'official' intention of WSE, and how does this relate to the range of intentions more generally reported in the literature ?
- (ii) How is the 'official' intention perceived by educators in the pilot school, and what divergences of perception, if any, is there between

official and perceived intention ?

- (iii) How is the process of implementation being envisaged and what have been the experiences of this process, in the pilot school ?
- (iv) What are the overall perception of WSE in terms of its utility in relation to its claimed intentions ?
- (v) How, if at all, might the WSE be modified or reconceptualised to increase its utility ?

1.5 PRINCIPAL THEORIES THAT INFORM THIS STUDY

Basically, the three bodies of theory which, at different levels, that informed this study, may be summarised as follows :

- Theoretical issues related to quality assurance in schools encapsulated in school effectiveness and school improvement, of which the latter has particular relevance for the process of improving quality (see, for example, van Velzen *et al*, 1985).
- Improvement, which by definition, implies change and especially the management of change, provide part of the context for this study (see, for example, Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991).
- Finally, the specific literature on the measurement and management of performance, both individual and organisational , which provided the most immediate context for this study (see, for example, West-Burnham *et al.* , 2001).

1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The scope of this research is limited in at least four respects. The first area of

concern is the use of self-reported measures. Ideally, this study should have been conducted by observation. Time constraints both on the part of the researcher and respondents precluded this type of research design.

The main limitation of the proposed study can be inferred from issues arising from the change process in education. According to the literature, these might be characterised into three broad phases (*see for example*, Berman and McLaughlin 1975, Fullan with Stiegelbauer 1991 and Gray et al. 1999) :

- **Initiation** – the period during which a decision is made to go ahead with an educational change and plans are formulated and developed.
- **Implementation** – a crucial stage when schools are asked to begin with the innovation in the classroom.
- **Institutionalisation** (incorporation/impact) – the final stage when the innovative practice becomes a routine part of the school. Alternatively, the change may disappear, either by way of a decision to discard it or simply through attrition.

While it will be possible to research the initiation aspect of WSE, and to obtain some useful insight into the experiences of the implementation process, it will not be possible to evaluate the introduction of WSE in the pilot school in terms of its real impact. Also because of the limited scale of a mini-dissertation, the decision was taken to focus substantially on reported experiences of those involved in the pilot school, rather than on a wider assessment. This together with the fact that the research is a case study, obviously prevents generalisation from the findings.

Nevertheless, from the point of view of the school itself, the findings are likely to be valuable, and they may provide indicators which ought to be addressed in a more comprehensive study.

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This investigation comprises five chapters. The intention of **Chapter One** has already been enunciated in its introduction.

Chapter Two presents a detailed literature survey. It considers, amongst others, the relationship between WSE and quality assurance; evaluation for accountability and development; change and change processes and evaluation; and school effectiveness and school improvement.

Chapter Three provides the methodological framework within which the study was conducted. It restates the research questions; outlines the broad approach to the research; explains the research approach; details the sample and describes the research instruments.

Chapter Four presents the findings for the empirical part of the study. This chapter reports on the preliminary survey and the main survey conducted. The main focus, however, remains the experiences of the sample group identified in chapter three.

Chapter Five analyses and discusses the critical themes that emanates from the experiences of the sample group. The themes are examined and evaluated in terms of what has been stated in chapter two and the official documentation.

Chapter Six draws conclusions from the findings of the study. The chapter includes recommendations based on the findings and ends with an overall conclusion to the study.

1.8 CONCLUSION

This opening chapter placed the study in perspective by way of a motivation and presented a systematic format for the study. A brief historical survey of

the pilot school was undertaken and the purpose of the study and its significance were clearly illustrated. It outlined the body of theory which informed the research project. The scope and limitations of the study were also presented. Lastly, a structure of the study was presented.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter identified the challenges facing education in South Africa and demonstrated that dramatic changing conditions require significant changes in the implementation of education policy, such as WSE. Schools continue to face an increasingly complex environment. As a result, quality assurance and the management of WSE become strategically important. This chapter presents a conceptual and functional definition of evaluation and issues related to the concept of WSE.

2.2 AN UNDERSTANDING OF EVALUATION IN EDUCATION

Making judgements about people and institutions, whether formally or informally, is, of course an ancient phenomenon, both within and outside the education system (Rogers and Badham, 1992). The need for effective management to include monitoring and evaluation as a basic component is well established in organisations, more recently perhaps, in the educational world. Evaluation has recently gained currency and importance in the educational debate. Yet despite its increasingly widespread use, this term has no clear definition and there is no empirical evidence to suggest what it might mean in practice. What is clear, however, is that evaluation is deep-seated and directed at the structural features of situations (see Hopkins *et al*, 1994).

Rogers and Badham (1992 : 3) thus, defines evaluation as :

... the process of systematically collecting and analysing information in order to form value judgements based on firm evidence.

While Norris citing Tyler (1990 : 16) remarks that evaluation implies 'a process by which the values of an enterprise are ascertained'.

An examination of the official documentation of the DoE reveals that the principles underpinning WSE are in line with the above understanding of evaluation. It states that WSE will 'seek to measure a school's success in relation to its circumstances' (DoE, 2000). It will take into account the extent of social and educational deprivation in the areas from which its learners come. Simply stated, it answers the question whether the school had added value to the life of the child. The DoE document further explains that a key principle in WSE is its intention to identify the extent to which a school adds to a learner's knowledge, understanding and skills.

2.3 WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

According to the report by the *Centre for Education Policy, Development, Evaluation and Management* (2001), improving education quality has been a key concern of post-apartheid education. All major pieces of legislation affecting education since 1994 have placed quality firmly on the agenda. The *White Paper on Education and Training* (1995) noted that there had been a decline in performance in many schools serving the majority of the population. Section 4 of the *National Education Policy Act* (1996) includes among its concerns 'achieving redress and enhancing quality'. Section 20 of the *South African Schools Act* (1996) entrusts school governing bodies with the provision of quality education.

Such commitment has gained concrete expression through, for example, the establishment of a Chief Directorate : Quality Assurance (CD:QA) in the national DoE. The main function of the CD:QA is to develop and execute policy on all aspects of quality assurance. Broadly, the accepted definition of quality assurance within this directorate includes reference to the determination by an expert body of standards, appropriate methods and quality requirements, accompanied by a process of inspection or evaluation

that examines the extent to which practice in schools meets these standards (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993).

Thus, to define quality assurance often results in a variety of contradicting meanings and implies different things to different people. However, the *Policy Framework For Quality Assurance In The Education And Training System In South Africa* (1998 : 9) refers to quality assurance as to the 'monitoring and evaluation of the performance of the various levels of the education system in achieving the specific goals at each level and overall objectives of the system'.

In essence WSE is concerned about improving quality. It uses self-evaluation methods and external support, and assume a whole school approach to reviews and planning. Whole-school evaluation is the cornerstone of the quality assurance system in schools (DoE : 2000 : 7) and according to the minister's foreword on the policy, WSE "introduces an effective monitoring and evaluation process that is vital to the improvement of quality and standards of performance in schools."

The quality assurance field has developed as a response to the demands for accountability in education in education from parents, taxpayers and politicians (see Watermeyer, 1997 : 30). With inspection and auditing being the frame of the past decades, quality assurance has come to be exemplified by the development of performance indicators and "school improvement" planning.

2.4 EVALUATION FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT

The National Policy On WSE document (2000:7) lists amongst its aims to 'moderate externally, on a sampling basis, the results of self-evaluation carried out by the schools' and to 'increase the level of accountability within the education system'.

It further cites self-evaluation; ongoing district support; monitoring and development and external evaluations as aspects of WSE. However, WSE assumes a mix of purposes; accountability of schools to the system and improvement through self-evaluation. Ideally, the two purposes would be effectively promoted through different methodologies.

According to the literature(see), there are two main purposes for performance evaluation :

- For accountability purposes, to prove quality;
- For development purposes, to improve quality.

Thurlow (1993 : 3) enhances this by citing two variants of evaluation – external evaluation and internal evaluation. The former occurs when assessment of an institution is assessed by those who are not participants of it , while the latter takes place when an institution is assessed by those who are participants within it. According to Thurlow (ibid.) these variants are not mutually exclusive and, perhaps represent the ends of a continuum.

Internationally, during the late 1970's and early 1980's in the United Kingdom, local education authorities adopted schemes of school self-evaluation as an alternative to inspection. In this approach schools, systematically examined their strengths and weaknesses. This was not very successful as Wilcox (1992 : 15), for example, suggests :

Although in some cases school self-evaluation, perhaps better termed school-based review, was influential in carrying through programmes of change, it did not take hold in the vast majority of schools and seldom, if ever, functioned as an appropriate instrument of accountability.

Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991 : 10) suggested that :

Much has been learnt from these schemes, but for most schools it

proved easier to identify priorities for the future development than to implement selected targets within a specific time-frame. School self-evaluation has consequently had limited effects on the daily life of most schools.

The document on WSE cited above delineates in some detail the aspects of the school to be evaluated, and makes reference to developmental issues. The document says, that 'as a process, WSE is meant to be supportive and developmental rather than punitive and judgemental.' It also acknowledges that 'its main purpose is to facilitate improvement of school performance through approaches of partnerships, collaboration, mentoring and guidance.' These developmental strategies may be acceptable, however, it is unnerving for teachers to note that the composition of the evaluation panel comprises DoE officials only. Hence, the already well publicised spat between the teacher unions and the DoE concerning classroom observation of teachers in practice :

... SADTU raised concerns regarding the implementation of the classroom observation component, including a system of Development Appraisal System as well as WSE and both of these necessitated classroom observations to ensure quality in education.

(DOE :20/05/2002)

While WSE is purported to be different, it would appear nevertheless to represent merely a variant on the old external inspection for contractual accountability system.

2.5 CHANGE AND CHANGE PROCESSES

This section draws from the literature on change broadly. The work of Fullan (1985) and Bowe *et al* (1992), are useful in understanding the processes of transformation and policy. The perspectives of change suggest that while

policy provides a broad definition and direction for change, change is ultimately dependent on how people at different levels of the process respond to the impetus for change. McLaughlin (1993:86) states :

At each point in the policy process, a policy is transformed as individuals interpret and act on it.

According to Fullan (1985) initiatives for change are reacted to the context of some familiar, reliable construction of reality. Policy initiatives meant for school-level change thus will have to deal not only with broad structural issues (principles) but also with teacher' perceptions, understandings and ideologies regarding the essential characteristics of what constitutes their practice. An innovation cannot be assimilated unless its meaning is shared. The implication is that players in the change process need to engage with initiatives in their own contexts, and should share the basic assumptions, conceptions and beliefs underlying the initiative.

The *Centre for Education Policy, Development, Evaluation and Management* (2001:7) report states :

... that changes as represented in the policy frameworks, no matter how transformative the discourse of the policies may be, cannot succeed unless due consideration is accorded to the players at the different levels.

The clarity of new innovations becomes a crucial aspect in influencing the nature of responses of those who must implement the changes. Research on educational change in other contexts has shown that if practitioners have a basic understanding of the principles behind the change and value the innovation, they often exert additional effort that may be required for implementation (Fullan, 1985).

Fullan (1991 : 35) highlights two notions with respect to clarity of innovations – ‘false clarity’ and ‘painful unclarity’. The former refers to situations where people ‘think they have changed but have only assimilated the superficial trappings of the new practice’. Painful unclarity is ‘experienced when unclear innovations are attempted under conditions that do not support the development of subjective meaning of change’. Fullan (1991:36) talks of the tendency of people to adjust to the ‘near occasion’ of change by changing as little as possible. He does not suggest that subjective realities should define what change is, but that ‘ultimately the transformation of subjective realities (be) the essence of change’. Thus, for example, the teacher can alter his/her teaching behaviour without coming to grips with the conceptions and beliefs underlying the new approaches to school improvement strategies.

Finally, a related point that needs to be made regards educational change broadly. According to Sabatier and Ceryth (1986:12), ‘the difficulty a reform encounters is dependent upon the extent of departure from values and procedures of an existing order.’ This point is emphasised by Odden (1991) who suggest the need to distinguish between ‘redistributive’ and ‘developmental’ policies – what Fullan calls first order and second order changes – in considering transformation. Redistributive policies are those that seek to distribute goods in society and tend to seek more fundamental change. Developmental policies, on the other hand, are initiated in the context of existing practice or activity and seek to improve efficiency and effectiveness without disturbing the basic features of what is being done (Odden, 1991; Fullan, 1991). The implementation processes of redistributive policies tend to be more contentious than those of developmental policies.

2.6 EVALUATION, SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

The school effectiveness research movement has become increasingly sophisticated at producing lists of the characteristics of the ‘effective school’. These lists of quality indicators are useful descriptors and have helped to

inform the framework on which schools might be evaluated (see Policy on WSE – DoE, 2000). However, according to Hopkins *et al* (1994 : 158) :

There remains a gap between the establishment of common understanding about characteristics that predispose schools towards effectiveness and implementation processes and strategies for generating improvement at the individual school level.

Barth (1990:19) distinguishes between the two different approaches towards school development that have generally been called 'school effectiveness' and 'school improvement' movements. He parodies the different sets of assumptions and opinions as follows :

- Schools do not have the capacity or the will to improve themselves; improvement must therefore come from outside the school.
- What needs to be improved about schools is the level of pupil performance and achievement, this measured by standardised tests.
- School improvement is an attempt to identify what people in schools should know and be able to do, and devise ways to get them to know and do it.

These assumptions (selected from Barth's more detailed list) imply an approach which encourages someone to do something to someone else; it is about measurement and control rather than growth and self-directed learning; it is about external interventions rather than internal development.

Barth (*ibid.*) goes on to argue that a 'community of learners' approach to school improvement generates a radically different set of assumptions from those above. Some of these are :

- Schools have the capacity to improve themselves, if the conditions are right. A major responsibility of those outside the school is to help

provide those conditions.

- What needs to be improved about schools is their culture.
- School improvement is an effort to determine and provide conditions under which those who inhabit schools will promote and sustain learning amongst themselves.

These assumptions capture the essence of this study's approach to school improvement. Van Veltzen *et al* (1985:78) define school improvement as 'systematic, sustained effort in changing learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.' Although it is not possible to cover this definition in detail, the following points [some of which has already been covered] are relevant to the context of this study :

- Change takes place over time. Realistic or undefined time-lines fail to recognise that implementation occurs developmentally. It is a process not an event.
- Ownership and understanding of the change are important - both the reasons why it is happening and how it will bring about improvement.
- Shared control of implementation is important – top-down is not all right.
- Organisational conditions within and in relation to the school make it more or less likely that school improvement will occur.
- It is very difficult to change education without also changing the school as an organization, without enlisting the co-operation of teachers and without the advocacy of school leaders.

It, therefore follows, according to Hopkins et al. (1997), that school improvement is about curriculum development, the strength in the school organisation, the teaching and learning process, and a developmental approach to evaluation. Such an approach to evaluation should focus attention on the school's capacity to deal with change and ensuring a belief in the school improvement agenda.

From this it is evident that evaluation is an integral element in school improvement. Stenhouse (1980:122), for example, argues 'against the separation of developer and evaluator' and is in favour of integrated research. He continues :

Evaluation should, as it were, lead development and be integrated with it. Then the conceptual distinction between development and evaluation is destroyed and the two merge as research.

Therefore, the fusion between evaluation and school development defines the central axis of school improvement processes and roles.

2.7 CONCLUSION

These are the conceptual issues related to the body of theory that inform WSE. It details evaluation literature in order to provide a platform for the study. The literature survey demonstrated the 'official' intention of WSE and related this, where possible, to the range of intentions more generally reported in the literature.

The next chapter will describe the method of the study and explain the choice of the research design.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The intention of this study was to explore the perceptions and experiences of the implementation of WSE in a pilot school. Consequently, for a small-scale study with limited focus, the methods used were relatively straightforward and standard ones. To gain an insight into the practical implementation of WSE, two surveys were conducted – a preliminary survey and then the main survey in the pilot school.

3.2 PRELIMINARY SURVEY

Upon having read extensively on the subject matter, a study of this nature would not have been completed if discussions were not held with a host of people. Prior to the main survey, preliminary discussions were held with a focus group of people and observations made of reactions to the announcement of the WSE policy of all ranks at the researcher's own school were recorded and are reported. Others in this group included members of the Education Management Development Committee (Isipingo Circuit) of which the researcher is a member, an official each of two teacher unions (SADTU and NAPTOSA) and a district official. This method 'enabled exploratory discussions that allowed for an understanding of the 'what' and the 'how' as well as to grasp and explore the internal dynamics of the research topic. Thus, in-depth information was acquired in the study.

3.3 THE APPROACH OF THE MAIN SURVEY

This is a case study into the implementation of WSE, with particular reference to a pilot school. The study identified a distinct group of people and an event

which suggested a research problem. Qualitative research, being a naturalistic inquiry, using non-interfering data collection strategies to discover the natural flow of events processes and how participants interpret them, was chosen (see Stake, 1995 ; Cohen and Manion, 1984; Anderson, 1993). Hence, two methods of data collection were used – the semi-structured interview and the survey questionnaire (discussed in section 3.3).

3.4 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Question 1 : This question looked at the 'official' intention of WSE, and related this to the range of intentions more generally reported in the literature. This was addressed by reference to official publications on the WSE policy and relevant literature in the previous chapter.

Question 2 to 5 : These were all questions relating to the perceptions of members of staff in the pilot school regarding WSE, with reference to the 'official' intention perceived by the educators, the implementation process, overall impressions of the utility and effectiveness of WSE, and possible modifications to increase its utility.

3.5 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Data for questions 2 to 5 in the above connections were obtained from the administration of a self-completion questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, largely eliciting open-ended responses. This allowed the respondents to communicate their perceptions and experiences in their own words, without any restrictions, about the practical implementation of the WSE in the pilot school.

The questionnaire consisted mainly of open ended questions [Appendix B] in order to allow the respondents to communicate their experiences or views in their own words, without any restriction, about the WSE process in the pilot school. Responses varied from a few lines to a few paragraphs. The broad

questions and purpose of the various questions or parts of the questionnaire are summarised below.

Question	Purpose of Question
1. To what extent were various stakeholders involved in the decision making process regarding the implementation of WSE at the school ?	To assess whether there was input from educators at school level into the design of the WSE process.
2. Was adequate training and support given to the stakeholders at the school prior to, during and after the WSE process ?	To examine the effectiveness of the training programme given to educators and to make recommendations for future initiatives.
3. Were there any problems / difficulties / obstacles or challenges experienced by educators in the implementation and management of WSE ?	To examine the effectiveness of the implementation of WSE and to make recommendations for the modification of the system if necessary.
4. How did the school manage the transition to the new WSE system ?	To ascertain what change management strategies were used by the school in introducing this innovation.
5. How has the experience of WSE contributed to the teachers' personal as well as professional development and the school's improvement ?	To evaluate the impact / effectiveness of WSE on educators and the school.
6. What role did the prevailing school culture play in the implementation and management of WSE ?	To evaluate the relationship between the school culture and the successful implementation of WSE.
7. Should WSE reports involve those outside the school ?	To examine the implications and levels of acceptability of WSE and the accountability theory ?

Table 3.1 : Research questions and purpose.

A few closed (dichotomous) questions were also used. These questions did not allow the respondents to provide answers in their own words, but forced the respondent to select one or more choices from a fix list of answers given.

The use of a self-completed questionnaire was supplemented with **semi-structured interviews** [Appendix A] with the principal and chairperson of the School Governing Body.

Analysis of data was carried out predominantly through content analysis of open-endedness of the questionnaire or responses obtained through the semi-structured interviews and citation frequencies was also used.

3.6 SAMPLING

There was no need for sampling decisions to be made, as the entire staff of the school was included in the study. This comprised the principal, the deputy principal, four heads of department and ten level one teachers. In addition to these, the chairperson of the School Governing Body was interviewed. As a convenience the respondents are discussed under the themes identified in research questions 2 to 5.

3.7 ACCESS TO THE SITE

Permission to conduct interviews and administer the survey instrument was sought from the Education Department and then the principal [Appendix C and D]. Foreshadowed problems did, however present itself. Some educators were new to the establishment and would thus have not experienced the actual evaluation process. Their opinions were otherwise taken to be important to determine the extent of the impact of the WSE at the school.

3.9 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the research design and methodology were outlined.

Qualitative data was obtained through the triangulation of data resources and the secondary use of the semi-structured interviews and survey questionnaire through the comprehensive sampling technique. The steps taken to validate the study were aimed at minimising error in the investigation so that the

reliability of the findings could be maximised enabling feasible recommendations to be made. The results obtained from the data collection and analysis methods described in this chapter are presented in chapter four.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings for the empirical part of the study. The summary of the major findings of the study are given and based upon these findings some recommendations are made in the final chapter. This chapter should indeed be a point of departure for further research and debate.

The interview questions posed to the principal and chairperson of the SGB are similar, however responses are reported and analysed in terms of the representative group. The responses given will be presented according to the themes raised by the questions asked. These are listed under the series of sub-headings and interpreted with reference to a body of the literature that pertains.

4.2 FINDINGS OF THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY

The stakeholders who participated in these discussions were from the researcher's school environment and were articulate about their feelings on the range of changes taking place in South African education. Their descriptions ranged from statements of optimism to total disappointment in the adoption of WSE.

Upon investigating the nature of WSE, it became apparent that their perception of WSE is consistent with what they had experienced under the 'old A-form' inspection system and conceived it as the way to 'quality control' rather than quality assurance. They perceived this authoritarian approach as a measure of quality assurance management.

The findings of the preliminary survey indicate that stakeholders are not entirely

convinced about the developmental emphasis of WSE. They indicated that the official strapline that as a process 'WSE is meant to be supportive and developmental' and its main purpose being to 'facilitate improvement of school performance' is an official deceit. A union representative argued that the WSE process is part of 'a move towards public management in schools and the new arrangements have, sought primarily to disempower and subordinate professionals, "police" the work being done in schools. He cited the appearance of MEC's for Education at school gates, at the start of the school year, chastising teachers on national television as an example of this.

Some other issues raised by the discussants included WSE being all 'stick and no carrot', because nowhere in the documentation does it state how 'effective' schools will be rewarded.

What these stakeholders do suggest, is for the CD:QA to concentrate on areas of known weakness in schools and focussing resources into the formative process of school development in partnership with schools and district offices.

Whilst these are the concerns of stakeholders, it needs to be ascertained as to whether their concerns are really by-products of WSE.

4.3 FINDINGS OF THE MAIN SURVEY

The study revealed five major themes with a variety of sub-themes. These can be distinguished as the emotional and affective domain of education policy change. The issues included the 'real intention' of WSE, teachers views on their professionalism in this changing context, and lastly issues pertaining to their development and the improvement of their school in general. The question, about the school's experience of WSE was put them in these broad terms.

4.3.1 THE 'OFFICIAL' INTENTION OF WSE PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS IN THE PILOT SCHOOL

The 'official' intention of WSE is 'to facilitate improvement of school performance through approaches of partnerships, collaboration, mentoring and guidance', (DoE : 2000 : 3). Asked if they perceived this to be a true reflection, respondents intimated :

The inspection developed a corporate spirit.

(principal)

The process developed within the WSE exercise became seen as intrinsic to planning and development ... Getting used to the evaluation was good. People are getting used to getting into working in groups and developing.

(head of department)

Some of the processes introduced within the WSE inspection, such as classroom observation and a focus on teaching and learning, were viewed as having an impact on school culture ... Teachers have taken on board that teaching matters are about sharing and are keen to observe each other's lessons.

(teacher)

Whilst on the other hand, there were some voices who felt that WSE was a bit of a simulated exercise :

We put on a superb performance ! It was not a true picture, the way we came over ... When the whole thing was over and done with, there was a general feeling that we had got away with it ... that we were able control the kids for a week, everyone had masqueraded well.

4.3.2 EXPERIENCES OF WSE AT THE PILOT SCHOOL

Reactions to the findings of the WSE at the pilot school reflect concern about aspects of the implementation process, the way the inspection was conducted and carried out. An example of this was the perceived neglect of 'context' and surfaced during comments made :

Things are taken out of context and the context is not reported –
things are not in place ... and the 'because' is not mentioned.
(principal)

The context/background was noted briefly but not taken into account.
Most children are from council homes. The school draws on one of
the poorer areas in (name of Circuit).
(head of department)

Other concerns were also expressed in comments made specifically about the processes. Many respondents alluded to the issue of time. The three days of inspection were considered by the teachers to be insufficient to obtain 'a true picture'. They felt with so much to look at in the time available it was difficult to do justice to the full range of evidence. For example, a teacher, who is also a member of the Staff Development Team (SDT) commented that the file on the Development Appraisal System had been 'merely flicked through and put aside'. Another concern with time included opportunities for teachers to explain the context of lessons observed and to receive feedback on them from the inspectors involved. The lack of opportunity to this may have contributed to the inspectors being perceived in a generally negative light :

They (inspectors) were there, very secretive, concentrating on their business, not able to communicate with them ... no one put you at ease – they concentrated on the fixed criteria they had to look for.

(teacher)

The SEM, when asked about this, was aware of the problem and attributed it, in part, to the experience of working to the rigorous framework of and timeframes to implement WSE policy and was considered to leave little space for giving feedback to teachers during inspection.

4.3.3 THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION AT THE PILOT SCHOOL

It became clear that during the week of the inspection and in the run-up, WSE had the effect in uniting the staff, producing what can be referred to effectively as an 'injury to one, is an injury to all' mentality. The importance of the role of the principal and senior management staff was stressed in preparing the staff and pupils for the inspection. In some cases, according to the feedback of teachers, the bonding seemed to have worked, while in some cases it was counterproductive :

The SEM, a member of the WSE team, came in to talk to us. Instead it put the fear of God into us. After these meetings there was real panic.

(teacher)

We had no notion the task of evaluation can be so daunting and had no clue what self-evaluation entailed, let alone undertaking one.

(head of department)

The principal arranged a series of preparatory meetings to equip the staff for the WSE and to defuse the tension. The effect seems was the opposite :

Preparing us with lots of meetings increased the pressure and the stress.

(teacher)

More critical than staff morale and stress was the fact that the normal life of the school came to a stop during at least the term of the inspection. All preparations for activities, that included a fundraising event, were delayed so that the school appeared to be 'serious'.

The WSE inspection week disrupted the school. The effect afterwards was a total anti-climax. Some of the innovations the school's curriculum committee wanted to bring into the curriculum was stalled, because the 'staff was simply not interested'. Not only was this due to the cumulative pressure of the build-up and the panic of WSE but also to the report itself. At the time of the inspection, teachers felt that relatively little feedback was given to them, though all teachers value direct feedback. As one teacher said in her questionnaire : 'No one ever told us it was a good report. They all looked for negative things, many of us felt demoralised and devalued.' A point made by Field *et al.* (1980 : 57) is that :

... the language of reports is stylised and restrictive, operating largely within the parameters of assessment and accountability.

4.3.4 THE OVERALL PERCEPTION OF WSE IN TERMS OF ITS UTILITY

In general this school, did not have a tradition of planning, and major improvements came about as a result of WSE. The one real spin-off of WSE for the school according to the survey :

We had little to offer in terms of long-term planning for development before. Therefore it helped us to develop and to prioritise. Even if it did not lead to major changes in the way planning was carried out it did lead us to re-prioritise.

(principal)

It made us emphasise and prioritise the qualities of teaching and learning. The staff probably saw no difference but they are more aware of where the management wants to take the school.

(deputy principal)

However, there also appears to be another positive sense about WSE amongst some of the staff. To quote from the report : 'leadership and organisation at a senior level are good, financial planning has responded extremely effectively to the constraints of the budget, there is little scope for further economy, the current level of resourcing is restricting the development of necessary learning opportunities.' The principal and his deputy found this comment 'very supportive' : 'The report brought things into the open and it helped us in dealing with the District Office afterwards.' Teachers were generally positive in their comments in as far as their personal growth was concern and reported that::

For the first time we knew what they were talking about came in and what a really good or bad job we were doing, I felt valued.

(teacher)

There were examples of teachers unsure of their own performance, very concerned before WSE, feeling a major sense of reassurance afterwards in knowing they were doing the right thing in the right way ... need to get a grip on internal evaluation though.

(teacher)

4.3.5 THE GOVERNING BODY AND WSE : POTENTIAL FOR EMPOWERMENT ?

The 'main recommendations' of the WSE report at the pilot school suggest that 'the parent representatives on the SGB need to be empowered to undertake strategic planning and school development plans', and 'parents on the SGB should be workshopped on all policies that direct the school in a manner that they can understand'.

The principal, for example, remarked that his SGB had contributed little to the WSE self-evaluation portion, but that did not mean to say they were not involved :

My SGB are very involved in everything ... they say to me ' Right JN you put it all together and we'll have a look at it'. So I dutifully do that and they pull it all to pieces and put their own stamp on it. We worked well together during this run-up to WSE and thereafter and enjoyed talking to them about it – but it (the self-evaluation report) was the school's if you like in every respect. The SGB is effective – this was noted in the report – and we get on well but they leave me to get on to a large extent, perhaps more so than I would like.

According the SGB chairperson, his committee felt they did not have the necessary expertise or knowledge and understanding of why a certain action, such as WSE, was undertaken in the school and 'to a large extent look to the senior management of the school for leadership and guidance'. She reported major benefits to have been a sense of participation and increased knowledge and understanding of WSE and why certain actions were taken in the school :

We, however, got the taste of the developments that have taken place and active involvement hereon in the monitoring process of factors affecting both pupils and staff becomes much clearer.

The SGB, as a result of WSE, according to both the staff and SGB chairperson, had increased their participation in the school and is seen as a very positive development by both governors and staff.

4.4 DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

In the preceding sections, the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders at the pilot school was recorded within the framework of the implementation of WSE. By way of summary, it is now worth considering how the data presented in the previous section can be used to establish a set of variables for the successful implementation of WSE in other schools.

4.4.1 THE INTENTION OF WSE

Inspections can be regarded as potential learning experiences for those involved. As with the teachers of the pilot school, they clearly learned a great deal from WSE. Shipman (1979:167), therefore, suggests that 'evaluation must be built into the decision-making processes of the school'. Hence a senior member of staff must be given this responsibility. This responsibility must be permanent. The job will be to organise :

- ongoing discussion of objectives as information is collected, tabulated and considered by staff in planning. Evaluation can not be a once-off 'snapshot'.
- the collection of information inside the school, its tabulation, storage and retrieval.
- the presentation of the information to other staff, to pupils and to the public of the school, where appropriate.
- peer evaluation where appropriate.
- the collection of national and local information for comparative purposes to match the first three points above.

The school will then be in a better position to embark on 'school improvement' and this will also then take care of problem of 'contexts' which was alluded to under the section : 'experiences of WSE.

4.4.2 EXPERIENCES OF WSE AT THE PILOT SCHOOL

Time is always likely to be a problem, especially during an inspection. According to Gray and Wilcox (1995:165), 'the amount of time available to inspectors in a school can affect at least two aspects of the inspection process – the social courtesies required and the credibility of the methods involved'. Social courtesies, in this instance does not only mean a friendly demeanour, but also the opportunity of allowing the teacher to explain what they are doing.

With regards to contextualisation Gray and Wilcox (ibid.) states :

Teachers would probably argue that if credible judgements are to be made by observing individual lessons, then it is essential that judgements are contextualised ... The credibility of an inspection will depend in part on the extent to which the evidence available will have been given proper consideration.

Therefore, there may be a case for extending the period of an inspection beyond the almost universal time norm of 5 days.

4.4.3 THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION IN THE PILOT SCHOOL

While teachers potentially learned a great deal about their school as a result of WSE. However, 'such learning is potential in the sense that staff have first to be persuaded that the findings are 'true', then internalize them and finally accept a share in collective responsibility for doing something about them', (Cousins and Earl : 1995 : 145). Given the trauma experienced by staff in a situation such as WSE, it is crucially important that the 'record of evidence' on which the findings are based is impeccable and above reproach.

A point made by Field *et al.* (1980 : 57) is that : ... the language of reports is stylised and restrictive, operating largely within the parameters of

assessment and accountability. It is, however, not a question of simply maintaining the social niceties previously referred to but one of maintaining proper respect for the integrity and worth of individuals whose sense of professional self-esteem can be severely bruised an inspection.

4.4.4 THE OVERALL PERCEPTION OF WSE IN TERMS OF ITS UTILITY

The measured success of the WSE exercise at the pilot school, brings into focus that WSE exercise can work if schools and teachers perceive it to be beneficial to engage themselves in the process. However, as Clift *et al* (1987:170) warns 'teachers responding ritually to the evaluation, by conducting superficial reviews of their schools, will not benefit the improvement of educational benefit'.

4.4.5 THE GOVERNING BODY – A NEW ROLE

It is apparent from the research evidence that WSE has the potential to empower rather than weaken or emasculate the governing bodies of schools. For the governing body of the pilot school, perhaps for the first time, that they have had a meaningful involvement in the school and its planning processes. Prior to the WSE inspection there may have been an illusion of power but afterwards, given the right conditions and the support of the school staff, they (SGB) have been able to become more involved in their school, particularly in development and action planning and in the monitoring of progress. Early (1998:36) states :

Nevertheless, inspection does appear to be encouraging more governing bodies to give serious consideration to how they are performing their duties ... Inspection in itself is unlikely to bring about improvements – either in the school or the governing body – but it can act as a powerful stimulus or catalyst for change for the better.

4.5 CONCLUSION

Having presented and discussed the empirical part of the study, it remains for the study to make recommendations and then conclude, which follows in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapters, the challenges and prospects facing schools have been discussed within the framework of evaluation, more specifically WSE and policy implementation. By way of summary, it is now worth considering a set of indicators for the pilot school to consider.

5.2 SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

It should be clear that WSE is not a recipe or an instant pudding for school improvement. It should be regarded as vehicle for delivering quality education. The continuous application of WSE principles can transform a school like the pilot school into a vibrant centre of learning and teaching, which will cater for the needs of all stakeholders, i.e. pupils, all who work within the school environment, parent and partners.

Based upon the responses of the participants in this research study, it became clear that there is a desire to be involved in the traditions of 'school improvement'. If one assumes that the sample group is representative of stakeholders at the pilot school, then this study believes that some important principle of WSE are implicit in the way things are now being done and thought of at the school.

The study, however, wishes to draw attention to one important aspect, which was rarely mentioned during the research, which is strategic management. Whilst the inspection findings must, and seemed to have, influenced the immediate action planning of the school, the perceived impact of external inspections on strategic planning and management is

absent. This, the study concedes can only be tested by research that takes place at an appropriate interval or intervals after inspections. However, the study hardly heard or saw anything that suggested a move towards 'development planning' or 'strategic planning'.

The long-term nature of strategic planning, therefore makes it difficult to estimate the full impact of WSE at the school, as was listed in the limitation of this study. However, the study offers these thoughts :

- According to Maychell and Pathak (1997:39), it does appear from the evidence, that 'in the short term, inspection findings are perceived as generally helpful, certainly by senior management'.
- Wilcox and Gray (1996) confirms the thought that the longer term effect of inspection on planning appears to lessen.
- The ownership of inspection findings may be weak, particularly for those other than the senior management (Wilcox and Gray, 1996 : 40).
- Glover *et al* (1996) suggests that the external factors pertaining to the school may have more influence on strategic thinking than the inspection findings. He further mentions that the individual culture of the institution is an underlying and important influence on strategy.

In light of the above, and in addition to research relating to evaluations, indicates the importance of shared understanding and ownership if the evaluation is to be effective. This casts doubt on the long-term efficacy of an externally owned and motivated inspection.

However, short-term action plans are dependent on inspection findings. At a minimum, the impact of inspection has further augmented the requirements for schools to write their development plans, strategic plans and mission statements, and has encouraged a focus on the concepts of planning and strategy.

5.3 CONCLUSION

In concluding this study, it is not presumptuous to claim that the aims set at the beginning have been achieved. At this juncture, it would be prudent to begin the conclusion by stating that there is no ideal way of implementing an innovation at school level. The experiences at the pilot school highlighted that it has still some way to go before the WSE process is ingrained in their 'way of doing things'.

The study broadly identified the potential of evaluation for the pilot school. When schools are required to embark on WSE it is the methods and techniques of evaluation that are given the least attention. And it is for this reason, that attention must be given to develop the schools into a culture of evaluation, otherwise, one feels the innovation would be doomed to failure.

This study has highlighted some of the weaknesses as well as the strong points in the way WSE, was implemented at the school. Concern about the direct functional utility of evaluation arose essentially from the teachers' view of the roles and goals of evaluation.

REFERENCES

- | | | |
|--|--------|---|
| Barth, R. | (1990) | Improving Schools From Within , San Francisco : Josey Bass |
| Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. | (1975) | ‘Federal programmes supporting educational change’, The Findings in Review , vol. iv , Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California. |
| Bowe, R. and Ball, S.J. with Gold, A. | (1992) | Reforming education and changing schools : Case Studies in policy sociology , London : Routledge. |
| Bush, T. and West-Burnham, J. (eds.) | (1994) | The Principles of Education Management , Harlow : Longman. |
| Centre for Education Policy,
Development, Evaluation and
Management. | (2001) | Transformation of the South African Schooling System : A Report from the SECOND year of Education 2000 Plus, a longitudinal study to monitor education policy implementation and change , Johannesburg : CEPD. |
| Clift, P.S., Nuttall, D.L. and McCormick (eds.). | (1987) | Studies in School Self-Evaluation , London : Falmer Press. |
| Cousins, J.B. and Earl, L.M. (eds.). | (1995) | Participatory Evaluation In Education : Studies in Evaluation Use And Organizational Learning , London : Falmer Press. |
| Department of Education | (1998) | Assessment Policy in the GET Phase, Grade R to 9 and ABET , Pretoria : Department of Education. |
| Department of Education | (1999) | Education Laws and Policy Handbook , Republic of South Africa : Juta and Co. |
| Department of Education | (1997) | Appraisal for Educators , Pretoria : Department of Education. |
| Department of Education | (2000) | National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation , Pretoria : Department of Education. |

- Department of Education (1998) **Policy Framework For Quality Assurance in the Education and Training System in South Africa**, Pretoria : Department of Education.
- Department of Education (2002) Whole-School Evaluation, **Joint Media Statement, 20 May**, Pretoria.
- Studies in School Self-Evaluation, London : Falmer Press.
- Participatory Evaluation In Education : Studies in Evaluation Use And Organizational Learning, London : Falmer Press.
- Field, C., Greenstreet, D., Kusel, P. and Parsons, C. (1980) OFSTED inspection reports and the language of educational improvement, **Evaluation and Research in Education**, 34(4) : 57-75.
- Fullan, M. (1985) 'Change processes and strategies at the local level', **Elementary School Journal**, 85, 3, 391-421.
- Fullan, M. with Stiegebauer, S. (1991) **The New Meaning of Educational Change**, New York : Teachers College Press.
- Glover, D., Levacic, R., Bennet, N, and Earley, P. (1996) 'Leadership, planning and resource management in four very effective schools. Part II. Planning and Performance, **School Organization**, Vol. 16, no.3, 247-61.
- Gray, J. and Wilcox, B. (1995) '**Good School, Bad School**' – **Evaluating performance and encouraging improvement**, Buckingham : Open University Press.
- Gray, J., Hopkins, D., Reynolds, D., Wilcox, B., Farrell, S. and Jesson, D. (1999) **Improving School – Performance and Potential**, Buckingham : Open University.
- Hargreaves, D .H. and Hopkins, D. (1991) **The Empowered School : The Management and Practice of Development Planning**, London : Cassell.

- Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. and West, M. (1994) **School Improvement in Era of Change**, London : Cassell.
- Maychell, K, and Pathak, S. (1997) **Planning for Action. Part 1. A Survey of Schools' Post-Inspection Action Planning**, Slough : NFER.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1993) 'What matters most in teachers' workplace context ?', in J.W. Little and M.W. McLaughlin (eds.), **Teachers' Work : Individuals, Colleagues and Contexts**, New York : Teachers College Press.
- Murgatroyd, S. and Morgan, C. (1993) **Total Quality Management and the School**, Buckingham : University Press.
- Odden, E.A and Wohlstetter, P. (1995) 'Making School Based Management Work', in **Educational Leadership**, February 1995.
- Republic of South Africa (1998) The Further Education and Training Act (98 of 1998), **Government Gazette**, vol. 236, 1723, Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa (1995) South African Qualification Authority Act, **Government Gazette**, vol. 364, no. 16725, Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa (1995) White Paper on Education and Training, **Government Gazette**, vol. 357, no. 16312, notice no. 196 of 1995, Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa (1996) National Education Policy Act, **Government Gazette**, no. 370, no. 17118, Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa (1996) South African Schools Act, no. 27 of 1996, **Government Gazette**, vol. 377, no. 17579, Pretoria.
- Rogers, G. and Badham, L. (1992) **Evaluation in Schools**, London : Routledge.
- Shipman, M.D. (1979) **In-School Evaluation**, London : Heinemann Educational Books.

- Sikes, P.J. (1992) 'Imposed changes and the experienced teacher, in **Teacher development and educational change**, M. Fullan and A. Hargreaves, 36-55, London : Falmer Press.
- Stenhouse, L. (1980) **Curriculum Research and Development in Action**, London : Heinemann Educational Books.
- Thurlow, M. (1993) 'School Effectiveness, School Improvement and Development Planning', address at the **Sixth National Conference of the Association Secondary School Principals**.
- Van Velzen, W., Miles, M., Ekholm, M., Hamemyer, U. and Robin, D. (1985) **Making School Improvement Work**, Leuven : Acco (International School Improvement Project).
- Watermeyer, J.W. (1997) **Quality Assurance in High Schools through Regression Analysis**. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Cape Town.
- Weindling, D. and Early, P. (1987) **Secondary Headship : The First Years**, Windsor : NFER-NELSON
- Wilcox, B. (1992) **Time – Constrained Evaluation : A Practical Approach for LEAs and Schools**, London : Routledge.

APPENDIX A.1

GUIDELINES FOR THE SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW : (Principal)

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have ?
Do you think that there is a need for schools to be evaluated ?
Have you ever been involved in any form of external or internal evaluation/inspection before ?
2. What knowledge did you have of WSE prior to your school having been evaluated ?
Does your school have an "evaluation" structure in place ?
If so, how active is this structure with regard to school improvement ?
3. Did your school experience the WSE process as outlined in the DoE manuals ?
How was WSE initiated at your school & to you personally ?
What role did your SMT play in the implementation of the WSE ?
What percentage of the staff was actually observed in the classroom ?
4. Were you consulted in the planning and implementation of the whole-school self-evaluation process ?
Did you and your staff receive adequate training in self-evaluation ?
5. How would you describe the impact of the WSE on the (a) school improvement efforts at your school, and (b) the quality of education delivery ?
6. Do you think that the Development Appraisal System should be an integral part of WSE ?
7. Do you think WSE reports should be made public ?
8. Do you think your school will or has been developed as a result of WSE ?
9. Who do you think should be the key roleplayers in WSE ?
10. Do you have the resources to implement the school improvement plans designed by the evaluators ?

APPENDIX A.2

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (HOD & EDUCATORS)

Section A

1. Rank : HOD ☐ Educator ☐
2. Number of Years Teaching Experience : _____
3. Have you experienced any form of evaluation before ? Yes ☐ No ☐

Section B : WSE AND YOUR SCHOOL

1. Were you involved in the decision making process regarding the implementation of WSE at school ? ☐ ☐

2. If no, do you think that you should have been consulted ? Why ?

3. Did you have any pre-knowledge of WSE before its implementation ? What was this source of knowledge ?

-
-
-
-
-

- [illegible]

1. What training and support did educators at school for the implementation of WSE ?

-
-
-
-
-

2. How effective was the training and support ?

3. How could this training and support be improved ?

Section E : IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF WSE

1. What impact did the experience of WSE have on :

(a) your personal development ?

(b) your professional development ?

(c) the quality of the school as a learning organisation ?

2. How was WSE linked to the school's mission, aim and development plans ?

3.1 Were WSE procedures effectively organised ?

3.2 Was WSE conducted in a structured manner ?

4. What is your overall impression of WSE as it is currently designed and implemented ?

5. What suggestions do you have on improving / modifying / refining WSE ?

Section F : SCHOOL CULTURE AND WSE

1. Describe the school culture (the way things are done at school, leadership style, etc.) and the effect it had on the implementation of WSE.

Section G : RATIONALE FOR WSE

1. Do you think WSE should be linked to rewards outcome for schools (extra funding) ? Provide reasons.

2. WSE should be used for :

- School improvement only
- Accountability purposes
- Development planning

Yes No

3. Should WSE reports be made available to the parents ? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Should members of the SGR be involved in WSE ? ☐ Yes ☐ No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION

2002-05-25

The Principal

ACADEMIC RESEARCH : *The implementation of whole-school evaluation in pilot schools.*

I am currently reading for a post-graduate study in Education Management at the University of Natal. I am a staff member at Gokul Primary School. I wish to undertake a study entitled : " The implementation of **whole-school evaluation** in schools " .

This study will therefore attempt to determine the perceptions of a piloted evaluated school and the extent of the success of the whole-school evaluation process.

The research study aims to locate school improvement after whole-school evaluation and add to the body of knowledge on school effectiveness, school improvement and development planning.

The Department of Education has kindly granted permission for the research and their letter is attached.

Your school has been purposefully selected as a sample. It would be appreciated if the Principal, the Deputy Principal, three Heads of Department, six Level One Educators and the Chairperson of the Governing Body participate in the research.

The research may involve interviews and/or survey questionnaires. The date and times for the interviews will be decided in consultation with the Principal.

It would be appreciated if a copy of the school's self-evaluation report, records of pre-evaluation meetings with the evaluators, staff meetings concerning the evaluation process and the final report from the evaluators be made available to the researcher as this will aid in the analysis and verification of the findings.

Information collected will be treated with strict confidentiality and all respondents/discussants will remain anonymous. A copy of the study would be submitted to the Department of Education and made available to your school on request.

I trust that this appeal will be given your kind consideration and time.

THANKING YOU IN ANTICIPATION.

Kind regards.
