

**AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM AT A SELECTED
SECONDARY SCHOOL IN THE NORTH DURBAN REGION.**

SHAMEEM JAFFER

**A research report submitted to the School of Education, UNIVERSITY
OF NATAL, DURBAN, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Education (Education Management).**

NOVEMBER 2002

ABSTRACT

The re-structuring and re-conceptualization of the South African Education System after 1994, necessitated a transformation of the evaluation process. The emphasis was now on enhanced performance at school level. This is clearly stipulated and documented in the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996. Thus, it was with such policy initiatives that the Developmental Appraisal System of South Africa (DAS), was designed, developed and implemented at school level. The rationale focussed on improving the quality of teaching and learning and organizational growth and development.

This research explores how the Developmental Appraisal System has moved from being entrenched with inflexible characteristics to a more educator-friendly approach of evaluation. The appraisee is the principle role player in the whole process. The purpose of this research is to undertake a case study to evaluate the implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) at a single secondary school in the North Durban Region.

The main finding was that due to multi-faceted reasons, this school has not been able to complete the implementation of the DAS. A small percentage of educators have been appraised. However, this is not sufficient to improve organizational growth and ensure that teacher development is taking place. The research makes recommendations based on the findings which if implemented could change the educator's perception of DAS. The emphasis is on developmental rather than criticism. In this way the culture of teaching and learning can improve.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that ‘An Evaluation of the implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System at a Selected Secondary School in the North Durban Region’ 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.



Shameem Jaffer

NOVEMBER 2002

SUPERVISOR'S STATEMENT

This dissertation is submitted with/~~without~~ my approval.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Michael Thurlow', written over a horizontal line.

Professor M. Thurlow

NOVEMBER 2002

DEDICATION

TO MY FAMILY AND FRIENDS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my supervisor, Professor M. Thurlow for his motivation, guidance and assistance. Special Thanks also goes to the principal and staff for their co-operation; without whom this research would not have been possible.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANC	-	AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS
DAS	-	DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM
DET	-	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
ELRC	-	EDUCATION LABOUR RELATIONS COUNCIL
OBE	-	OUTCOMES BASED EDUCATION
PGP	-	PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN
SADTU	-	SOUTH AFRICAN DEMOCRATIC TEACHERS UNION
SDT	-	STAFF/SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT TEAM
SMT	-	SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM

NAR-GBA
I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TITLE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
DECLARATION	iii
STATEMENT BY SUPERVISOR	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
CHAPTER 1	
1. Overview	1-2
2. Focus of the Study	2-3
3. Research Questions	3
4. Research Methods	4
5. Limitations of the Study	4
6. Structure of the Study	4-6
Conclusion	6
CHAPTER 2:	
Introduction	7-8
2.1 Appraisal in General	8
2.2 International Literature	9-10
2.3 The Nature and Purposes of Appraisal	10-12
2.4 Types of Developmental Appraisal and Evaluation	13
2.5 The South African Developmental Appraisal System:	
2.5.1 A Process of Transformation	14-15
2.5.2 The New System	15-18
2.5.3 The Effective Management of Appraisal	18-20
2.5.4 An Initial Assessment of the South African DAS	20-22

Conclusion	22-23
 CHAPTER 3:	
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:	
Introduction	24
3.1 Research Questions	25
3.2 Methods Used	25-26
3.3 The Population	26
3.4 Limitations of the Research	26
3.5 The Instruments	27-28
Conclusion	28
 CHAPTER 4:	
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS:	
Introduction	29
4.1 The Questionnaire	29-37
4.2 The Interview Schedule	38-42
Conclusion	42
 CHAPTER 5:	
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:	
Introduction	43
5.1 Findings	43-49
5.2 Recommendations	50-52
Conclusion	53
 REFERENCES	
 APPENDICES:	
Appendix A: The Questionnaire	
Appendix B: The Interview Schedule	
Appendix C: North Durban Region – DAS QUESTIONNAIRE	

CHAPTER 1:

1.1 OVERVIEW:

During the last quarter of the twentieth century, there appears to have been an almost universal concern in education with issues of enhanced efficiency, effectiveness and relevance in schooling. This concern has been expressed in the considerable literature of the broadly characterized school effectiveness and school improvement 'movements'. At the heart of this literature is a renewed focus on performance management, both at the level of the organization and the individual. In the latter connection, in particular, attention has been given, in many countries, to ways in which the performance of teachers may be more effectively evaluated, both for purposes of accountability and development. In the South African context, there is evidence also of a renewed concern with evaluation of teacher performance, exemplified in the recently initiated Developmental Appraisal System (DAS).

The South African DAS has been shaped largely in reaction to practices prevailing prior to 1994. In this connection, Chetty et al. (1993: 2) characterised prevailing practice prior to 1994, in the following terms:

“South Africa’s system of appraisal has been largely inspectorial and bureaucratic. It shares with all other aspects of the education bureaucracy a top-down, closed, hierarchical and authoritarian character. In the case of black teachers it has been concerned with efficiency and social control rather than professional development.”

In its Policy Framework for Education and Training (1994: 7), the ANC asserted that:

“There is an urgent need to move away from the present summative authoritarian (appraisal) practices ...”,
and a process of transformation of teacher appraisal was embarked upon, which has been outlined succinctly by Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001: 92).

The outcome of this process was an agreement reached and signed in the Education Labour Relations Council in 1998 (Resolution 4 of 1998) relating to a ‘new’ approach to appraisal. Subsequently, initiatives were undertaken during 1999 and 2000 for the implementation of the DAS.

Although a national review of the implementation of the DAS was intended to take place towards the end of 2000, to date no wide scale review has been undertaken. With the exception of a small-scale review undertaken by a teacher union in KwaZulu-Natal (APEK 2001), a 'speculative evaluation', not based upon empirical research (Thurlow and Ramnarain 2001), and a DAS Questionnaire (May 2002) (Appendix C) submitted to the schools in the North Durban Region by the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education and Culture, to ascertain whether the DAS has been successfully implemented at school level. This questionnaire is also designed to gauge whether schools require any assistance in the implementation of the DAS. However, except for the above-mentioned small-scale reviews and assessment of the DAS process (Thurlow and Ramnarain: 2001) there has been no substantive study of whether DAS has been effectively implemented.

It is in this context that the present research study is located. This study aims to evaluate the DAS implementation process in a single secondary school in the North Durban Region.

This chapter will highlight the purpose of this research; the research questions that were used to make the study more focussed; the research methods employed to gather data; the limitations of the study; and the structure of the study.

1.2 FOCUS OF THE STUDY:

The focus of the study is further elaborated and set out as demonstrated below.

The purpose of this study is to undertake an 'indicative' assessment of the implementation of the DAS at a single secondary school in the North Durban Region. In terms of overall conceptualization, this research will attempt to compare the DAS with other models available internationally. In terms of implementation, the research will explore broadly the experiences of educators in this single secondary school, including the SMT, as they relate to the DAS as a whole and to efforts to operationalise it.

The focus of this research will address broad issues that are related to:

- The DAS and the School: preparation, training and support for implementing DAS; organizational and administrative problems.
- The DAS and the educator: educator assessment of the various sub-processes which together constitute the 'official' procedure.
- An overview of the DAS: An investigation of overall impressions of the design and implementation of the DAS; suggestions for improvement.

Thus, having highlighted the aim and purpose of this study the research questions will be stated.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

The key questions that this study focussed upon are:

1. What are the conceptual underpinnings of the DAS, and how do these relate to the contextual realities of South African education, as well as other conceptualizations underpinning similar processes in other countries?
2. How was the implementation of the DAS 'officially' conceived, and what are the theoretical limitations associated with this conception?
3. What has been the actual experience of the school in attempting to implement the DAS and what might be done to enhance the DAS and its implementation?

Having briefly outlined the research questions that underpin the study it must be stated that a series of some 20 subsidiary questions had been designed to address the broad issues which have been stated in the key questions. The next sub-sections will briefly outline the research methods employed to obtain data and allow for statistical analysis that will assist in reaching some form of deduction.

1.4 RESEARCH METHODS:

With regard to the key questions mentioned in the previous section, the research methods employed to obtain data and statistics can be identified as follows. The theoretical perspective of DAS was obtained through a study of the literature and the limited range of the 'official' documents that relate to the DAS. In addition, an in-school inquiry took place. There was no sampling problems, as most of the educator population had been involved. The subsidiary questions associated with the key questions in the previous section had been addressed to all staff members, using a self-completion questionnaire with questions having both closed and open elements. This stage of the research identified broad trends in response to and had been supplemented through a series of interviews to explore responses more in depth, as they became necessary. The analysis of the data obtained was straightforward and depended on frequency counts which was illuminated and expanded through quotations.

Thus, it can be noted that through the research methods respondents answering a self-completion questionnaire and a semi-structured interview of the SDT members the study is in some ways limited. Hence the next section will elaborate on this aspect.

1.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

This research is limited to one secondary school only and therefore the findings cannot comfortably be generalized to other schools.

STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY:

The structure of the research is important since it gives direction and focus to the study. Chapter 1 highlighted the need for an effective evaluation system to be established in order to exemplify teacher performance. It drew a brief comparison between the

appraisal systems of the past and the present DAS. This chapter also signpost the purpose, research questions, research methods employed to obtain data and finally it stressed the limitations of this study.

Chapter 2 will be broadly sub-divided into two main sections; the first section will discuss appraisal in general. The second part will deal specifically with the South African DAS, exploring the reason for a change in the process of evaluation and outlining the characteristics of the new system.

Chapter 3 deals with the actual Research. The Questions, Methods, Population, Limitations and Instruments that were used to carry out the research and obtain analysis that could be used to reach some deduction.

Chapter 4 will present the Findings of the research. It will present the data obtained from the questionnaire and interview schedule.

Chapter 5 is vital to the research since it places the research into perspective. It will contain the Summary of the Findings and offer some Recommendations that could make the DAS easier and simpler to administer at this secondary school.

Thus, this outline will assist the research in attaining some findings and recommendations that will benefit the school.

CONCLUSION:

The traditional system of appraisal has undergone transformation in the South African education fraternity. It has been formulated through a series of negotiations and initiatives on the part of the South African education department. The main emphasis is the improvement of performance at school level that will impact positively on the

learners and hopefully bring about organizational gain.

It must be noted that the South African DAS is not an isolated entity but rather the formulation as a result of the political transformation that took place in South Africa after 1994. Although the first cycle of the DAS ought to have been completed and reviewed some schools have still not been able to complete the process. To date no national review has been undertaken and thus feedback with regard to its success remains in abeyance.

Chapter 2 will be informative in that, it will comment on the appraisal system in general. In addition it will highlight the reasons behind formulating a new system of evaluation and the characteristics of this new system.

CHAPTER 2:

2.1 INTRODUCTION:

The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), although imperative for individual and organizational growth, still remains a sensitive and controversial issue. Developmental Appraisal originally meant 'to strengthen' or 'to empower' however, it has evolved and transformed itself through varying degrees to encapsulate much more.

Castetter, W.B. (1981: 216) succinctly encapsulates the definition of performance appraisal as:

“a process of arriving at judgements about an individual's past or present performance against the background of his/her work environment, and about his/her future for an organization.”

The above definition places appraisal into perspective. It emphasizes the need for improvement of the individual as well as the organization. Thus, the rationale behind the appraisal of educators is the improvement in the quality of teaching and learning at school level. The Industrial sectors of society have already moved into the postmodern stance where the emphasis is on the quality of human service and accountability. In order for the educational sphere to reach its maximum in terms of potential there is an urgent and inherent need for staff development to take place so that educators and learners are performing at their optimum. DAS is one method whereby the culture and ethos at school level can be dramatically improved.

The process of evaluation and the question of accountability have long been implemented and reviewed internationally. There is extensive literature on teacher appraisal, evaluation and its implementation however, not much local research seems to be available.

Chapter 2 will be broadly sub-divided into two main sections. The first section will discuss appraisal in general and incorporate international literature on the subject. The second section will be further sub-divided into two parts both dealing specifically with the need for change from the traditional evaluation to the emergent or ‘new’ system of appraisal in the South African education system and the characteristics of the DAS.

2.2 APPRAISAL IN GENERAL:

The debate surrounding the Developmental Appraisal System appears to be unabated. It is still viewed with trepidation and suspicion by educators who label it as a device for “weeding out weak teachers.” (Bollington, R. et al. 1990:4). Others view it as an instrument through which teacher’s vulnerabilities are exposed.

Williams, V. (ed) (1995: 71) is of the opinion that at its best and most impressive, performance appraisal offers a new focus for developmental planning. It emphasizes collaboration and teamwork. It can also be a mechanism for school self-review rather than being a mechanism of domination and control. It is a process that forces teachers into introspection and inner reflection which can lead to improvement in methodology and practices. It can also act as a morale booster for the educator who feels less confident. In South Africa, as far as, the DAS is concerned, the appraisee plays the pivotal role and is in complete control until the process has reached completion. The next two sub-sections will review International Literature on Appraisal; highlighting the Nature and Purposes of Appraisal and outlining the Types of Developmental Appraisal and Evaluation.

2.2 INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE:

There is extensive international literature on a wide range of issues related to the appraisal of teachers.

Middlewood, D. and Cardno, D. (2001) state that:

“the question of defining good teaching has concerned educationalists and academics for some considerable time.” (p.2).

In other words the debate concerning evaluation and appraisal has not been abated. The assessment of teacher performance and work need to be done in an open and transparent manner. Middlewood, D. et al. (2001) advocates that a narrow model of appraisal will be inadequate when evaluating teacher performance.

Middlewood (2001) supports Wragg's (1987) view concerning appraisal. Middlewood (2001) states that:

“a system of appraisal which is entirely backward-looking and punitive would be useless so far as encouragement of change is concerned.” (p. 66).

Wragg, (1987) goes on to purport certain guidelines that all teacher appraisal schemes should include. These can be summarized as having adequate information about the process, procedure and implementation of appraisal; ensuring that the seven main phases are adequately implemented – these are :

- preparation
- classroom observation
- appraisal interview
- results
- monitoring
- moderation; and
- evaluation.

Among these guidelines there must a set criteria by which the appraisal process is implemented.

Middlewood, D. (2001) researched secondary schools in England in 1999. The research focussed on teachers' perception of the new proposal and what they envisaged as suitable criteria for effective appraisal. The data analysis revealed that the fostering of the climate of trust and team unity were among the key principles relevant for effective management to take place. This impacted directly on the factors that were necessary for effective appraisal. Among those cited were the fact that teachers are not merely educators but have a far more demanding role to play; they operate as a team; and need to be supported and understood.

Middlewood, D. (2001) aptly captures the essence of effective performance appraisal by stating that:

“it must be part of the whole process of the management of staff in the school, fully integrated into a whole approach to the way in which people are recruited, selected, inducted, mentored, developed and excited.”

Thus, it seems as if appraisal is constantly being re-conceptualized to incorporate these various changes and challenges that hinder it from being completely effective as a developmental tool.

The next sub-section will draw on literature with regard to the Nature and Purposes of Appraisal. This is vital to our understanding since it outlines the criteria and principles that govern the appraisal system.

2.3 THE NATURE AND PURPOSES OF APPRAISAL:

As already noted, the aim of Developmental Appraisal is:

“to facilitate the personal and professional development of educators in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management.”

(Manual for Developmental Appraisal – Department – 1999).

This re-conceptualization of the aim of Appraisal has transformed the nature of the DAS from its judgmental and opaque traditional nature to becoming more transparent, collegial and non-judgmental.

Monahan and Hengst (1982) outline several purposes for appraisal within schools. Firstly, in recent years there has been a shift towards emphasizing quality in educational institutions. In addition they state that an appropriate Developmental Appraisal System will identify areas of concern and shift the institution toward improvement and enhancement.

They go further to add that teachers differ in their abilities and performances. The performance of teachers could then be used to determine the employment, placement, salary, promotion, or tenure of a teacher. Although this form of summative evaluation may be common overseas, the implications for South African schools is that it may assist managers to place teachers in appropriate phases, for example, Junior Secondary to the benefit of the learners. Perhaps a review of this purpose is necessary in the South African educational context if teacher motivation is to be enhanced.

This next purpose of evaluation is concerned with the improvement of the personal and professional performance of teachers. The evaluation process should help the teacher to foster and grow through positive motivation and constructive criticism. This will lead to overall improvement in the ethos and culture of teaching and learning at school level.

Castetter, W.B. (1981: 230) and O' Neill (1994) echo the sentiments of Monahan and Hengst (1982) by reiterating how a properly constituted and well implemented Developmental Appraisal System can lead to the attainment of organizational goals and aims. This will enhance the quality of teaching and learning at school.

O'Neill (1994) elaborates by citing other purposes of DAS. These can be summarized as fostering collaboration and teamwork; identifying personnel with special talents and assisting with problematic areas in school.

Williams, V. (ed.) (1995: 71) infers that performance appraisal should not be seen as 'hierarchical control or an accountability mechanism.' Rather, this is a self-review of the school in the sense that:

“It should be a compass that points towards constancy in a shared value system for the school and provides clear direction in planning and evaluative processes for the continuous development of exemplary professional conduct by individuals as members of teams.”

Thus, in this way the DAS would be a useful tool in restoring a sense of balance between teaching and learning.

Fullan, M. et al. (1992: 158 et seq.) aptly denote that although these purposes appear to be far-fetched and unattainable, it can begin some improvement if it is effectively managed and correctly implemented.

Turner, G. and Clift, P. (1988: 59) postulate that the nature of appraisal is closely linked to its purpose. Thurlow, M. (1993: 13 et seq.) infer that whereas the basic characteristics of the process of systematic appraisal are fairly standard, the precise nature of any specific scheme is likely to vary according to the fundamental purpose for which it is being adopted. Thus, appraisal can be broadly categorized into two types, viz. the formative and the summative. These will be elaborated upon in the next sub-section.

2.4 TYPES OF DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL AND EVALUATION:

The two basic types of appraisal can be differentiated as follows:

- **FORMATIVE APPRAISAL** is concerned with:
“professional development, the improvement of practice by identifying strengths, weaknesses, needs and interests.”
- **SUMMATIVE APPRAISAL** is concerned with:
“the selection, promotion, redeployment and dismissal of teachers.” (Sergiovanni: 1988)

Although a distinction can be made between formative and summative evaluation, they cannot be really separated since there are aspects that overlap and complement each other. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) also illustrate the differences by referring to summative evaluation as judging the quality of teaching and formative evaluation as emphasizing the effectiveness of the school with regard to the programs and activities that are provided. Information derived from this evaluation can be used constructively toward understanding, correcting and improving the activities at school.

It can be deduced that formative evaluation is more favourable and should be the focus of teacher appraisal since it strives to help to improve teacher performance thereby enhancing overall performance of the school. Since this evaluation is not concerned with judging, but rather with improving, it would be less threatening to teachers.

Schools need to foster commitment from teachers if they are to keep abreast with the current trends in education. Thus, formative appraisal ensures that steps are taken toward improving the quality of teaching and learning at school level. The next main sub-section will deal specifically with the South African DAS. It will explore reasons behind the change that took place, the new DAS and its characteristics and a brief critique of the DAS.

2.5 THE SOUTH AFRICAN DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM:

2.5.1 A PROCESS OF TRANSFORMATION:

In the South African educational context the need for re-structuring education became imperative due to the political transition that had gripped the country in 1994. What made the Developmental Appraisal System unique to the South African context was the political impact that brought about dramatic changes in the educational sphere.

Thurlow (2001) examines the change that transpired with regard to teacher appraisal following the political transformation in 1994. Education had been highly bureaucratic, structured on the basis of segregation and authoritarian in nature. This underwent re-structuring and re-conceptualization in terms of policies and legislatures. The discussion surrounding the traditional evaluation process needs to be outlined so that a comparison can be easily drawn.

Evaluation, pre-1994 was closed, autocratic and hierarchical in character. Some criticisms have been outlined by Chetty et al (1993: 3) cited by Thurlow (2001). They are:

- the prevalence of political bias in the system;
- the unchecked power which inspectors wielded;
- the incompetence of inspectors;
- the irrelevance of some evaluation criteria;
- the secrecy surrounding appraisal;
- the absence of contextual factors in appraisal.

Fullan and Hargreaves (1992: 162) highlight the criticism against the traditional approach in that it was narrowly-focussed, concentrating for the most part on classroom performance rather than on a broad reflective examination of teaching life.

It is not surprising that such a tight-fisted approach to evaluation would definitely bring about dissatisfaction and resistance from the teachers. Educators were not consulted. This approach made them become rebellious and resist the entire process of evaluation. The year '1994' heralded a beginning and a beacon of hope for the educational fraternity. In keeping with the political move towards democracy, educational policies such as appraisal followed suit. Hence, the new system of appraisal was established. This new system will be discussed in detail in the next sub-section.

2.5.2 THE NEW SYSTEM:

The grievances against the traditional system assisted policy makers to formulate the new Developmental Appraisal System along a reviewed and revised formula. This system focussed on the development and growth of the personnel being evaluated. It enshrined democracy, in that the appraisee would be involved at all stages of the process. Its value could best be seen in its aim that emphasized individual and organizational development and growth. The shift of the emphasis made it more appealing to the educators who had resisted the judgmental character of the traditional approach of evaluation.

Thus, the Developmental Appraisal System was discussed, formulated, reviewed, piloted and now awaits feedback from its first phase of implementation at school level. In discussing the processes involved in the DAS, it highlights the involvement of the educator. The characteristics of the DAS process can be summarized as follows:

- STAFF DEVELOPMENT TEAM: (SDT)

The staff development team is elected by the staff at a democratic and open meeting. It comprises of representatives from the staff component irrespective of the post level held by those individuals. The principal is a compulsory member.

The objective of the SDT members is to facilitate and manage developmental appraisal at school level. Their tasks include co-ordination, monitoring, initiating and most importantly to ensure that training takes place. They assist in setting up panels and trying to link appraisal to organizational development. It is important for those members serving on the SDT to undergo training. This will assist them to carry out their task with confidence.

(Thurlow, M. et al. 2001) and (ELRC (1999) Manual for Developmental Appraisal).

- **APPRAISAL PANELS:**

The individual's appraisal is done by a panel that comprises the appraisee and at least three other members who are drawn from peers, management, union representatives and persons from outside school such as members of the district office, etc. The appraisee must be satisfied with the members serving on his/her panel. The panel together with the appraisee schedules a meeting to elect a chairperson who will be responsible for conducting meetings, reporting to the SDT and scheduling together with the appraisee dates for the commencement of the appraisal. It must be stressed that at least two class visits has been suggested. These visits will/can be by two separate individuals from the panel, and they are announced visits.

- **THE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT:**

Thurlow, M. (2001: 99) cite the ELRC (1999: 86) definition of instrument as "the actual tool that is used in the appraisal of educators."

The appraisal entails filling in five essential forms and one optional questionnaire. They are to be kept in separate files. These will be briefly described. They are:

1. A Personal Details Form:

This form is completed by the appraisee before the appraisal begins. It is an abbreviated curriculum vitae. (Thurlow (2001: 99).

2. A learner questionnaire that is optional.

3. The Needs Identification and Prioritization Form:

This form contains the different criteria's that are identified for various levels of educators. It also identifies the core criteria (classroom expertise, professional development, leadership and communication skills). The appraisal panels discuss this prior to the appraisal. It identifies and records priorities for development.

4. The Professional Growth Plan:

The objective of this form is to prioritize needs. It is initially completed by the appraisee but finalized by the panel through discussion and consensus. Through the key performance indicators it demonstrates whether the outcomes have been achieved.

5. The Discussion Paper:

This document is completed by the appraisee after the appraisal and then discussed with the panel. It reports on whether the objectives in the PGP have been achieved. It also takes into consideration other factors that could have impacted negatively on the appraisal. It makes allowances for other reasons as to why the appraisal did not go well, rather than focussing only negatively on the educator's style, method, attitude, etc. It suggests the nature of support needed for the future development and to improve performance.

6. The Appraisal Report:

This contains prioritized needs and criteria (such as strategic planning and transformation); identified needs (Educational Management development); strengths of an educator; a suggested development programme (eg. Time frames and measures of monitoring and controlling); suggested provider developmental programme (The SDT members and principal, educators, SEM) and dates for developmental programs delivery (meeting's, completion of forms, classroom visits, etc.).

It must be impressed upon the individual's who are being appraised that record keeping by the panel will deem the success or failure of the SDT to carry out its functions properly. Although the suggestions for successful implementation have been laid out in the Manual of the ELRC (1999), it can only be reviewed and changed if it is practiced by all schools. This will highlight the shortfalls of the system.

Finally, to complete the process of appraisal, the SDT needs to compile a general report and present it to the staff so that professional growth and development of the organization can take place. Having noted the characteristics of the process there have been various suggestions with regard to how appraisal can be effectively managed. These will be outlined in the next sub-section.

2.5.3 THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF APPRAISAL:

Middlewood (1997) stresses the need for appraisal to be embedded in the culture of the organization if it is to be effective in both its developmental and evaluative aspects. He postulates that the responsibility of the senior managers in school is to establish this culture where performance is monitored and feedback given.

Effective management of appraisal in education is likely to involve setting the climate, establishing procedures, taking action, ensuring links with development plans, monitoring and evaluating appraisal.

Target-setting is also seen as a critical area where the individuals aspirations and goals of the organization are combined and converted to practical objectives. Barber, et al (1995: 62) highlights the importance of Target-setting with this apt quotation:

“While the other aspects of appraisal can contribute to an improved professional climate and raised morale, it is target setting that decides whether it will lead to hard, practical action and therefore to school improvement.”

Jenkins (1991) offers some practical tips for the school leader if appraisal is to be successful. Jenkins goes on to suggest that a skilled coordinator be deployed since the programme needs to be managed and run efficiently. It is also recommended that the Head of Department (line manager) be responsible for appraisal as he knows most about the subject.

Middlewood (1995) provides insight into how a manager can facilitate the process of appraisal. He suggests that words such as 'interview, evidence, assessment and report' be avoided as many people become anxious and uncomfortable with these formal terminologies that can impede the progress of appraisal.

Also suggested, is the establishment of a set of principles that should stipulate whether the appraisal is linked to pay, promotion or demotion, the commitment to equality regarding gender, race and so on, a commitment that every member of staff would be appraised and an assurance about the extent of confidentiality.

Bush, T. and West-Burnham, J. (eds) (1994: 29) sees the manager's task as being vital toward enhancing staff development. He infers:

“If managers ... are not responsible for the development of their colleagues then they could be seen as overpaid teachers and highly overpaid administrators.”

In this regard the appraiser should assume responsibility and show commitment and ambition toward extending the professional development of the appraisee.

Another condition of success as outlined by Middlewood (1995: 187) is for teachers to be involved in their appraisal and:

“to feel that appraisal of their performance involved their own views and perceptions of that performance.”

Therefore the need for self-appraisal is crucial in this regard as it empowers the teacher to realize his or her potential and to assume commitment toward improving.

The process of appraisal, though not completely favoured by some educators, eventually culminates in staff development toward leading the organization forward.

The above are general points that can assist in the implementation of appraisal at school level. Having noted these recommendations this chapter will be incomplete without an initial assessment of the new system of DAS in the South African education sphere.

2.5.4 AN INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN DAS:

The new system of appraisal is in its formative stages of implementation. It is not possible at this stage of the research to critically analyze the process without the completion of the first phase at school level. However, an initial assessment would cast some light on the positive and negative aspects of the process.

It must stressed that in comparison to the traditional evaluation method, the new DAS is a radical shift in term of its underlying purpose and mode of operation. The role of the appraisee is pivotal and not sedentary. It is similar to the system of evaluation that is used in most countries. (Thurlow: 2001)

Despite its radical shift and its attempted postmodern outlook, a brief critique can be done at this stage. A policy is merely a document and as Craig (1990) cited by Thurlow (2001) notes that even the best policies do not implement themselves. The traditional evaluation system has had a negative impact on most educators. Thus, any form of appraisal or evaluation will be viewed with scepticism.

Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001) offer some critique in terms of implementation problems that they envisage the new system will be faced with. The following points are noted from their review:

1. The Pilot Project was limited in terms of scope and duration and its findings were not independently evaluated. The motto “one system fits all” has not been explored.
2. The aim of the developmental appraisal emphasizes democracy, commitment, trust etc. This impacts on the way schools ought to be managed. This can cause some constraints on the implementation process being successful.
3. The manual does not clarify the link between appraisal and organizational development; and
4. The appraisal manual does not clearly spell out anything in terms of classroom observation.

Having already noted that no empirical research exists on the first round of the implementation of the new system in South Africa, the small- scale survey conducted by the Teacher organization, APEK (2001) will have to suffice as part of the initial assessment of the DAS. This survey of APEK (2001) members was to ascertain the success of the Appraisal system and to review those aspects that needed to be improved.

It was found that although 73.2% of schools had received information about DAS, 26.8% had not. In addition, there was lack of interest, lack of understanding, time constraints and apathy or staffing problems that posed problems with implementation.

Other criticisms pertained to the Manual on DAS and while some found it concise, informative and easy to understand, others saw it as vague, difficult for Second and Third language speakers and drawn out.

There were some criticisms that the department had been ill-prepared and that the system had been hastily introduced. Time constraints also posed a problem with there being too many disruptions as teachers had to leave their classes to appraise others. However, the self-appraisal aspect received much approval.

With regard to choice of appraisers, there was no pre-requisite for the Subject Head to be included in the panel, and some tended to invite friends. Some teachers also experienced awkwardness.

The PGP received approval by way of highlighting strengths and weaknesses while others felt that it was futile since no meaningful gain had taken place.

General comments pertaining to the questionnaire tended to be negative with some complaining about the time constraints, others referring to it as 'window-dressing', there being criticisms of the panel being too large and the system too elaborate and complex. Hence, the need to review this system of appraisal as the current appraisal system has not been met with positive expectations.

CONCLUSION:

This chapter commenced with a discussion on the system of appraisal in general. It also highlighted international literature on the topic but most significantly it concentrated on the new system of appraisal in South African education (DAS). The traditional system was discussed so that a comparison between the old and new system could take place. The characteristic of the new system was outlined and some brief suggestions were offered to ensure effective implementation of the process. However, no section can be complete without a brief review of some sort. In this case, this research draws on the shortfalls and recommendations as suggested in Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001) and the APEK (2001) survey.

The first phase of implementation of the DAS in South African schools is still an ongoing process. However, this research will serve to gauge and ascertain to a certain extent reasons as to why the process could not have been successfully implemented at this secondary school.

Chapter 3 will discuss the Research concentrating on the methods, population, limitation of the study, and the research instruments that were used.

CHAPTER 3:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

INTRODUCTION:

Surveys, as a data-gathering technique seem to be the most commonly used descriptive method in educational research. They are generally linked to the interviews, questionnaires, standardized tests and attitude scales. This research will employ the use of the self-completion questionnaire and semi-structured interview techniques. (Cohen and Manion: 2001).

This research will undertake an ‘indicative’ assessment of ‘impact’ through an exploration of educator perceptions. In terms of overall conceptualization, the research will attempt to compare the DAS with other models available internationally and, in terms of implementation, the research will explore broadly the experiences of educators in the school, including the SMT, as they relate to the DAS as a whole and to efforts to operationalize it. In this latter connection, the focus of the research will address broad issue related to:

- a). The DAS and the School: preparation, training and support for implementing DAS; organizational and administrative problems.
- b). The DAS and the educator: educator assessment of the various sub-processes which together constitute the ‘official’ procedure.
- c). An overview of the DAS: An investigation of overall impressions of the design and implementation of the DAS; and suggestions for improvements.

This chapter will outline the questions for research, the methods used, the population that was used in the research, the limitation of the study and the instruments employed to obtain the necessary data.

3.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

The research addressed the following key questions:

1. What are the conceptual underpinnings of the DAS, and how do these relate to the contextual realities of South African education, as well as other conceptualizations underpinning similar processes in other countries?
2. How was the implementation of the DAS ‘officially’ conceived, and what are the theoretical limitations associated with this conception?
3. What has been the actual experience of the school in attempting to implement the DAS and what might be done to enhance the DAS and its implementation?

These research questions are important to give the research focus and direction. Hence the next section will deal with the research methods that was used to get gain some assumption to the above-mentioned questions.

3.2 METHODS USED:

The research methods that were used to obtain the responses to the questions in the above section were the descriptive technique of surveys. To attain data the techniques used were a self-completion questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews. The aim of a survey is to obtain information from which the findings can be presented and discussed. Whichever method of data gathering is used, the aim is to obtain answers to the same questions from individuals to enable the researcher to demonstrate that certain information can be attained from data. (Bell, J.: 1987).

As already mentioned, two data-gathering techniques of the survey will be employed in this research and thereafter the data will be analyzed and some inferences can be drawn about whether the DAS has been successfully implemented at this secondary school.

What can also be ascertained is whether educators are familiar with the process; and their comments and opinions will help to determine whether there is a need for restructuring to take place.

Having noted the above, the next section will assist in giving the reader an indication of the population that was used to obtain the necessary data.

3.3 THE POPULATION:

This staff comprised of a population of 32 members, including the principal and the SMT. Nearly all educators participated in the completion of the questionnaire and 4 members in the semi-structured interview. The 2 members who did not participate in this research were the researcher and the educator on leave. By involving nearly the whole staff population the data obtained becomes more valid and reliable. However, as with any research there must be limitations. This will be elaborated upon in the next subsection.

3.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

Issues related to the South African DAS, which need to be addressed include those concerned with its overall conceptualization; the process of its implementation; and its ultimate impact. Of these the last is the most difficult to research because it deals with longer term effects of the process and lies beyond the time-scale available for a mini-dissertation research. It must also be emphasized that this study was a case study of a single secondary school and therefore the results cannot be generalized.

The next section deals with the instruments used in the research which are the self-completion questionnaire and the semi-structured interview techniques. This section will describe in detail, the structure of the questionnaire and the interview schedule.

3.5 THE INSTRUMENTS:

The descriptive method used was the survey. The data-gathering techniques of the survey that were employed were the self-completion questionnaire and the semi-structured interview. The discussion will focus first on the questionnaire and then on the semi-structured interview.

3.5.1 The questionnaire: (Appendix A)

The self-completion questionnaire was designed in a structured manner based on information obtained from Cohen and Manion (2001). This questionnaire has been drawn along similar pattern as the APEK survey questionnaire. This questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first part comprised of 8 questions on the DAS and the School. This section included questions on the preparation, training and support for the implementing of DAS and was related to organizational and administrative matters. The second part was entitled The DAS and You. This section consisted of 9 questions related to educator assessment of the various sub-processes that constitute the DAS procedure. This section also made allowances for educators to state whether they had been appraised and if not the reasons for not having completed the process. The third part was the General section that comprised of 2 questions. Here respondents could comment on their overall impression of the design and implementation of the DAS and proffer suggestions for the improvement of the DAS.

This questionnaire comprised of indicative ‘yes’ or ‘no’ type responses which the respondents could easily understand and tick off (x) and questions that required comments and opinions. Here space was provided for the respondents to comment in.

The respondents were however not compelled to answer any part of the questionnaire. This was given to 30 members of staff and all responded. Respondents were given a week to complete the questionnaire. This proved to be sufficient time, since all responded adequately. The next instrument was the semi-structured interview. This will now be dealt with in detail.

3.5.2 The semi-structured interview: (Appendix B)

The semi-structured interview was designed to obtain data concerning the DAS process and its implementation at school level. It comprised of 17 questions that were addressed to 4 SDT members. The panel consists of 5 members but in this case the researcher was the one excluded. These questions were of an indicative ‘yes’ or ‘no’ type responses that made allowance for the respondents comments. The questions included sections on the manual, design and training of the DAS in which the interviewees had to indicate whether they had received and given adequate training in this regard. The role of the SDT members was specifically emphasized and acquiring information with regard to the administrative and organizational problems were focussed upon. The schedule also made provisions for the interviewees to offer suggestions for enhanced implementation of the DAS. The duration of the interview ranged from 45 minutes to 1 Hour. Interviewees answered the questions to the best of their abilities.

Thus, the underlying purpose behind the questions in the self-completion questionnaire and the semi-structured interview schedule was to gain information with regard to the design, manual, training, implementation and suggestions for improvement of the DAS. These instruments also provided an indicative feedback of whether this secondary school had successfully completed the first round of the DAS process.

CONCLUSION:

The information in the Research Methodology chapter served to highlight how the research was conducted and data gained. It outlined the questions, methods, population, limitations and instruments that were employed to attain the data. Thus, based on this information the next chapter focuses on the presentation and discussion of the findings. Once again it must be stressed that these findings cannot be generalized since it is a case study of a single secondary school.

CHAPTER 4:

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS:

INTRODUCTION:

The research conducted in Chapter 3 had to be analyzed and the data presented so that some inferences and deductions could be made. This chapter will outline the findings of the self-completion questionnaire and then the semi-structured interview schedule. These findings will be presented and discussed in the same order as they appear in the questionnaire and the interview schedule. (Appendix A and B). The findings will give a fair indication of whether the process had been successfully completed at this school. Information with regard to the design, manual, training and suggestions for enhanced implementation at school level will also be highlighted.

4.1 The questionnaire: (Appendix A)

The analysis of the results of the questionnaire were as follows:

The DAS and the School:

Question 1: Are you aware of the DAS?

Respondents were invited to say 'yes' or 'no' and if 'yes' to briefly state what they considered as the purpose of the DAS. The 'yes' response was 100% from the respondents. Majority of the respondents stated that the purpose of the DAS was to develop the educator and in turn be of benefit to the learner. However, approximately 6 (20%) of the respondents were suspicious of the purpose of the DAS and indicated that perhaps it was a return to the traditional, top-down and bureaucratic system of evaluation of teacher's performance.

Question 2: Has the process been implemented at your school?

Respondents were invited to indicate 'yes' or 'no', and if 'no' to provide some explanation. All 30 respondents indicated that the process had been implemented at this school but they emphasized that only 16 educators that is, (50%) of the staff have been through the complete process thus far.

Question 3: Have you seen a copy of the DAS Manual or parts of it?

Respondents were invited to indicate 'yes' or 'no' and if 'yes' they were requested to comment on the usefulness and quality of the manual. All respondents indicated that they had seen a copy of the DAS manual of which an abridged version consisting of the necessary requirements and documentation was also included. Majority of the respondents felt that the manual was simple, easy to interpret and concise. The other 6 20% of respondents felt that the manual was too long and not self-explanatory. They felt that there was an urgent need to improve certain aspects of the manual. Among the areas requiring attention were the many forms that the appraisee needed to fill in; and the procedure of how the DAS can be implemented. This they felt could be easily misinterpreted.

Question 4: What training and support did you and your colleagues receive for the implementation of the DAS?

The 30 respondents indicated that they had received some sort of training at school level as part of the Staff Development Programme. Majority of them were adequately knowledgeable in as far as the procedure and implementation of the DAS was concerned. Approximately, 25 (75%) of the respondents felt well equipped to undertake the DAS. However, the other 7 (25%) felt that the training had been minimal and more substantial and thorough training was necessary not only from the SDT members but it should be done at every school by the Departmental officials who had undergone intensive training themselves. Then only will this 25% feel comfortable about undergoing evaluation or appraisal of any sort.

Question 5: What is your view of the quality and effectiveness of this training and support?

Majority of the respondents had already commented on this aspect in Question 4. However, some offered comments that they were pleased that the school was pro-active and had selected motivated personnel to be part of the SDT panel. Thus, most of these panel members were adequately prepared and conducted workshops with staff members in an open and supportive manner. The staff did not feel threatened and intimidated and could easily ask for repetition of certain aspects; could pose questions freely and aired their grievances without the SDT members becoming impatient. Minority as already stated in Question 4 appeared to adopt an indifferent, non-participating and uncooperative approach towards the entire DAS process and the workshops that had been conducted. They were completely opposed to any supervision taking place because they felt that teachers are responsible adults who do not need to be accountable to anyone either than the learners.

Question 6: Please comment on the role that the SDT played in your school in terms of Training and support for the DAS.

This open-ended question allowed for respondents to comment on the role of the SDT members in as far as preparing the staff for the implementation of the DAS. Majority 23 (75%) of the respondents were pleased and satisfied with the workshops conducted by the SDT members. The 7 (25%) who choose to be non-responsive and indifferent to the DAS were not dissatisfied with the SDT member's training but were dissatisfied about the implementation of such a process of appraisal and accountability. It could be deduced that they did not want any form of assessment or evaluation because they felt that the best judges in the process of learning and teaching were the learners.

Question 7: In your opinion, could the role played by the SDT have been improved?

Here respondents were invited to indicate 'yes' or 'no' and if 'yes' they were to fill in brief suggestions for improvement. This question leads on from Questions 5 and 6. Therefore, majority 23 (75%) of the respondents offered a positive and favourable

response, however, the other 7 (25%) felt that no human is completely concise, precise and exact. There is always room for some improvement but they tended to agree that once again the variation of the improvement would determine whether the workshops conducted by SDT members warranted improvement. Overall the respondents agreed that these members were well equipped and knowledgeable enough to conduct these workshops.

Question 8: Did your school experience any problems in organizing and administering the DAS?

Respondents were invited to indicate 'yes' or 'no'. If the response was 'yes' they were asked to elaborate. 24 (80%) of the respondents did experience some difficulty. Only 6 (20%) did not elaborate on the nature of the difficulty they had experienced. Some of the comments that arose out of the elaboration ranged from inadequate time to plan and implement the DAS as a suitable compromise regarding time constraints could not be reached by panel members. 9 (30%) of the respondents had difficulty in finding suitable members to be on the panel. Approximately 11 (35%) of the respondents had considerable difficulty in answering and filling in the various documents. They felt that this was a laborious and time- consuming task.

The DAS and You:

Question 9: Have you been appraised?

Respondents were invited to indicate 'yes' or 'no'. If the response was unfavourable 'no' then the respondent was requested to give a brief explanation. Only 16 members of a staff comprising of 32 educators had by that time been appraised. This constitutes 50% of the staff. Thus, the other 16 (50%) of the staff were still waiting to undergo the process of appraisal. The reasons cited range from difficulties in trying to set up a panel; problems with coming to terms with the various documents that need to be completed or finding the appropriate time to be appraised. However, the 12 (40%) of the staff did indicate that they were keen to take the process a step further and follow in the footsteps of others that have already been appraised.

Question 10: The DAS includes a self-appraisal. Did you find this to be of value?

Respondents had to indicate 'yes' or 'no' and regardless of their response they were requested to comment. The 16 (50%) educators who have been appraised found this section to be of great value. They could make positive input about themselves and could engage in inner reflection and self-analysis. They saw this as being favourable because they could also identify their strengths and weaknesses. They could also draw a comparison between the panel members evaluation and judgment and their own. This will assist them in trying to improve themselves as educators. The other 16 (50%) of the educators who have not been appraised did not really commit themselves to any response.

Question 11: The DAS includes a panel appraisal. Did you find this to be of value?

Here once again, the respondents had to indicate 'yes' or 'no' and to offer some comment. The 16 members of staff (50%) already appraised offered both positive and negative criticisms about panel appraisal. These ranged from the panel offering varying opinions and ratings to support, motivate and encourage depending on whom you choose to be part of your panel. This in turn can be seen as a negative aspect because educators namely choose their friends so that they would receive positive feedback and rating; this creates stress and tension for the educator regardless of who is on the panel; and generally such evaluation causes awkwardness among friends and staff members. Of the 50% waiting to be appraised 9 (35%) also offered some of the above-mentioned comments on the value of panel appraisal. Finally, 4 (15%) of the respondents did not comment on this question.

Question 12: The DAS includes a Professional Growth Plan (PGP). Has this been useful to you?

The respondents were requested to comment after indicating 'yes' or 'no'. Only those already appraised choose to respond and comment on this question. From the 16 respondents 12 (85%) indicated a favourable response while 3 (7%) indicated an

unfavourable response. The positive comments centered around the PGP being a yardstick which highlighted the areas of weakness; gave the educator some insight in terms of syllabus completion and the teacher can estimate the duration it will take to achieve the objectives.

The unfavorable comments about the PGP were that the time-constraints did not make it possible for the educator to carry out the recommendations and this form was only completed to meet departmental requirements – it was not realistic to the educator.

Question 13: Please give your opinion on the number and type of forms to be completed in the DAS?

All respondents choose to offer some sort of comment on this question. These responses could be categorized into a list of typical comments such as:

- Educators are already over-burdened with administrative work and should not have to go through the laborious process of completing unnecessary forms.
- There are too many forms – these must be re-planned and re-formulated.
- It is time-consuming.
- Some are complicated.
- Many educators only complete the process to meet departmental regulations and requirements. They have not had much benefit from this process.
- Definite streaming is necessary.

Question 14: Was sufficient time allocated to you to prepare for your appraisal?

Of the 16 (50%) of educators waiting to be appraised, 7 (35%) commented that due to poor planning and time-constraints, they had difficulty in implementing this process. 3 (15%) choose not to respond. The 16 (50%) of appraisees felt that although time was a major obstacle they had seized the opportunity whenever they could and had been through the process. Of this 16 (50%), 6 (30%) felt that due to insufficient time they had not given off their best. Thus, they had gone through the process for the sake of it and not any positive or favourable gain.

Question 15: Did you find the criteria and definitions in the DAS relevant and easy to understand?

The respondents were in the majority when it came to giving unfavourable comments. They felt that the terms and definitions used were filled with unnecessary jargons. It could have been simplified and made more educator friendly. The definitions were unclear. A poor rating scale was used. The theoretical aspects made the process seem complicated and intimidated the educators.

Question 16: What is your opinion on the effectiveness of the Rating Scale (A/B) used in the DAS?

Majority of the respondents, 26 (85%) were comfortable with this rating scale. They saw the reversal as a welcome change and were glad that numbers were not used. On the other hand, the minority of 5 (15%) offered unfavourable comments such as:

- the rating scale reversal led to confusion;
- they did not favour rating of any sort; and
- very seldom will an educator discredit himself/herself.

Thus, subjectivity and biasness will definitely enter into the process.

Question 17: Has your experience of the DAS contribute positively to your personal and professional growth?

Here respondents already appraised commented on this question. Thus, 15 (50%) of the respondents were involved. 5 (35%) of them offered favourable comments and agreed that it had led to professional growth. These respondents were of the opinion that by highlighting their strengths and weaknesses they could become better educators; it offered an opportunity for introspection and they had gained some knowledge from the exchange of ideas. 2 (10%) of the respondents felt that DAS was a de-motivator and had not impacted positively in terms of personal and professional growth. The reasons for this have already been exhausted in other questions.

General:

● Question 18: What is your overall impression of the DAS as it is currently designed and implemented?

Respondents were free to comment on this question. This open-ended question provided an opportunity for positive and negative responses.

The analysis can be summed up as:

Positive comments : 55% -(17)

Negative comments : 35% - (11)

No comments : 10% - (2)

The positive responses included:

- it involves the appraisee at every level of the process;
- fosters a climate for collaboration and teamwork;
- helps the educator to analyze his/her teaching methodology and style;
- provides positive and negative criticism;
- helps to develop and improve the culture of teaching and learning at school level;
- gives educators an opportunity to learn from visiting colleagues classrooms; and
- that it keeps the educator abreast with changes in teaching and learning practices.

The negative comments were that it:

- is time consuming;
- can cause disharmony among staff members;
- is a de-motivator;
- contains numerous documents that need to be completed;
- makes an educator go through the process for the sake of it; and
- it should not be so long drawn.

Thus, it can be assumed that the DAS was not well received by all educators.

Question 19: Please provide suggestions about what might need to be done to improve the current appraisal process.

Only 60% (18) of the respondents choose to offer any suggestions. 40% (12) left this question unanswered.

Some suggestions included that it:

- should be made streamlined;
- should be re-examined in terms of paper work that needed to be completed;
- the rating scale could be straight A/B and not reversed;
- the training manual should be more educator friendly, easier to understand and simplified;
- the emphasis should not be on evaluating the teacher's performance in the class but on the teaching style employed; use of resources and learner involvement and participation.

SUMMARY:

The self-completion questionnaire was well responded to. Educators did not feel threatened in anyway and could respond quite freely. It can be assumed that although the educators are fully aware of the DAS process – its manual and process of implementation it is a matter of time before the entire staff completes the first phase of appraisal successfully. Thus far, only (50%) 16 educators have been fully appraised. The educators however, did not resist the process but due to circumstances beyond themselves they have not been through the process. There is no blue print for the implementation of any evaluation or accountability system but majority of the aspects and mechanism associated with it must be compiled in collaboration with all role-players. There must be constant feedback so that the re-evaluation can take place and this in turn will lead to an almost perfect system. However, no system is without its loopholes and flaws and one cannot always judge the success and failure of one system based solely on the outcome and analysis of the data associated with a single secondary school. It requires research of a much broader context to generalize these findings and recommendations. It can also be noted that some of the positive and negative comments that have been discussed in this section may overlap with responses of the APEK (2001) survey , suggestions made by Middlewood (1995); West-Burnham (1994) and Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001).

The Interview Schedule: Appendix B:

The analysis of the Interview Schedule were as follows:

Question 1: In your opinion what is the main purpose of the current DAS process?

●f the 4 SDT members who were interviewed, the majority felt that it was a process that developed the individual to perform at their optimum and this in turn would create a balance and improve the culture of teaching and learning at school level. The principal saw this as being a positive process of trying to identify the strengths and weaknesses of his staff members.

Question 2: Do you have a copy of the DAS manual?

The interviewees all had copies of the DAS manual. They had attended workshops at which these manuals were discussed and given to them. Copies of this manual was duplicated and given to staff members.

Question 3: Have you familiarized yourself with the information contained in this manual?

The interviewees had conducted workshops at staff level and therefore needed to be familiar with the information contained in the manual. On the other hand they were also at the assistance of those undergoing the process of DAS.

Question 4: Were the SDT members democratically elected at your school?

The response was a clear 'yes'. This was done at a fully constituted staff meeting and the members had an opportunity to decline or accept the position.

Question 5: Did you as a member of the SDT receive training from departmental officials?

All the respondents had been for training workshops.

Question 6: Do you think that this training was sufficient?

Here interviewees had to indicate 'yes' or 'no' and elaborate. 50% (2 respondents) felt that the training was valuable. The other 50% (2 respondents) felt that the officials were inadequately prepared. They were boring and monotonous. A dynamic and motivated speaker would have really impressed and motivated the members attending the workshop.

Question 7: Were you involved in training and informing the staff about the DAS?

'YES' was the unanimous response received from the interviewees. They all played pivotal roles in educating and empowering staff members about the DAS.

Question 8: In your opinion are the staff members well-informed about the DAS?

In this question the interviewees had to give their opinions and comments. Generally they were of the opinion that the workshops that they conducted had prepared and informed the members of staff adequately. This obviously may not be the opinion that is shared by all staff members.

Question 9: Do the SDT members meet regularly to discuss problems that the staff members are experiencing with the DAS?

The SDT members were of the opinion that whenever the need arose, they would meet and at intervals make input whereby the process needs to take a gigantic leap in terms of completion and compiling of general comments and developmental approach that need to be strongly implemented and instituted so that there is improvement in the teaching and learning at this school.

Question 10: Have the SDT members successfully set up DAS panels?

The SDT members have attempted to set up panels but whether these panels have been able to carry out the appraisal seems to be questionable. From the staff comprising of 32 members, only 16 (50%) of the staff members have completed the process of the DAS.

Question 11: Have these panels been able to complete the DAS process at least once?

From the data received in the questionnaire section from the 30 educators, it can be deduced that only 16 panels have successfully completed the process of appraisal. The other panels have had difficulties in term of time-constraints; finding adequate members to be on their panels; while a minority seem opposed to the process of appraisal and evaluation.

Question 12: What in your opinion is the most difficult aspect of the DAS process?

Most of the interviewees have reached some consensus on the fact that the most difficult aspect of the DAS process is actually getting the process started at school level. Once the cycle starts in a well-planned and organized manner then, the other educators become somewhat motivated and want to get the process over with.

Question 13: As a member of the SDT what role did you play in the DAS process?

In this question, the interviewee responses varied to cover such roles as:

- conducting workshops;
- setting up panels;
- advising staff members;
- appraising;
- offering assistance to staff in connection with completion of documents; etc.

Question 14: What do you think about the number of forms that need to be completed in the DAS process?

The responses of the interviewee's can be summarized as follows:

- They are too many in number;
- It is a time-consuming process;
- Some of the forms appear to have unnecessary questions and detail requirements;
- A definite review and re-structuring of the forms is required;
- It must be made more user-friendly; and

- Perhaps if the process is streamlined then DAS will become more readily acceptable at school level.

Question 15: Did your school experience any problems in organizing and administering the DAS process?

From the data obtained of the self-completion questionnaire and the interview schedule it can be deduced that the school is experiencing some difficulty since only 16 educators out of a staff comprising of 32 educators have been thus far appraised. The comments offered in the discussion on elaboration included:

- that there was resistance from certain staff members;
- some educators were unable to set up adequate panels;
- the members are too busy;
- the process is too time-consuming; and
- that teachers feel that the process will not lead to much improvement.

Question 16: Suggest ways in which the current appraisal process might be improved?

As with the responses in the self-completion questionnaire section, the interviewee's offered the following suggestions:

- The reviewing, re-structuring and streaming of the manual might make it more favourable to educators at school level;
- Departmental officials should be deployed to schools where problems are of a challenging level and this may dissipate conflicts that arise;
- The appraisee must be made to feel important since the process involves him/her;
- The planning and organizing of the process will determine the rate of its success;
- On the completion of the process, a staff developmental workshop must be held;
- The process must be open and transparent from the outset; and
- Panels must be set up in an objective and unbiased manner.

Summary:

The interview of the SDT members seemed to be a fruitful and valuable experience in that the information with regard to the implementation of the DAS process at this school could be determined and the success of the DAS could be ascertained. From this data-gathering instrument it could be deduced that there was some resistance from educators with regard to the process of implementation. Educators, it seems are still suspicious of the process and in some way impeded the completion of the process. The need for re-structuring was highlighted and the emphasis of the process being time-consuming also added to it being not completely implemented at this school. Chapter 5 will contain a more thorough discussion of the findings.

CONCLUSION:

The two data-gathering techniques implemented in this research seemed to be adequate in ascertaining the success of the implementation of the DAS process at this single secondary school in the North Durban Region. The self-completion questionnaire provided an intensive review of the process itself. It also effectively highlighted the shortcomings of the process and suggestions with regard to re-structuring and streamlining of the documents and the manual could assist to change the way in which DAS is currently being perceived by educators as a laborious and non-beneficial task.

The interview served to reiterate the plight of those who have to go through the process and also offered valuable suggestions that could enhance the perception and implementation of the DAS at school level. Chapter 5 will give the reader a more comprehensive summary of the process of the implementation of the DAS process and will also outline certain recommendations for the improvement of the process.

CHAPTER 5:

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

INTRODUCTION:

Chapter 4 outlined for the reader the data gathered using the descriptive method of research inclusive of the self-completion questionnaire and the interview schedule.

Chapter 5 serves a dual purpose. It is imperative in that it highlights the findings of the research and also offers recommendations for the improvement of the DAS process so that it becomes educator-friendly and more easily implemented at school level. It can be assumed that though the process has evolved internationally over time, through trial and error it remains far from being perfect and user-friendly. The findings and recommendations will demonstrate the reasons for it not being implemented successfully at this secondary school. It will also highlight recommendations for improvement in the DAS process.

5.1 FINDINGS:

The findings of this research as has already been mentioned are specifically to one school and cannot be generalized to other schools since this is a case study. However, these findings can overlap with findings obtained in other research that has been undertaken such as the APEK survey (2001) and the article by Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001). It must be noted that the process of change is not always readily acceptable to all individuals and resistance is an obstacle to its success.

Evaluation and Accountability have been a contentious issue from its inception. Although the process has become more formalized in recent times, it has been in existence for decades. Internationally as well as, in the South African Educational

sphere, educators have opposed the process due to the suspicions concerning its purpose. There has also been sensitivity with regard to its implementation. However, it can be assumed that the new DAS is more readily accepted by educators than the traditional system of evaluation had been.

The survey carried out that included the self-completion questionnaire section and the interview schedule will be discussed under their headings. The findings will be generally categorized and discussed according to the way they appear in the research.

5.2.1 The Questionnaire: (Appendix A):

The discussion on this aspect will take the form of sub-sections to make the discussion more focussed and easier to comment on:

A: The DAS and the School:

This sub-section of the questionnaire contained 8 questions on the above heading. The following can be deduced from the respondent's opinions and comments:

- The respondents were aware of the DAS and generally noted its purpose to be of benefit to the institution.
- The implementation of the DAS process has started at this school.
- Questions 3-8 can be assumed to suggest that the DAS has been workshop at school level; and majority of the educators have been adequately trained and have the manual in their possession.
- The SDT members have cascaded the information to staff via internal training session.
- The comments offered in connection with its effective implementation include that:
 - there are clear directives for future re-structuring of the manual;
 - the manual should be re-structured along the lines of conciseness of vocabulary, stream-lining and decrease in the number of forms that need to be filled in.

Despite the positive characteristics of the DAS process, some individuals still view it as a sensitive and controversial issue. These educator's suspicions with regard to the appraisal is still quite prevalent and some resistance may be present.

The above mentioned criticisms and comments have also been suggested in the article by Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001). They infer that it is necessary to undertake a review of the implementation of the DAS process at school level.

However, for it to be applicable provincially it has to be undertaken by the Department of Education and Culture. The survey conducted by APEK is on a small-scale and although the above-mentioned comments feature strongly in their document, this survey had been done on a small-scale and does not include all schools and educators. However, these comments are valuable in that it will allow the process of DAS to become more readily accepted at school level. This will impact positively in improving the culture of teaching and learning. The next sub-section deals with the findings with regard to the individual and the actual process of appraisal. The findings can be assumed as those stipulated below.

B: The DAS and You:

This sub-section of the questionnaire was made up of 9 questions, and it dramatically emphasized the number of educators who have been appraised at this particular secondary school in the North Durban Region.

The findings revealed that only 16 educators (50 %) of the population out of a staff comprising of 32 educators have thus far been appraised. It can be assumed that the staff members were not opposed to the process of appraisal but due to circumstances beyond their control they had not been appraised by the time that this research had been undertaken. They offered the following comments as to the reasons for the DAS process not being completely implemented.

They can be summarized as:

- time-constraints;
- reduction of staff due to redeployment necessitated re-structuring of some panels;
- teachers were unwilling to leave their classes especially with the new OBE (Outcomes Based Education) programs where work specified for a particular time-frame had to be completed within that time; and
- they were unable to set up panels because teachers were not willing to appraise others.

Although educators offered these comments they noted the urgent need for the process to make headway and seemed anxious that so few educators have been appraised at their

school. This appears to be a positive sign since half the battle is won especially in the fact that individuals want to take the initiative and go through the process. Some of these general comments have been noted in Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001) and the APEK survey report (2001) that seem to make similar observations with regard to the implementation of the DAS process at other schools.

The respondents were also asked questions with regard to their opinions on the process and forms that need to be completed in the DAS process. The respondents seem to favour the section on self-appraisal since it gave them an opportunity to assess their self-worth. The panel appraisal also featured positively because it gave respondents an opportunity to weigh their self assessment against the opinion of others. However, some negative comments included the major problem of individuals opting for their friends to be part of the panel therefore this could cause an unpleasant and inaccurate evaluation of the educator.

The PGP was seen by majority of the respondents as an important component of the DAS process as it provided some means by which an individual's strengths and weaknesses could be highlighted. On the other hand, the minority who saw it as a negative aspect substantiated by implying that educators merely filled this aspect of the form in order to meet the requirements of the process.

The other questions on this sub-section dealt with preparation, rating scale and individual's opinion on their experience with the DAS. In these questions, respondent's comments varied and highlighted the point that the appropriate time is difficult to adhere to since the appraisers had to leave their classes unattended. Perhaps they did not assess the worth of the individual objectively. The A/B reversed rating scale was not preferred by most respondents. The majority of the respondents were of the opinion that DAS had contributed positively to their growth and development. It was a capacity building exercise that empowered the level 1 educator since they were allowed to offer comments and criticisms to their colleagues as they had been involved in the process of appraising them.

The third sub-section consisted of 2 questions of a general nature. Here respondents were given the opportunity to offer suggestions for the improvement of the DAS process.

Section C: General:

In this sub-section, the respondents suggestions can be summarized as those listed below:

- a definite review of the new DAS was necessary;
- the stream-lining of the manual and the forms that needed to be completed by the appraisee;
- language simplification of the manual was necessary;
- time frames need to be more realistic; and
- the role of the managers need to undergo transformation to incorporate this new process. Managers need intensive training so that they can motivate the staff adequately.

The above are an edited version of the suggestions that had emerged as a result of the research conducted at this particular school. However, some comments can be regarded as the general opinions of other educators who have been exposed to the DAS. The changing role of the Managers is seen as vital to the success of the process at school level. There needs to be a dramatic change in the perception by the Head of the institution concerning the implementation of the DAS since this could lead to overall improvement of the institution. The DAS must not merely be seen as an instrument that can be used to assess the individual teacher for merit. This change in the way the DAS is perceived could motivate other staff members to undergo appraisal and thus the culture of teaching can be enhanced. The APEK (2001) survey also contained information that was similar to the suggestions offered by these educators. It also stressed the aspect with regard to the manual, forms and time frame that need to be reviewed. Thus, it seems that if these suggestions can be taken into consideration, it will enhance the effectiveness of the implementation of the DAS process at school level.

The findings based on the data gathered from the interview conducted with the SDT members will now be discussed.

5.2.2 The Interview Schedule: (Appendix B):

The data collated through the interview with the SDT members provided information in terms of the training received from departmental officials, the manual and the process of the DAS. This schedule consisted of 16 questions that were addressed to these members. These questions can be broadly categorized and discussed under the following sub-sections:

The purpose and role of the SDT member:

It can be assumed that most members felt that the DAS process was important for organisational growth and development. The roles played by the SDT members varied and individuals were given an opportunity to involve the appraisee at all levels of the discussion. These individuals were well acquainted with the information contained in the DAS manual and could offer knowledge in this regard. These interviewees had received training from the departmental officials but not all trainers were dynamic and vibrant when they cascaded information. The next sub-section will address the question of whether successful panels had been set up.

The DAS panels:

It can be deduced that attempts to set up panels were successful to a certain extent. The redeployment and transfer of educators deemed the process invalid and other panels had to be set up. This disbanding of some panels inevitably led to the formation of new panels and in some cases individuals were part of more than one panel at a time. The next broad section will deal with problems associated with the process of implementation and suggestions for enhanced implementation.

Problems and suggestions for improvement:

The problems associated with the process included a discussion concerning time, re-formation of certain panels, completion of unnecessary documents and the suggestions were valuable in ensuring the future success of the process. Among the suggestion for enhanced implementation a few can be highlighted. These can be summarized as:

- the need for re-structuring of the documents and forms;
- the manual must be made user-friendly;

- the department must conduct a provincial survey with regard to the DAS process;
- time frames must be of a realistic nature; and
- the role of the Manager must be abreast with the current changes in education.

Some positive characteristics that emerged out of the interview will now be noted.

Positive Characteristics:

Among the positive attributes associated with the DAS process, the following comments featured. They were as follows:

- It was an enriching experience to be a member of the SDT;
- By attending the workshop these members were at an advantage;
- DAS is here to stay, regardless of its shortfalls;
- Despite its weaknesses it can contribute positively in improving teaching;
- There is consultation and fostering of teamwork;
- The educator is part of the decision-making process;
- Teaching styles and practices can be learned and modified; and lastly,
- It does keep the teacher stimulated.

Thus, some of the above-mentioned suggestions and comments have been repeated. Nevertheless, it seems that if the new system of DAS undergoes certain changes it can be used effectively enhance the quality of teaching and learning at school level. Teachers will have to adopt a more positive attitude towards the process. Change is never easily accepted by all at any point in time, but if majority accept it readily then it can be seen as being somewhat effective.

Some recommendations for the improvement of the new DAS process will now be discussed. These suggestions can enhance the quality of the DAS.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS:

The new system of appraisal recently implemented into the South African Educational context has been researched at a single secondary school in the North Durban Region.

The findings have been stated and discussed. A comprehensive summary containing the comments and suggestions offered by the educators of that school and others discussions as contained in the article by Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001) and the APEK survey findings (2001) necessitates suggestions for recommendations to improve the implementation process of the DAS. Effective management of the appraisal can be beneficial to the overall organizational growth and development.

Some suggestions have been proposed by O'Neill (1994) who cite the following as recommendations for the improvement of the DAS at school level. Firstly, the role of the manager is vital to the process and as such he/she can ensure that a climate that is conducive to teaching and learning is created at that school. Among the other characteristics are openness, trust and consensus among individuals in that institution. As a leader, the role of the principal will help to create such an environment and he/she must be democratic and open to suggestions and committed to making this process work.

O'Neill (1994) further elaborates that there must be sensitivity and the individuality of the every person needs to be considered.

Mokgalane, E. et al. (1995: 5) in 'National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report' outlines the principles that ought to underpin the DAS. These are important for effective implementation of the process. These include:

- The process is as important as the product.
- The process should be negotiated.
- The process should involve peer review.
- The process should be developmental rather than judgmental.
- The process must be nationally instituted.
- There must be transparency.
- Adequate training must take place before the process can be instituted.

- Summative and formative evaluation types should be conducted separately.

These principles may overlap with the suggestions made by other writers on the subject of appraisal but ultimately they point to a democratic, transparent and non-judgmental approach whereby developmental and professional growth can be fostered.

The South African educational context is unique in that the dramatic transformation of the political climate has impacted on the educational sphere. In this regard, the closest small-scale survey conducted by APEK (2001) appears to be very informative. It provides some basis for discussion since it tried to ascertain the shortfalls and the positive aspects as viewed by this teacher organization membership. In this regard there are some recommendations that have been proposed. They can be summarized as:

- A revised system of appraisal which is streamlined and less complex.
- There should be realistic time frames.
- The system of the panel of appraisers should be reviewed and simplified.
- The rating system should be revised and expanded.
- The number of forms should be reduced.
- There should be more assistance from departmental officials.

These suggestions can contribute effectively in making the system of appraisal more user-friendly and easier to implement. A system such as the DAS needs to be constantly reviewed to keep abreast with the latest policy developments in education.

Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001) also proffer suggestions with regard to improvement in the DAS. Some of these suggestions have been listed under Chapter 2. However, other comments include:

- The concept of professional development and activities will need to be re-addressed.
- The unrealistic time frames proposed whereby educators need to complete the appraisal process in one of two six month periods, taking into consideration that panels need to be in operation poses a major problem. This was not envisaged when the process was piloted since it only involved two appraisees in each of the sample schools and it was not tested throughout the school.

- South Africa has 11 official languages. Yet, thus far the training manual of the DAS has only been printed in the English language. This can create a problem in terms of understanding especially in reading and interpreting the information contained in the manual.

The above-mentioned recommendations are merely suggestions however, it can improve the DAS process and lead to enhanced implementation of the DAS in the South African educational context.

The DAS process is not flawless nonetheless it has positive characteristics that can help with individual and organizational growth and development.

The recommendations have bearing and suggestions that this secondary school can employ to enhance the implementation process of the DAS. The principle role-player is the appraisee whom in this case any member of the institution be it the principal or the level one educator. These suggestions stress collaboration, effective communication and commitment on the part of all educators. The school cannot benefit from this process if only a small percentage of the staff has undergone appraisal. It must be fully implemented to impact on the growth of the organization. The educational authorities have taken the initiative and formulated a policy based on their expectations and experience. Only through trial and error can such a process like the DAS become more acceptable to all role-players who need to be appraised.

Thus, this research has been successful in ascertaining the reasons for the DAS process not being completed at this secondary school. The recommendations have been beneficial in that the success and shortfalls of the system can be viewed and discussed at length. It also serves as a yardstick that can lead to the improvement of the system.

CONCLUSION:

This research has placed the Developmental System of Appraisal into perspective in the South African education system. It has stressed the positive and negative comments of the process. It focussed on the successful implementation of appraisal at a single secondary school in the North Durban Region. Having made suggestions for the improvement of the system, if it is implemented and reviewed perhaps the process can become more realistic to be put into operation at school level. This school will benefit from the recommendations and the role of the Manager is of vital importance in ensuring the success of the process. The Manager does not have to work in isolation in as far as the DAS is concerned, he/she has the support of the SDT members. This fosters a climate of collaboration, teamwork and empowerment.

Despite criticism of the process of appraisal, dramatic advancement has been made towards a collegial and teacher-friendly approach and the basic structures are in place toward improving the quality of teaching and learning. The Department has taken the initiative (See Appendix C) in sending out a DAS questionnaire to the schools in the North Durban Region. The information from this questionnaire might be instrumental in sowing the seeds towards a more progressive, less complex and streamlined DAS system. What is needed now is the commitment and ownership from teachers towards making the process of DAS successful. Teachers cannot afford to be apathetic and allow the organization to stagnate – they are key role-players and must take a positive and pro-active role in the whole process of appraisal.

REFERENCES:

ANC (1994) **A Policy Framework for Education and Training**, Johannesburg: Education Department, African National Congress.

APEK Research (2001) **Developmental Appraisal System (DAS)**. APEK Educational Matters.

Barber, M. Evans, A., & Johnson, M. (1995) **An Evaluation of the National Scheme of School Teacher Appraisal**, London: DFEE.

Bell, J. (1987) **Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science**, England: Open University Press.

Bollington, R., Hopkins, D. & West, M. (1990) **An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal**. London: Cassell.

Bush, T. and West-Burnham, J. (eds) (1994) **The Principles of Educational Management**. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Castetter, W.B. (1981) **The Personnel Function in Educational Administration**. Third Edition. United States of America: Macmillan Publishing Company Inc.

✓ Chetty, D., Chisholm, L., Gardiner, M., Manau, N. & Vinjevold, P. (1993) **Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa: Policy Options and Strategies**. Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand/NECC.

Cohen, L. Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2001) **Research Methods in Education**. Fifth Edition, London: Routledge Falmer.

✓ ELRC (1998) **Developmental Appraisal: Resolution 4 of 1998**, Pretoria: Education Labour Relations Council.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (ed). (1992) **Teacher Development and Educational Change**, London: The Falmer Press.

Jenkins, H.O. (1991) **Getting It Right: A Handbook for Successful School Leadership**, Oxford: Blackwell Education.

Middlewood, D., Blount, J., Sharnan, M. & Fay, C. (1995) **Evaluation of Teacher Appraisal in Northamptonshire**, Northampton, Northants County Council.

Questionnaire on the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) for school-based educators.

This questionnaire is aimed at ascertaining your views about the recently introduced Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) and if it has been efficiently implemented at our school. Your assistance in answering this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. Be assured that your responses will be treated in *STRICTEST CONFIDENCE*.

Wherever there are questions requiring YES/NO answers; please enter a cross in the appropriate box. (eg. if your answer is YES please enter a cross as indicated:

- YES
- NO


1. Are you aware of the DAS?

- ☐ YES
- ☐ NO

If your answer is yes, please explain what you consider the underlying purpose of the DAS to be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

2. Has the DAS process been implemented in your school?

-  YES
-  NO

If yes, please go to the next question. If no, please give some explanation.

3. Have you seen a copy of the DAS Manual, or parts of it?

☐ YES

☐ NO

If yes, please comment on the usefulness and quality of the manual.

4. What training and support did you and your colleagues receive for the implementation of the DAS?

5. What is your view of the quality and effectiveness of this training and support?

6. Please comment on the role that the Staff Development Team (SDT) played in your school in terms of training and support for the DAS.

7. In your opinion, could the role played by the SDT have been improved?

☐ YES

☐ NO

If your answer is yes, please state briefly how it could be improved.

8. Did your school experience any problems in organising and administering the DAS?

☐ YES

☐ NO

If yes, please elaborate.

The DAS and You:

9. Have you been appraised?

☐ YES

☐ NO

If yes, please go to the next question. If no, please explain why not.

10. The DAS includes a self-appraisal. Did you find this to be of value?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please comment.

11. The DAS includes a panel appraisal. Did you find this to be of value?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please comment.

12. The DAS also includes a professional growth plan (PGP). Has this been useful to you?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please comment.

13. Please give your opinion on the number and type of forms to be completed in the DAS.

14. Was sufficient time allocated to you to prepare for your appraisal?

☐ YES

☐ NO

If no, please comment.

15. Did you find the criteria and definitions in the DAS relevant and easy to understand ?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please comment.

16. What is your opinion on the effectiveness of the Rating Scale (A/B) used in the DAS ?

17. Has your experience of the DAS contributed positively to your personal and professional growth?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please elaborate.

--

General:

18. What is your overall impression of the DAS as it is currently designed and implemented ?

--

19. Please provide suggestions about what might need to be done to improve the current appraisal process.

--

Thank You for your co-operation!

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ON THE DAS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: SDT MEMBERS:

1. In your opinion what is the main purpose of the current DAS process?
2. Do you have a copy of the DAS manual?
3. Have you familiarized yourself with the information contained in this manual?
4. Were the SDT members democratically elected at your school?
5. Did you as a member of the SDT receive training from departmental officials?
6. Do you think that this training was valuable and sufficient?
Please elaborate.
7. Were you involved in training and informing the staff about the DAS?
8. In your opinion are the staff members well informed about the DAS?
Please comment.
9. Do the SDT members meet regularly to discuss problems that the staff members are experiencing with the DAS?
Please elaborate.
10. Have the SDT members successfully set up DAS panels?
11. Have these panels been able to complete the DAS process at least once?
Please elaborate.
12. What in your opinion is the most difficult aspect of the DAS process?
13. As a member of the SDT what role did you play in the DAS process?
14. What do you think about the number of forms that need to be completed in the DAS process?
15. Did your school experience any problems in organising and administering the DAS process?
Elaborate.
16. Suggest ways in which the current appraisal process might be improved?

APPENDIX C

NORTH DURBAN REGION: DAS QUESTIONNAIRE



PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL
ISIFUNDAZWE SAKWAZULU-NATAL
PROVINSIE KWAZULU-NATAL



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
UMNYANGO WEMFUNDO NAMASIKO
DEPARTEMENT VAN ONDERWYS EN KULTUUR

NORTH DURBAN REGION ISIFUNDAZWE SENYAKATHO NETHOKU NOORD DURBAN STREEK

Address: PHOENIX DISTRICT OFFICE
1 SPIRE ROAD
STONEBRIDGE
PHOENIX

Enquiries: MR ES CHETTY
Tebuzo
avrae



Reference: mr es chetty PDO 377 2002
Verwysing:

Telephone: (031) 5024307
Ucingo: 5391963
Telefoon:
Fax: (031) 5026324

Date: 03 MAY 2002
Usuku:
Datum:

TO ALL PRINCIPALS/ACTING PRINCIPALS

DAS QUESTIONNAIRE

Attached please find a copy of a letter from the office of Mr BE Nobin .

You are required to take note of its contents and return the attached questionnaire to the District Office on or before Thursday, 23 May 2002.

Your co-operation in this matter is appreciated.


ES CHETTY
DISTRICT MANAGER

03 MAY 2002
DATE



PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL
ISIFUNDAZWE SAKWAZULU-NATAL
PROVINSIE KWAZULU-NATAL



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
UMINYANGO WENFUNDO NAMASIKO
DEPARTEMENT VAN ONDERWYS EN KULTUUR



Address: Tugro House
Insheni: 17 Victoria Embankment
Adress: Esplanade

Private Bag:
Insheni: 17 Victoria Supco
Private Bag: 4000

Private Bag X14323
Durban

Telephone: (031) 360-8911
Usheni: (031) 360-8911
Telefoon: (031) 337-4281
Fax: (031) 337-4281

Enquiries:
Insheni: G L Jai
Navraag:

Reference:
Insheni: DAS
Verwysing:

Date:
Usheni: 25 May
Datum:

To: District Managers
Senior Education Management
School Principal
Staff Development Team's (SDT's)

DAS : QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INFORMATION GATHERING

1. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect valuable information on the implementation of in all institutions.
2. The Staff Development Team (SDT) in your institution must complete this form.
3. You are requested to be honest when completing this questionnaire to ensure proper monitor and supporting strategies are applied
4. Kindly ensure that this form is completed by 23 May 2002 and returned to your District Of
5. Thank you for your co-operation

1 SENIOR MANAGER (ACTING)
NORTH DURBAN REGION

EMIS No. : _____

Name of Circuit : _____

Names of SDT

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

DAS IMPLEMENTATION

1. Has your school submitted a Management Plan?

Yes

2. If no, state the DATE when your Management Plan will be submitted.

Date

3. Has the process been implemented in your school?

Yes

4. If no, state the DATE when the process will commence at your institution

Date

5. Do you require any assistance on the implementation of Das?

Yes

6. If yes, state the kind of assistance your school requires _____

8. If yes, what areas of development do they require? (List them)? _____

9. **GENERAL**

Comment on the implementation and the status of DAS in your school institution: _____

Please complete the grid attached to this form entitled developmental appraisal supervision by filling in the date of completion and also the expected dates of completion.

Annexure 1 provides the details of Steps 1 - 19 as required by the grid.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
	APPOINTMENT OF PANEL	SUBMISSION OF PANEL (SDT)	COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DETAIL FORM	PANEL MEETING	COMPLETION OF (A-F)	FIRST OBSERVATION (PORTFOLIOS)	APPRAISERS MEETING (RATING H-F)	PANEL MEETING	DEVELOP WOP	SUBMISSION NLE / PGP / SDT	IMPLEMENT POP	OBSERVATION 2 ND	PANEL MEET (DEV. OFF GP)	SUBMISSION OF IGP (SDT)	COLLECTION, DISCUSSION FORM	SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION FORM	PANEL MEET, DISCUSSION OF APPRAISAL PROCESS	COMPLETE FINAL REPORT	SUBMISSION OF FINAL REPORT

