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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the impact of Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) designed by National Department of Education (NDE) on the way educators perform their duties and specific causes of problems in the implementation of DAS in Tembisa primary schools.

The study established that the appraisal panels including the principals, School Management Teams (SMTs) and educators lacked the necessary skills to implement DAS in these schools. These panel members failed to work as a team and had conflicts among themselves. The principals and SDTs who were required by NDE to facilitate and encourage staff to implement DAS lacked necessary knowledge to lead the process.

Consequently, there was poor implementation of DAS in these schools since inadequate strategies were employed to implement DAS and educators were frustrated by the implementation of the appraisal system. Hence, they developed a negative attitude towards DAS, which led to its failure.

In this research inquiry it was argued that the alternative strategies that include proper and sufficient training, communication and teamwork should be employed in an effort to implement DAS effectively. Educators also need to be motivated in this process in order to accept change. The study also illustrated that educators should be involved in the decision-making and planning of the implementation of DAS in order to commit themselves.
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KEY CONCEPTS

1. DAS

The Development Appraisal System is an instrument that has been introduced by the National Department of Education to focus on the development and training of educators to perform their duties in a competent way.

2. SMT

School Management Team: A team of school managers composed of the Principal, Deputy Principal/s and the Heads of Department for different Learning Areas.

3. SDT

Schools Development Team: A team that has been elected by educators to co-ordinate the activities of DAS in schools.

4. APPRAISAL PANEL

It is a team of people that has been appointed by the appraisee (educator) for the purpose of evaluating the appraisee.

5. EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT

Human resource developments in education, focusing on a wide range of skills, capacity attitudes and needs that are required to perform the work.

6. TRAINING

Development of skills to educators focusing on the activities that are associated with their work.
7. OBE
Outcomes Based Education is an approach that requires educators and learners: to focus on desired results of learning and learners need to demonstrate that they have attained them.

8. NDE
National Department of Education is the only component that controls education system in South Africa.
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CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL ORIENTATION

1. INTRODUCTION

After the democratic elections in 1994, the new South African government had to introduce a new education system called Outcomes Based Education (OBE). The primary intention of the National Department of Education (NDE) was to replace the apartheid racially segregated education system, which was fragmented into Black, Coloured, Indian and White education systems, with a unified system.

OBE is a system which is learner-centred. Naicker (1997: 87) argues that outcomes-based education is a system of education that accommodates all learners, irrespective of their race, gender or creed.

The South African education system therefore needed a change. There were problems that included inadequate facilities for black schools, unequal educational opportunities, irrelevant curricula, insufficient finance and inadequately qualified teaching staff (Van der Horst & Mc Donald 1997: 5). All these problems led to a crisis in the South African education system. OBE and Curriculum 2005 (C2005) were envisaged to eliminate some of the above mentioned problems.

Along with the new system of education based on C2005 and OBE, the NDE introduced an instrument that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of educators; the instrument is called the Development Appraisal System (DAS). The developmental and performance appraisals are two forms of appraisals that could improve an educator’s performance in the classroom. According to Mdlalose (2001: 1) developmental and performance appraisals may change the negative attitude of educators towards a positive one. He further contends that DAS should be taken as a process of creating a positive mindset which encourages realistic efforts to keep pace with the rapidly changing field of knowledge regarding teaching and learning.
The appraisal system should be conducted from time to time in order to monitor the work and give a clear direction of what is expected of educators. Educators should be appraised to determine whether their teaching and classroom management are effective.

The appraisal system is one of a number of structural changes that have been introduced in the South African education system. Its significance is that it impinges directly on the work of every member of the staff and on internal structures and relationships within each school. The appraisal system is used to evaluate educators on various aspects, such as curriculum development, lesson presentation, methodology, classroom management, learner assessment, human relations and extra-curricular activities (Government Gazette 1999: 62).

Staff appraisal ensures that every member of staff is seen as fulfilling his or her job requirements. Educators would also actually improve their performance, thereby contributing to the raising of educational standards. For educators to perform effectively, they must be well motivated and have a sound understanding of what is expected of them. Educators should have a sense of ownership and possess the abilities and skills to fulfil the responsibilities they are charged with (Kydd, Crawford & Riches 1997: 148). Appraisal may also be used to give managers and educators information on their strengths and weaknesses.

The main question in the current study is to determine how DAS is implemented and perceived by the managers and educators in Tembisa primary schools.

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The researcher as an educator himself has observed that the Developmental Appraisal System was not effectively implemented in Tembisa schools since educators were experiencing problems relating to untrained appraisal panels and were not sure of what was expected of them during the appraisal process. It seems that there was no appraisal policy for the implementation of DAS in these schools and management plans were not properly followed by School
The Development Team (SDT) and educators. The researcher has observed that in some cases the appraisal panel members did not honour their appointments and time allocation was very limited for many aspects that were to be evaluated in the classroom.

The SDT members had been democratically elected by educators in an open staff meeting. The SDT was expected to draw the management plans for the appraisal system activities, such as class visits, appointments with educators that were due to be appraised and kept the records of the educators who had already been appraised. Although the SDT was supposed to assist with the implementation of DAS, it encountered endless problems that made its work very difficult. Currently the SDTs are not functional in schools. Although SDT members have attended workshops, they did not understand the roles that they were supposed to play in the implementation of the appraisal system. Educators also contributed towards the non-functioning of the SDTs, as they had a negative attitude towards the appraisal system.

The appraisees requested their personal friends to form part of the appraisal panel. In some instances the personal friends did not have the expertise in certain learning areas. They then scored appraisees positively irrespective of the situations. For this reason the appraisees were not fairly evaluated.

The school principals were supposed to initiate the implementation of the appraisal system; however, they did not get the full support of the educators.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Educators in Tembisa primary schools experienced problems with the implementation of appraisal system. These problems included poor planning of evaluation, appraisees not knowing exactly what was expected of them during the appraisal process and untrained appraisal panels. The School Development Team members lacked proper training in the management of the appraisal system and yet the SDTs and the principals were required to initiate, co-ordinate and monitor appraisals in terms of the management plan (Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2003: C86).
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
For this reason, the study will try to answer the following questions:

- **Major research questions**
  a) What reasons educators could have contributed towards the failure on implementation of DAS in Tembisa primary schools?
  b) Why did NDE introduce DAS in education system?
  c) How did educators perceive the implementation of DAS in Tembisa primary schools?

- **Minor research questions**
  a) In your opinion, what is appraisal?
  b) How is Staff Development Team formed in your school?
  c) What is the role played by the principal in initiating DAS in your school?
  d) What strategies (plans) are used to implement the appraisal system?
  e) What problems are experienced by educators regarding the appraisal system in your school?
  f) What should be done to eliminate problems encountered by educators in the current appraisal system?

1.4 AIMS OF THE STUDY
In the light of the problems mentioned above, the aim of the study is:

- to equip the SDTs with the skills and knowledge of appraisal.
- to change the educators’ negative attitude towards appraisal.

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to determine the educators’ understanding and implementation of appraisal system in Tembisa primary schools.

- to explore attitudes of educators towards the Developmental Appraisal System,
- to provide guidelines for the implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System in primary schools,
- to assist educators to gain an understanding of the performance and Developmental Appraisal System,
- to improve the relationship between educators, management and learners,
to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management and
identify the exact causes of problems in the implementation of appraisal
and suggest solutions to solve them.

1.6 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY
There are a total number of 28 primary schools in Tembisa; however, the
researcher will conduct the study on only six of these. These schools are based
in Ekurhuleni West, District Six (D6) in Gauteng Province. The study includes
the Principals, Deputy Principals, Heads of Department (HODs) and educators
who are currently employed by the Gauteng Department of Education.

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
The significance of the study is to enable the SMTs and SDT members to
implement the appraisal system in their schools in an efficient manner in order
to improve their practice. The study also intends to provide the SMTs and SDT
members with appropriate strategies for the implementation of the appraisal
system. Hence, the study will be beneficial to Tembisa primary schools.

1.8 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS
Appraisal
The South African National Department of Education has introduced DAS to
develop educators to perform their duties in a competent way. This is in line
with Kydd et al. (1997: 6) when they maintain that appraisal is a means of
promoting staff development and professional expertise and offering some kind
of judgement about the quality of performance.

Appraisal emphasizes the forming of qualitative judgements about activity, a
person or an organization (Wragg et al. 1996: 3). Appraisal implies making
judgements and decisions on the quality and effectiveness of programme,
action, set of actions (Government Gazette 1999: 58). Appraisal may also be
defined as the manner in which an individual is evaluated or judged by others
(appraisers). Appraisal is defined by Baird in Gerber et al. (1999: 169) as the
process of identifying, measuring and developing human performance.
Appraisal may be defined as a formal and systematic process by means of which the job-relevant strengths and weaknesses of employees are identified, observed, measured, recorded and developed (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk & Schenk 2000: 406). The components of this definition are explained further as follows:

- Identification refers to the determination of the performance dimensions to be examined;
- Observation indicates that all appraisal aspects should be observed sufficiently for accurate and fair judgement to be made;
- Measurement refers to the appraiser's translation of the observations into value judgements about the rate's performance;
- Recording concerns the documentation of the performance appraisal process outcomes; and
- The development components indicate that appraisal is not simply an assessment of the past but it should also focus on the future and on the improvement of individual performance.

**Appraisal Instruments**

Appraisal instruments mean the basic procedures, methods and criteria through which the appraisal of a person will take place (Government Gazette 1999: 58).

**Appraisee**

Appraisee refers to the educator who will be appraised for professional development (Government Gazette 1999: 58). Wragg, Wikeley, Wragg and Hayes (1996: 4) maintain that an appraisee is the teacher being appraised.

**Appraiser**

Appraiser refers to the educator who is responsible for conducting the appraisal process of an appraisee (Government Gazette 1999: 58). According to Trethowan (1991: 45), an appraiser is a person who is responsible for the performance of the people he or she manages, agrees with them on what is important, encourages and supports them. He further says that the principal as
the main appraiser should be able to provide resources, facilitate the work, develop and appraise the educators.

**Educator**

Educator means any person who teaches, educates and trains other persons or who provides professional educational services, including professional therapy and educational psychological services at any public school, further education and training institution, departmental office or adult education centre and who is appointed in a post on any educator establishment under this Act (Government Gazette 1998: 4).

**School**

According to the South African Schools Act (SASA) (1996: 4), school means a public school or independent school, which enrols learners in one or more grades between Grade 0 and Grade 12. School may also refer to a place where pupils or learners are taught by responsible adults.

**Development**

Development teaches employees new knowledge, skills and abilities, ensuring their continued usefulness to the organization and meeting their personal desires for advancement (Werther & Davis 1996: 11). According to the Oxford Dictionary (1995), development is the action or process of developing (growing) or being developed.

**Staff development**

A staff development programme is a planned process of development which enhances the quality of pupil learning by identifying, clarifying and meeting the individual needs of the teaching staff within the context of the school as a whole (Bell & Day 1991: 164).

**Developmental Appraisal System**

This is a process that allows educators to gain further knowledge, skills and attitudes. This is an ongoing process that ensures growth and development in line with changes. The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) is an instrument that has been introduced to evaluate the effectiveness of educators.
in their teaching. This instrument is used both in ways to develop an educator in the areas in which he/she is lacking as well as to check the quality of the work that the educator is delivering to the learners. It is very important that a class visit or class observation should be conducted by the appraisal panel, so that they are able to score the appraisee.

**Curriculum**

A curriculum is everything planned by educators which will help develop the learner; this way may include extramural sporting activities, a debate or even a visit to the library (Department of Education 1997: 10). Carl (1995: 32) argues that curriculum is a broad concept which includes all planned activities and thus also subject courses which take place during the normal school day. He further mentions that curriculum includes after-school activities such as sports and societies. Curriculum 2005 (C2005) refers to the new curriculum introduced in post-apartheid South African schools.

**School Development Teams**

School Development Teams are been elected by educators to co-ordinate the activities of DAS in schools (Government Gazette 1999: 54).

**Appraisal panel**

It is a team of people that has been appointed by the appraisee (educator) for the purpose of evaluating the appraisee (Government Gazette 1999: 59).

**1.9 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of the study is to determine the impact of DAS designed by NDE on the way educators perform their duties and find out the causes of the problems in the implementation of DAS in Tembisa primary schools.

**1.10 THE STUDY OVERVIEW**

In Chapter One a background to the research study on the performance appraisal system is made. The problem statement, research questions, aims of the study, objectives of the study, delimitation of the study, significance of the
study, clarification of concepts, purpose of the study as well as the study overview are presented in this chapter.

Chapter Two reviews the literature relevant to the topic and the impact of educators on the appraisal system in Tembisa primary schools.

In Chapter Three the research methodology will be discussed. The research paradigm, research design, data collection, procedures, techniques, data analysis, validity and reliability as well as the sample will be described in detail. In data collection, procedures and techniques, the researcher used different instruments to gather the information.

In Chapter Four the results are tabulated, analysed and interpreted to determine whether the Developmental Appraisal System was properly implemented in Tembisa primary schools or not.

Chapter Five provided the discussions of the findings, recommendations and conclusions of the study. The raw data collected from Chapter Four was analyzed to draw recommendations and conclusions for the research.

1.11 SUMMARY
The aim of Chapter One was to present the general orientation of the study, which includes the background, research questions, delimitation, the significance and clarification of concepts as well as the purpose of the study.

The next chapter conducts a detailed literature review.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. INTRODUCTION

Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh (1990: 67) contend that a literature review helps the researcher to glean the ideas of the writers who had reported on the particular research in question. McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 612) argue that a literature review is a compressed critique of the status of knowledge on a carefully defined educational topic; a selection of a study or proposal that provided the rationale for a research problem. A literature review is the systematic identification, location and analysis of documents containing information related to a research problem (Fraenkel & Wallen 1993: 552). A literature review is the study of information and documents that are related to the topic of interest to the researcher.

The aim of this chapter therefore is to provide a theoretical framework within which the questions of this study can be answered. In this study the developmental and performance appraisal system with emphasis on effective implementation are briefly described. Furthermore, the chapter examines the views of different authors on the developmental and performance appraisal systems in the organisations (schools). The focus therefore will be on educators' attitude towards the developmental appraisal systems, the school environment, the appraisal system, developmental appraisal process, the main approaches to appraisal, major methods of appraisal, guiding principles of the developmental appraisal system; compilation of the Staff Development Team (STD) as well as the problems with appraisals.

2.1 EDUCATOR'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Very often educators see the phenomenon of appraisal system as negative and judgmental as they are evaluated on the work that they have done. This view is supported by Everand and Morris (1990: 90), who argue that appraisal is seen as a process of judging an individual rather than providing a means to future
improvement. The negative attitude that educators have towards the appraisal system hinders the quality of education in the schools. Mdlalose (2001: 15) states that the quality of education will, however, not be enhanced if educators have a negative attitude towards developmental appraisal. He further maintains that some educators have negative or indifferent attitudes towards developmental appraisal and are therefore less likely to benefit from it. These negative attitudes of educators delay the possible successful implementation of the appraisal system in schools.

The appraisal panel should be composed of the appraisers who are almost on the same post level as the appraisee. This will enhance the appraisee’s confidence, high self-esteem and motivation. In some instances educators are unable to accept the challenge of appraisal as they are appraised by senior managers only; as such, appraisal installs a form of hierarchy in schools. The unions as workers’ representatives reject the implementation of the appraisal system as they feel that it supports this hierarchy. Wragg et al. (1996: 65) argue that a more senior manager (Principal or District Official) should not appraise junior educators as this situation may cause frustration to educators.

From informal discussions between the researcher and educators on the appraisal system, it emerged clearly that the implementation of the appraisal system is a problem in many schools. The problems experienced by educators include poor planning of evaluation processes; appraisees not knowing exactly what is expected or needed during appraisal and untrained appraisers. These problems experienced by educators were caused by an inadequate implementation of the appraisal system. The inadequate training of appraisers also causes serious misunderstanding between School Developmental Team members and educators.

The University of Witwatersrand Education Policy Unit was requested by the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) in 1996 to come up with new ways in which educators can be appraised at all levels in the education system; this includes office-based educators in the Districts. From the results of the Education Policy Unit (EPU) research, a manual for developmental appraisal
was compiled by the ELRC. This manual presented a modern and democratic document consistent with the needs of a new education and political system (Molapo 2002: 1).

The National Department of Education (NDE) in consultation with various stakeholders reached an agreement about the implementation of the appraisal system. On the 28 July 1998 a final agreement was reached in the ELRC on the implementation of the new developmental appraisal system. This agreement is reflected in Resolution Number 4 of 1998.

Some of the agreements within ELRC are:

• that the overall nature of the appraisal system that was piloted be maintained. This entails the "guiding principles", the nature of the appraisal process and the use of "appraisal panels";
• that the "instrument" to be implemented is one that is "developmental" in nature only and will be conducted at all levels of personnel within education, in- and outside the schools;
• that the appraisal will be tied to the nature of job descriptions of the specific level of post to which a person may be attached.

According to the ELRC resolutions, the new developmental appraisal system could have been implemented in schools in 1999, with all structural and other arrangements being put in place within 1998. The effectiveness of the system was monitored and evaluated in 2000.

Due to the problems of mistrust, and lack of training of appraisers, the appraisal was not properly implemented in schools. Therefore the NDE was unable to enforce the implementation of the appraisal system is schools. When the DAS was introduced, many educators saw it as an instrument to be used to eliminate educators who are not performing their work well. For this reason the DAS did not attract the interest of educators.
2.2 THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT
The appraisal system is adversely affected by the environment in which learners and educators find themselves. Learners and educators usually find themselves in an environment that is not conductive to good work. Educators who are working in an unfavourable environment have problems with the implementation of the appraisal system. The NDE has set the same criteria to evaluate educators’ performances irrespective of the environment in which they find themselves. However, there are various internal and external factors that may affect the educators’ performance and these factors may lead to poor or good performance on the part of educators.

2.3 THE APPRAISAL SYSTEM
The purpose of the appraisal is to develop teachers professionally and the development process should be characterized by negotiations as well as agreements about the priorities and targets. The appraisal system is the manner in which the employees are developed and evaluated in accordance with the work description they are performing. During the appraisal the employees are able to judge their strengths and weaknesses in the jobs that they are doing.

Poster and Poster (1993: 1) argue that appraisal is a means of promoting, through the use of certain techniques and procedures, the organization’s ability to accomplish its mission of maintaining or improving what it provides while at the same time seeking to maintain or enhance staff satisfaction and development. The authors further said that a well-run appraisal system would benefit individual members of staff and organisations by:

- Encouraging self-development and personal initiative.
- Giving them a greater sense of purpose through the provision of clear objectives.
- Enhancing the communication of organizational aims to all staff and facilitating the co-ordination of efforts.
- Encouraging better communication, both vertically and laterally, and creating a more open style of management.
• Giving managers greater control through the setting of objectives within the organisational objectives.
• Providing a mechanism whereby individual effort may be recognised when no financial reward can be given.

Appraisal is a tool that is used to evaluate the work, and develop and motivate the employees (Anthony, Perrewe & Kacmar 1996: 343). The authors argued that appraisal can be thought of as a means to verify that individuals are meeting the performance standards that have been set. French (1994: 331) and Byars and Rue (1997: 284) concur that appraisal is the formal systematic assessment of how well employees are performing their jobs in relation to established standards and the communication of that assessment to employees.

Appraisal should involve examining a professional’s performance by another professional, assessing that performance, appreciating achievements, valuing the contribution of both appraiser and appraisee, identifying areas of improvement, assessing potential and contributing to the appraisee’s personal and professional growth (Smith 1995: 157).

In the industrial world, appraisal is used to take decisions in organisations in terms of promoting, firing, laying off and merit salary increases, while in the education situation appraisal is intended for the development of educators in order that they perform their work better. There is no attachment of any salary increases, promotions, dismissals or layoff. From both the industrial and educational point of view, appraisal assists in determining the needs for the development of staff and encourages performance improvement. It is also regarded as a means of communication to employees as to how they are doing and suggesting needed changes in behaviour, attitudes, skills and coaching in order for employees to improve their performance and development for future potential.

The major purpose of appraisal is to develop the employee to perform effectively in his or her job. According to Rebore (2001: 193), there are
universal reasons for appraisal as they are applicable to all school districts and all positions:

- Appraisal fosters the self-development of each employee.
- Appraisal helps to identify a variety of tasks that an employee is capable of performing.
- Appraisal helps to identify staff development needs and to improve performance.
- Appraisal helps to determine if an employee should be retained in the school district and how large a salary increase he or she should be given (the latter part is currently discussed between South African National Department of Education and educators’ unions).
- Appraisal helps to determine the placement, transfer or promotion of an employee.

Hancock and Settle (1990: 7) postulate that there are three key reasons for an appraisal system:

- It is a means of letting you know how you are doing, indicating to you the changes needed in behaviour, attitudes, skills and knowledge.
- It provides you with an accurate base on which to build coaching, counselling or self-improvement schemes.
- It ensures that objective judgements are made about you on which salary increases, promotions, transfers or job changes can be based.

Cascio (1995: 303) contends that appraisals serve the following purposes:

- Appraisals provide legal and formal organisational justification for employment decisions, for the promotion of outstanding performers, for the weeding out of marginal or low performers; and for the training, transferring or disciplining of others and the justification of merit increases or no increases in salary.
- Appraisals are used as criteria in test validation (that is, test results are correlated with appraisal results to evaluate the hypothesis that test scores predict job performance).
• Appraisals provide feedback to employees and thereby serve as a vehicle for personal and career development.
• Appraisals can help establish objectives for training programmes.
• Appraisals can help to diagnose the organisational problems (by identifying training needs and the knowledge, abilities, skills and to distinguish between effective and ineffective performers).

Bayn-Jardine and Holly (1994: 37) hold the view that appraisal schemes are designed to:
• Help teachers to identify ways of enhancing their professional skills and performance.
• Assist in planning the in-service training and professional development of teachers individually and collectively.
• Help individual teachers, head teachers, governing bodies and local education authorities to see where a new or modified assignment would help the professional development of individual teachers and improve their career prospects.
• Identify the potential of teachers for career development, with the aim of helping them, where possible, through appropriate in-service training.
• Provide help to teachers having difficulties with their performance, through appropriate guidance, counselling and training.
• Inform those responsible for providing references for teachers in relation to appointments.
• Enhance the overall management of the school.

According to Turner and Clift (1988: 9), the purpose of teacher appraisal are:
• To help teachers to improve their teaching performance.
• To decide on renewed appointment of probationary teachers.
• To recommend probationary teachers for tenure or continuing contract status.
• To recommend dismissal of unsatisfactory tenured or continuing contract teachers.
The Gauteng Department of Education (2003), after consultation with all concerned stakeholders, argued that development appraisal systems have focused on the following purposes:

- To ensure personal and professional development.
- To ensure that individual performance is improved.
- To help build the capacity of institution or office.
- To put in place lifelong learning and development to ensure quality assurance.

The above authors share the view that the appraisal system should be implemented in different working situations in order to develop the employees for effective performance.

Since South Africa is a developing country, the National Department of Education proposed that all educators should be appraised and be paid according to their performance (Sunday Times, 20 April 2003: 4). The DAS was introduced to put the process of appraisal into action. The introduction of performance-related pay is likely to cause a serious setback to educators. Currently, educators are given an annual salary increase across the board, irrespective of whether they are performing exceptionally or only partly satisfactorily.

The ELRC maintains that the DAS is a very important aspect of educator development and support. It outlines processes and structures to be in place in order to identify the professional needs of educators to develop relevant programmes that will enhance professional competence and growth to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

**BENEFITS OF APPRAISAL**

According to Smith (1995: 159) the benefits of appraisal for the school and for the educator are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The benefits of appraisal for the school:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The aim of the schools and individuals can be better co-ordinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many of the school's priorities will be clarified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff responsibilities will be made more specific.
There will be a greater exchange of ideas.
Communication will be improved.
It will be easier to meet school needs through targeting certain areas.
Individuals and teams should belong to a more supportive environment.

The benefits of appraisal for the individual teacher:

Greater job satisfaction.
Improved feedback and recognition.
A more regular review of INSET needs.
A better awareness of career development and possible routes to follow.
More support in school.
A better understanding of the job being done.

Figure 2.1: The benefits of an appraisal system

2.4 DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL PROCESS
For the appraisal to be successful there are various stages or steps that should be followed before it takes place. Smith (1995: 157) states that in order to achieve the objectives, the process of appraisal has to follow a pattern which includes: an initial interview to discuss and agree on the areas to be appraised; classroom observation or observation of specific areas of the job being done; an appraisal interview, a written appraisal document followed by a meeting to agree the appraisal document; and evaluation and review during the next year. Van Deventer and Kruger (2003: 214) explain that, during the pre-appraisal stage, the appraisal panel should be set and the roles of members of the appraisal panel clarified, and the appraisee must fill in the form as stipulated by Chapter C of the Personnel Administrative Measures (Government Gazette 1999:85) (See Appendix A).

Jones (1993: 15) contends that the development of the school's own concept of appraisal is a vital pre-requisite to the school's growth and development. In this regard educators will know exactly what is expected of them.
APPRAISAL PROCESS
Smith (1995: 165) suggests that the appraisal process should be as follows:

1. INITIAL MEETING
2. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
3. APPRAISAL INTERVIEWS
4. RECORD OF APPRAISAL
5. APPRAISAL FOLLOW-UP REVIEWS

Figure 2.2: Schematic representation on the process of appraisal

- The initial meeting
This initial meeting is between the appraisee and the appraisers. Both the appraisee and the appraisers must have a common understanding on the aspects that need to be evaluated. According to Smith (1995: 165), the initial meeting has the following purposes:
• Clarifying and confirming the purposes and context of the appraisal.
• Considering the teacher’s job description and agreeing to its meaning and what emphasis should be attached to its various sections.
• Reaching agreement about the scope and identifying which areas of the job it is appropriate to focus on.
• Agreeing the arrangements for classroom observation, including where it will be, when it will take place and what areas of teaching style and classroom management the observation will focus on.
• Agreeing on the method of collecting data for the appraisal other than by classroom observation – that is, data for pastoral care, working with a team and other activities.
• Agreeing on the timing of the appraisal in terms of dates and times for all the different sections.

The initial meeting creates a positive relationship between the appraisee and the appraisers. The appraisee is able to prepare the necessary documentation and the venue in which the appraisal will take place.

➢ The classroom observation
The educators need to be observed in the classroom doing what they are paid to do and what they spend most of their time doing (Smith 1995: 165). The appraisers may use a checklist when doing the classroom observation. The checklist could include the following aspects:
• Are the books and artefacts displayed so that pupils find them stimulating and exciting?
• Is the classroom managed in such a way that pupils are encouraged to find and use appropriate resources without using up valuable teaching time?
• Is there evidence of appropriate teaching styles for different curriculum purposes, for example, groups, individuals and the whole class?
• Are there opportunities for pupils to discuss their work with the teacher and other pupils?
• Are the questions asked and the problems set open-ended when appropriate?
- Are there opportunities for responses other than writing?
- Is continuity achieved between different activities?
- Does the teacher's personal style — that is, body language, frequency of shouting and position in the room — influence the ethos of the classroom?
- Is the teacher able to tell what the children are doing, what they are learning and of what use that learning is?
- Is the teacher able to tell what he or she is aiming for in his or her teaching, what he or she is learning from it and how this experience will be used in future practice?

When using an observation schedule, it is imperative that the appraisee and the appraisers agree on what is going to be observed. It is very important for the educators to recognise that classroom observation is about being constructive and has to involve sharing information so that the appraisee is helped within the context of the school’s development programme (Smith 1995: 167).

➢ The appraisal interviews
The appraisal interview brings together the previous steps (choice of appraiser, initial meeting, and classroom observation) against the background of trust, mutual respect and agreed purpose. During this period the appraisee and the appraisers are able to exchange ideas and set the goals for the next appraisal.

➢ Record of appraisal
The written appraisal record is proof that an individual have been evaluated during a certain period. Both the appraisee and the appraisers have to agree that what is written is a true record of the appraisal and sign the document (Smith 1995: 169). The appraisal record is confidential; the people who have access are the principal of that institution, the district official, the appraisal panel and the appraisee. The GDE has a specific form that needs to be completed by the appraisee and it is subdivided into various sections for different information. This form includes personal details, professional growth plan and discussion paper (See Appendix A and Figure 2.6).
Appraisal follow-up reviews
The appraisers should meet the appraisee and give feedback about the appraisal. As the teacher appraisal works in a two-year cycle, it is appropriate to hold some kind of review at the end of the first year. The appraisee and the appraisers are able to review the objectives and set up new targets for the following year. The educators are able to prepare the work that is required for the next appraisal. The reviews lead to the development that is needed by the appraisee in the next appraisal.

Educators should prepare the portfolios of their learners, the records of ongoing professional development, learning experiences and achievements. According to Bayne-Jardine and Holly (1994: 41), the development of a successful appraisal scheme at schools requires a clear and co-ordinated strategy. They further identified six steps that should be followed in order to have a successful appraisal system.

FIRST STEP: DEVELOPING A CONCEPT OF APPRAISAL
In this step educators should understand the concept before it is implemented. In this regard it is the responsibility of the National Department of Education and its different districts to workshop or to educate teachers about the appraisal system. Bayne-Jardine and Holly (1994: 42) point out that prior to the articulation of a concept of appraisal both the school and the Department of Education will need to debate a number of issues, such as:

- the extent to which staff are aware of the background to appraisal particularly in relation to the demands for greater public scrutiny;
- the range and nature of appraisal;
- the rationale for the purpose of appraisal;
- the benefits and limitations of appraisal.

SECOND STEP: DEVELOPING A FRAMEWORK FOR APPRAISAL
The successful implementation of an appraisal strategy requires the commitment of those whom the scheme has been designed. This can only happen if staff clearly understands the structure of the appraisal arrangements.
and the way in which it impinges upon their contribution to the school. Issues which need to be addressed as the appraisal framework is developed include:

- generating ground rules based on the school’s concept of appraisal – staff must at the outset clearly understand the principles upon which the appraisal programme is to be based. The procedures to be followed, the training requirements and methods of gathering data and reporting should also be made explicit;
- contemplating the organisational issues and outlining strategies for dealing with them – organisations will need to consider what modifications need to be made to its organisation in order to facilitate the introduction of the appraisal arrangements;
- making decisions in relation to the precise format of the scheme – questions posed by staff will require considered responses;
- selecting areas to be appraised – staff with a range of management duties;
- deciding upon the most effective and efficient methods for the collection of relevant data; and
- deciding upon the format of the appraisal interview.

**THIRD STEP: IMPLEMENTING THE APPRAISAL PROGRAMME**

Putting the appraisal scheme into action is an aspect of the general management of any developing organisation, and as such it must be perceived as an integral part of existing management practice. Key considerations for management are:

- the creation of a conductive climate for appraisal;
- the selection of appraisers;
- the development of a timetable;
- the formulation of job descriptions;
- the training of appraisers and appraisees; and
- supporting the process over time.
FOURTH STEP: COLLECTING DATA
This stage of the process is based upon the principle that appraisal linked to professional development relies on the gathering of relevant data from a range of appropriate sources. The selection of appropriate area for data collection includes:

- curriculum review;
- classroom practice;
- pupil outcomes;
- wider school responsibilities; and
- career aspirations.

FIFTH STEP: THE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW
The appraisal interview or discussion provides a formal opportunity for the appraisee to discuss his or her performance with an appraiser. The interview should focus on the central issues embodied in the process of teaching young people, as well as those items which may be of a more personal interest or concern. The appraisal discussion is a two-way process which is primarily aimed at providing opportunities for:

- discussing performance in key areas;
- discussing career aspirations;
- setting professional development targets; and
- re-negotiating job roles within the school.

The emphasis is heavily upon the professional development of the individual and subsequently the growth of the school in which he or she works.

THE FINAL STEP IS THE POST-INTERVIEW FOLLOW-UP
For the appraisal process to enjoy any degree of credibility it will need to focus upon both the performance and professional development of teachers. It is evident that when recommendations for action have been made during the interview, a follow-up procedure is called for. It is important that the appraisee is given feedback immediately.
THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL PROCESS

According to Gauteng Department of Education (2003) the developmental appraisal process should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Process Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>STAFF MEETING</strong>&lt;br&gt;Discuss Process&lt;br&gt;* Clarify DAS Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>ELECTION OF SDT:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Head of institution calls a meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Constitute Appraisal Panel:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Choose a peer, union representative, a senior and an outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>PANEL MEETING:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Clarify roles of members&lt;br&gt;* Arrange visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>APPRAISAL AND NEEDS ASSESSMENTS:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Self-appraisal and panel appraisal A/B indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>DISCUSS AND PRIORITIZE GROWTH PLAN:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Take ownership of own development&lt;br&gt;* Prioritize development needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENT GROWTH PLAN:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Self-help and from others for growth&lt;br&gt;* Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>REVIEW DEVELOPMENT PROCESS:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Note achievements, made recommendations&lt;br&gt;* SDT compiles final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>ANNUAL CYCLE:</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Continues from Step 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3: The developmental appraisal process. Source: Gauteng Department of Education (2003).

2.5 THE MAIN APPROACHES TO APPRAISAL

Appraisal methods are aimed at improving the whole managerial process, as well as the performance of each individual (Meiden 1981: 23).
Hancock and Settle (1990: 15) suggest that four main approaches should be used in the appraisal of educators, namely: comparative procedures, absolute standards, management by objectives and performance indicators.

| Comparative procedures | This approach would compare teacher with teacher against a range of given criteria. The criteria are selected by the management and, in the main, are dimensions which are perceived to be of value to the school as a whole. De Cenzo and Robbins (1996: 333) concurred with Werther and Davis (1996: 358) that different methods should be implemented to compare one person’s performance with that of co-workers. Managers are simply compared with one another on any characteristics or activity that is of interest to the appraiser (Meidan 1981: 24). |
| Absolute standards | In this approach the teachers are evaluated against a set of written standards. The management sets the criteria that they want to evaluate. Individual performance is compared against some set of absolute standards (Meidan 1981: 26). Meidan further points out that this method makes it possible to evaluate managers on several performance criteria, rather than one characteristic. The employee’s performance is measured against some established standards (De Cenzo & Robbins, 1996: 328). |
| Management by objectives | In this approach the teacher of the management clearly sets the objectives to be achieved by the individual teacher, who is evaluated only in terms of the progress made towards these specifically agreed targets. According to De Cenzo and Robbins (1996: 334), “employees (educators) are evaluated by how well they accomplish a specific set of objectives that have been determined to be critical in the successful
completion of their jobs”. The heart of the management-by-objectives approach consists of goals that are objectively measurable and mutually agreed on by the employee (educator) and the manager (principal) (Werther & Davis 1996: 263).

| Performance indicators | These occur when targets are laid down for organisational success and judgments are made purely on the quality of the outcomes. According to Meidan (1981: 28), managers are evaluated solely by the results they have achieved. |

2.6 MAJOR METHODS OF APPRAISAL

It is generally conceded that appraisal by the immediate supervisor is necessary and is the most effective method. In the school situation, supervisor means the Head of the Department (HOD) who is responsible for supervising the post level one educators. In this chapter the term supervisor and HOD are used interchangeably throughout. The major appraisal methods that have been identified are supervisor’s (HODs) appraisal, self-appraisal, external appraisal, group appraisal and peer appraisal. Each of these appraisal methods will be briefly described.

2.6.1 Supervisor (HOD) appraisals

The supervisor works closely with the appraisee; therefore they have a mutual relationship with one another. The supervisor has the formal authority to conduct appraisals and controls the rewards for the performance (French 1994: 337). French explains that the supervisor is typically in the best position to observe the subordinate’s performance and to judge how well that performance serves the goals of the unit (department) and the organisation. The supervisor is in the best position to observe the employee’s behaviour and determine whether the employee has reached the specific goals and the objectives (Dessler 1997: 365; Carrell, Elbert, Hatfield, Grobler, Marx & Van der Schyf 2000: 283).
These authors are in an agreement that the supervisor should form part of the appraisal panel during the evaluation of the employees.

2.6.2 Self-appraisal
The authors say that self-appraisal appears to be good in terms of self-development and the encouragement of personal growth. McKenna and Beech (2002: 177) state that self-appraisal is used as a means of empowering workers, enhancing teamwork and raising awareness of quality.

Self-evaluation is of central importance for teachers in trying to work out whether they are achieving what they intend or what they think is going well (Webb 1994: 48). Webb further states that self-evaluation assists teachers to focus on the areas that need change. Smith (1995: 162) argues that, in the case of an appraisal of a teacher who is effective in recognizing his or her strengths and weaknesses and hopefully changing those weaknesses into strengths, such a teacher often has several well-developed characteristics. He further states that educators should have the ability to continuously monitor, evaluate and revise their own practice; approach their job with an open mind; base their judgment as teachers on insights gained from many educational disciplines; and enhance the fulfilment they get from their job by collaboration and dialogue with colleagues. The views of the above authors are supported by the National Department of Education (Government Gazette 1998: 53), which stated that self-appraisal occurs when an educator undertakes self-analysis and introspection in terms of his/her own performance, client questionnaire results as well as institutional development plans. Most effective teachers have learned from their successes and failures and are capable of identifying their strengths as well as weaknesses.

2.6.3 External appraisal
This type of appraisal is performed by people from outside; this could include district officials, principals from other schools or non-governmental organisations (NGOs).
External appraisal can particularly support the teacher by assisting in the setting of objectives and in providing responsibility for the individual to develop.

2.6.4 Group appraisal
In group appraisal the assumption is that the appraisal or assessment is done by a “team” which is involved with the individual teacher concerned. Group appraisal is the multiple-rater approach in which a team appraises the performance of individual team members (Carrell et al. 2000: 291; French 1994: 339 & Dessler 1997: 366). The multiple-rater approach has the following advantages: it improves the coaching roles for the supervisor; it exposes some of the rater’s errors; it ensures procedural fairness; it standardizes the assessment method and it increases employees’ involvement in their performance and job.

2.6.5 Peer appraisal
This takes the form of the involvement of a colleague in assisting the appraisee to review his/her performance with a view to prioritizing professional development needs (Government Gazette 1999: 53). The peer evaluations are conducted by employees’ co-workers – people explicitly familiar with the behaviours involved in jobs mainly because they, too, are doing the same thing (De Crenzo & Robbins 1996: 340). The observation of an educator in practice is the process through which a colleague on the appraisal panel will visit the workstation of the appraisee occasionally for the sole purpose of observing methods used by the educators and to provide the necessary support (Government Gazette 1999: 59). The appraisee is able to choose the people that he or she trusts and has confidence in.

2.7 GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM
The following guidelines must be taken into account when exercising the developmental appraisal system (Van Deventer & Kruger 2003: 211):
• The process of appraisal should be open, transparent and developmental.
The appraisal of educators is in essence a developmental process, which depends upon continuous support. It is designed and intended to entrench strengths, develop potential and overcome weaknesses.

The process of appraisal should always involve relevant academic and management staff.

The appraisal should include stakeholders, and those involved should be trained to conduct the process of appraisal.

Educators should be informed of all aspects of the appraisal process, so that they can take the initiative to conduct the process of appraisal.

Prompt feedback by way of discussions and written communication to those who are being appraised should be one of the indispensable elements of appraisal.

The appraisee has the right to have access to and respond to the appraisal report.

The instrument used in the appraisal should include appropriate criteria to appraise the nature and level of the work performed.

According to Bayne-Jardine and Holly (1994: 41), the guiding principles should include the following:

- The process should start with self-appraisal, there should be a high degree of appraisee participation, and problems inhibiting performance should be discussed.

- The appraisal discussion should concentrate on performance in defined areas and not on personality.

- There should be open, frank and immediate feedback to the appraisee.

- There should be mutually agreed targets for the forthcoming year followed by a review discussion.

- Formal appraisal should be an ongoing process.

2.8 COMPILATION OF THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Each school must formulate a committee that facilitates the appraisal system. The committee is called the Staff Development Team (SDT). The Staff Development Team is a committee of educators who have been elected democratically by other educators in that particular school to initiate, co-ordinate
and monitor appraisal in terms of the management plan. The SDTs must also facilitate ongoing professional support and ensure that training in the development appraisal system occurs.

According to the Government Gazette (1999: 54) the SDTs should be constituted as follows:

- Head of an institution (principal of the school).
- Educators, who are democratically elected by other educators.
- A chairperson will be democratically elected by the SDT members in their first meeting.

Since the number of educators differs from school to school, the school with few staff members will need to have a small number of SDT members. In schools where there are large numbers of educators, there will be a need to elect more SDT members so that they can share the responsibility of appraising. The school may request the district officials to give guidance in the formation of SDT and workshop educators on the appraisal. Finally the appraisee may invite the district official to appraise him or her.

2.8.1 The Roles of SDTs

The SDTs have an important role to play in the facilitation of the appraisal system in schools. Van Deventer and Kruger (2003: 212) state that the role of the SDTs is to prepare and monitor the management plan for developmental appraisal as follows:

- Identify educators to be appraised in each phase (half of the educators are supposed to be appraised during the first semester and the other half in the second semester).
- Facilitate the establishment of appraisal panels and prepare the schedule of panel members.
- Link appraisal to the development of the whole institution.
- Liaise with the Department of Education for in-service training of educators (INSET) and education management development of high frequency needs.
- Monitor the effectiveness of the appraisal system report to the staff members and to the governing body.
• Ensure that the records are filed properly.
• The record is confidential to the head (principal) and the person appraised (Turner & Clift 1998: 25).

2.8.2 Appraisal Panel
The appraisal panel is a group of people who have been selected to evaluate the appraisee. The appraisal panel is composed of at least four people: the appraisee and three others drawn from the following groups:
• A peer nominated by the appraisee;
• A union representative;
• A senior manager (head of department; deputy principal, principal);
• Outside support – for example, subject adviser, educators from other institutions recognised for their expertise, non-governmental organisations, university/college lecturer or district official – and these supporters may be invited by the appraisee in agreement with the appraisers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPRAISEE</th>
<th>PANEL MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1 Educator</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(classroom-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal / Deputy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office-based educator</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.4 Appraisal panel. Source: ELRC (2003: C88)
The panel thus ensures that it allows for democratic participation, transparency and collaboration (Van Deventer & Kruger 2003: 213). The members of the appraisal panel have various roles that they play. They:

- Ensure that the appraisee fills in the relevant forms and these are discussed jointly in the appraisal panel meetings.
- Go through the appraisal instrument jointly and arrive at shared understandings of terms that are used within it.
- Discuss critically, openly, honestly and non-judgmentally the reports of the observation visits or other such appraisals with the appraisee in an appraisal meeting.
- Jointly arrive at final decisions about the appraisal of the particular educator and practically work out what developmental plans may be put into place to ensure the further development of the educator who has been appraised.
- Work through the discussion paper and make sure that clear recommendations for further professional development are stipulated.
- Finalise the appraisal report and make sure that all the panel members’ signatures appear on it.
- Arrange for the observation of the educator in practice and elect person/s from the panel to conduct such observations. It is recommended that at least two such visits (pre-appraisal) should be done to ensure that dates and times for observation visits have been arranged.

2.9 MANAGEMENT PLAN

A management plan is a programme that is drawn up and followed to execute the activities of the organisation. As there are many problems experienced prior to appraisal, the management plan (timetable) must be drawn up, typed, signed by the SDT chairperson and distributed to the educators. This alleviates the problems of not preparing the documents and planning the work as well as the fear that educators have of the appraisal system.
Apart from the probationers, half of the staff in the first six months and the other half in the second six months will be involved in appraisal (ELRC 2003: C88). All educators have to be trained in developmental appraisal prior to implementation in order to ensure that the spirit of appraisal is observed in practice.

**MANAGEMENT PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEKS IN CYCLE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 1</td>
<td>Head of an institution calls a staff meeting to discuss:</td>
<td>Head of an institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aims of appraisal process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time frames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rating scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To elect the SDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 2 – 3</td>
<td>• Training of staff</td>
<td>SDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 4 – 6</td>
<td>• Identification of appraisees for 1st and 2nd phases of Cycle One</td>
<td>SDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constitution of panels and election of chairpersons</td>
<td>Staff members identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appraisees complete personal details form</td>
<td>Appraisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 6 – 9</td>
<td>• Submission of educators’ portfolios to the panel</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observation of educators in practice</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 9 – 12</td>
<td>• Decide on optional and additional criteria and motivate for the</td>
<td>Appraisee, panel and SDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision on the needs identification and prioritisation form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKS IN CYCLE</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification and prioritisation form</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalise needs identification and prioritisation form</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete professional growth plan (PGP) form</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 12 – 28</td>
<td>• Appraisee implements the professional growth plan</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 28 – 32</td>
<td>• Appraisee fills in the discussion paper in preparation for the review</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Panel works through the discussion paper</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appraisal report is prepared</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5 Appraisal management plan. Source: ELRC (2003: C88)

FORMS
For the success and record-keeping of the appraisal system, the educators should fill in a form that requires various details about them (See Appendix A).

FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>COMPLETED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL DETAILS FORM</td>
<td>Record personal particulars, qualifications and teaching / management / other experience</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEDS</td>
<td>Self-appraisal</td>
<td>Appraisee, other panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITISATION FORM</td>
<td>Other panel members Appraisal panel appraisal</td>
<td>Members, Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>COMPLETED BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN (PGP) FORM</td>
<td>Shows plan for development in a cycle. Reflects objectives, activities, resources and key performance indicators. One form for each cycle. Motivation for reclassification of core criteria as optional has to be recorded</td>
<td>Finalised in panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION PAPER</td>
<td>To review success / difficulties of PGP in this cycle</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISAL REPORT</td>
<td>A signed record of the entire appraisal process for the cycle, including identified needs, strengths and development plan Self-appraisal on the needs identification and prioritisation form Peer union representative / senior appraisal needs</td>
<td>Appraisee and appraisal panel members Appraisees Second panel members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.6 Appraisal forms. Source: ELRC (2003: C88)
2.10 PROBLEMS WITH APPRAISAL

The appraisal system may cause conflict between managers and employees and lead to dysfunctional behaviours that can contribute to the total failure of the organisation. There are many problems that are encountered. Anthony et al. (1996: 374) have identified the following problems:

- A poorly defined system means that something is wrong with the design. The appraisal system must be tied directly to clearly stated organisational objectives and strategies.
- The appraisal system is doomed if it is not properly communicated to everyone involved. The appraisers and appraisees should have similar expectations as to the purpose and the importance of the appraisal system.
- Most common characteristics of inappropriate systems include measuring inappropriate types of performance; asking the wrong people to do the evaluation; conducting the performance appraisal discussions too infrequently and using a rating system that is not suited to the performance being measured.
- The appraisal system can fail if it is supported only by top management. A successful appraisal system should be accepted and supported by all who use it.
- The appraisal system is not monitored regularly, problems go undetected and the appraisal becomes meaningless.

There are also a number of difficulties mentioned by various authors. McKenna and Beech (2002: 183) argue that problems are caused by unreliable judgements because of subjectivity on the part of the appraiser. According to Fletcher and Williams (1986: 101), owing to a lack of training in how to observe subordinates' behaviour, or lack of ability to do so, the immediate supervisor may not be qualified to act as an appraiser. The writers further state that the experience of the appraiser may affect the quality of the appraisal. There is also often a lack of first-hand information required to make valid assessments. A major source of dissatisfaction among teachers is lack of systematic follow-up to appraisal throughout the year (Turner & Clift 1988: 171). Smith (1995: 158)
states that individuals do not admit to deficiencies of any significance and are nervous of an interview that is unproductive.

Webb (1994: 124) maintains that the main reasons for a person leaving an appraisal interview feeling dissatisfied are:

- Misunderstanding of the purpose of the appraisal interview by either the appraiser or appraisee.
- Inadequate preparation of the appraisee or appraiser.
- Failure of the appraiser and appraisee to develop a reasonable relationship due to such things as personal antipathy or lack of trust, respect, openness and honesty.
- Poor setting for the appraisal interview. This is supported by Gerber et al. (1999: 173), who state that a performance appraisal system that is poorly designed causes operational problems.

Some authors argue that there are important challenges that include legal constraints and rater biases.

- **Legal Constraints**

  Performance appraisals must be free of illegal discrimination (Werther & Davis 1996: 347). Werther and Davis further maintain that the form of evaluation that is used should be both reliable and valid.

  The appraisal panel may commit several kinds of errors when conducting appraisals. These errors make the appraisal process less reliable or less valid. The former means the consistency with which the appraisal panel rates the appraisee in successive ratings, whilst the later refers to the extent to which appraisal procedures measure real differences in performance. These errors include halo, central tendency, strictness or leniency and recency.
Rater Biases
Bias is the inaccurate distortion of measurement, and often occurs when raters do not remain emotionally unattached while they evaluate employee performance.

The halo effect
The halo effect occurs when the rater's personal opinion of the employee influences the measurement of performance (Werther & Davis 1996: 348). It occurs when an evaluator bases his or her appraisal on an overall impression, which may be positive or negative (Gerber, Nel & Van Dyk 1996: 215). The evaluator is sometimes influenced by a person's performance positively or negatively. The halo effect occurs when the rater allows one trait or characteristics (either positive or negative) of the employee to override a realistic appraisal of the other traits or characteristics (Anthony et al. 1996: 370; Carrell et al. 2000: 265). In the halo effect the rater may score the employee on a high rating because he or she has a good relationship with the senior manager or always arrives early at work.

The error of central tendency
Central tendency errors occur when the rater avoids the extremes of the performance scale and evaluates most employees somewhere near the middle of the scale (Anthony et al. 1996: 372; French 1994: 340). The problem of central tendency occurs when the supervisors cannot evaluate employee performance objectively because of lack of supervisory ability or fear that they will be reprimanded if they evaluate individuals too high or too strictly (Carrell et al. 2000: 266). Some raters do not like to rate employees as effective or ineffective, and so they distort ratings to make each employee appear average. Evaluators often tend to avoid high and low appraisals and to group their appraisals around the average on a scale (Gerber et al. 1999: 173). Raters have a tendency to rate all employees the same way, such as rating them all average (Dessler 1997: 360).
Strictness or Leniency

The strictness bias results from raters being too harsh in their evaluations. The leniency bias results when raters tend to be generous in evaluating the performance of employees. Gerber et al. (1999: 174) argue that the performance appraisal requires from the performance evaluator an objective decision based on performance criteria. When evaluators (appraisers) are lenient in their appraisal, an individual’s performance becomes overstated, that is, rated higher than it actually should, and a negative leniency error understates performance, giving the individual a lower appraisal rating (De Cenzo & Robbins 1996: 335). Sometimes raters consistently give low ratings even though some employees may have achieved an average or above-average performance level (Carrel et al. 2000: 266). Employees are demoralised as a result of unreasonable performance expectations.

Vroom and Searle (1990: 182) contend that there are many issues inherently wrong with most of the performance appraisal systems in use, and this creates drawbacks such as:

- Judgements on performance usually becoming subjective and impressionistic,
- Ratings by different managers, especially those in different departments, are usually incomparable. What is excellent in one department may be unacceptable in another in the same school.
- The boss’s resistance is usually attributed to the following causes:
  A normal dislike leads to criticising a subordinate (and perhaps have to argue about the criticism).
  - Lack of skills needed to handle interviews.
  - Dislike of a new procedure, with accompanying changes in way of operating.
  - Mistrust of the validity of the appraisal instrument (Vroom & Searle 1990: 156).
  - Personal prejudice.

According to Werther and Davis (1996: 349), a rater’s dislike of a group or class of people may distort the ratings those people receive. The authors argue that
when prejudice affects the ratings of protected class members, this form of discrimination can lead to equal employment violations.

- Inflationary pressures
  This error committed by evaluators involves pushing evaluation marks upwards.
- Lower appraiser motivation
  The evaluator knows that a poor appraisal could significantly affect / destroy the employee’s future in the following manner:
  - Particular opportunities for promotion or a salary increase.
  - The evaluator may be reluctant to give a realistic appraisal (De Cenzo & Robbins 1996: 336). De Cenzo and Robbins further state that it is difficult to obtain accurate appraisals when important rewards depend on the results of appraisals.
  - The recency affect.
  Ratings are affected strongly by the employee’s most recent actions that are good or bad and are more likely to be remembered by the rater. This is supported by Graham and Bennet (1998: 248) when they say that appraisers are strongly influenced by a subordinate’s (appraisee’s) recent behaviour rather than by his or her work throughout the appraisal period.

Carrell et al. (2000: 266) concur: it is natural for supervisors to remember recent events more clearly than events in the distant past. To avoid the recency error, raters should conduct frequent appraisals, for example monthly or quarterly.

There are also problems that are linked to the appraisal in educational institutions. According to Riches and Morgan (1998: 200 – 203), some of the problems are:

- Management of professionals
  Teachers are professionals and tend to be more independent. It is more difficult to manage professionals than non-professionals. The manager must strike a balance between the management functions of a school and the professional activities of the staff members.
• Results unclear
It is difficult to determine the results of an organisation (school) if there is no clarity about the goals. In schools there are many complex objectives and these are difficult to reach. It is difficult to compare schools with one another.

• Reward uncertain
In industrial and commercial organisations, financial and other benefits are generally linked to evaluation. This is not the situation in educational institutions. This makes the reward more difficult for educational staff and therefore they are not eager to participate in the evaluation process.

• Difficulty of assessing teaching
There are no agreed universal criteria for good teaching and assessment becomes more difficult because teaching is closely linked to learning. The results of effective teaching are difficult to determine and more difficult to assess.

• Too many bosses
The staff members in schools have more than one person of authority to whom they are accountable. This creates a problem for educators and it also makes the appraisal more difficult.

• Lack of time
Appraisal takes a lot of time and in education there is not enough time for the management tasks at hand. The principals must make sure that they make sufficient time available for the educators to participate in the appraisal process.

The teachers’ perceptions on the current appraisal system reflect a strong sense of distrust and anxiety (Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Magau & Vinjevold 1993: 2).
2.11 SUMMARY

The aim of this chapter was to discuss views by different authors on the process of developing appraisals, the main approaches to appraisal and major methods of appraisal. Furthermore, the guiding principles of the developmental appraisal system, composition of the staff development team as well as the problems related to appraisal were discussed. There should be adequate training for both the appraiser and the appraisee for everyone to have confidence in the system. For educators to have confidence the appraisal process needs to be seen by everyone as open and fair at all times. The main approaches to and methods of appraisal should be thoroughly conveyed to the appraisee so that he/she understands the purposes of appraisal.

In Chapter Three the Research Methodology will be explained. This is aimed at outlining the researcher’s action plan on investigating the problem already stated in Chapter One.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3. INTRODUCTION

McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 9) refer to research methods as a way in which the research collects and analyses data. Morrison in Coleman and Briggs (2002: 11) maintains that methodology provides a rationale for the ways in which a researcher conducts research activities. Research methods have been developed for acquiring knowledge from reliable sources; these methods use certain procedures to collect data during the investigation. The procedures should be planned to yield data on a particular problem.

This chapter therefore describes the methodology procedures that are used in this study as discussed above. Various techniques that included research paradigm, research design, data collection, data analyses; validity and reliability and sampling are used. These techniques are fully discussed in the following manner:

3.1 RESEARCH PARADIGM

In this study a qualitative approach was chosen instead of quantitative type since the latter is statistically oriented and the former focuses on describing and interpreting the events, behaviour as well as actions of the subjects in their natural setting.

Qualitative research is naturalistic inquiry that uses non-interfering data-collection strategies to discover the natural flow of events and processes and how participants interpret them (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 391). In qualitative research the subjects are investigated in their natural settings. The term “naturalistic setting” refers to the fact that the variables being investigated are studied where they naturally occur (Gay 1990: 209). Fraenkel and Wallen (1993: 380) concurred with Gay (1990) that the natural setting is the direct source of data. In this regard the researcher went directly to the particular setting in which he was interested in order to observe and collect the data. This
kind of qualitative research provided the much-needed freedom to listen and observe face-to-face all that the respondents stated (Madigoe 1997: 35). This also helped in putting together information during the interviews, because it was assumed that the qualitative approach is based on the belief that multiple constructions of reality exist. On this basis, a qualitative method was preferred in this research because of the researcher's desire to elicit the passionate and subjective actions, beliefs, thoughts and perceptions of respondents on the problems encountered during the implementation of DAS in their schools.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is a plan for selecting subjects, research sites and data collection procedures to answer research questions (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 162). The goal of a sound research design is to provide results that are judged to be credible. In this regard credibility refers to the extent to which the results approximate reality and are judged to be trustworthy and reasonable. The research design in the current study includes strategies of inquiry such as phenomenology and ethnomethodology, ethnography and historical method.

3.2.1 PHENOMENOLOGY AND ETHNOMETHODOLOGY

McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 101) postulate that phenomenology is an analysis of qualitative data to provide an understanding of a concept from participants' perspectives and views of social realities. Phenomenology is a philosophy of knowledge that emphasizes direct observation of phenomena (Bernard 2000: 20). Phenomenology is a theoretical point of view that advocates the study of direct experience taken at face value, and one which sees behaviour as determined by the phenomena of experience rather than by external, objective and physically described reality (Cohen et al. 2002: 23). In phenomenology, the researcher attempts to understand what the behaviour means to the subject being studied and emphasizes the subjective aspects of the behaviour (Wiersma 2000: 238). This strategy was used to enable the researcher to observe the actions and behaviour as they occurred in the environment of the participants.
Seale (1999: 32) mentions that ethnomethodology involves investigation of the methods by which participants make sense of their activities, both to themselves and to others. Ethnomethodology thus seeks to understand social accomplishments in their own terms and is concerned to understand them from within their environment (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2000: 24). According to Neuman (2000: 509), ethnomethodology is a social science that combines philosophy, social theory and method to study common sense knowledge. The researcher used this approach, as he was able to study the respondents’ social interaction that revealed the rules that they were using to construct and maintain their everyday social reality.

Symbolic interactionism is the belief that people act according to how they understand the meaning of words, things and actions in the environment (Best & Kahn 2003: 245). Cohen et al. (2000: 25) postulate that human beings act towards things on the basis of the meaning they have for them; and the attribution of meaning to objects through symbols is a continuous process. In symbolic interactionism the participants were able to account for actions, interact with others and negotiate. Since educators were from different cultural background (schools) they understood the world around them differently. The researcher used this strategy as he was directly interacting, observing and understanding social activities as well as symbols practised by the participants in their schools.

3.2.2 ETHNOGRAPHY

In ethnography research the collection data is done on many variable over an extended period of time in a naturalistic setting, usually using observation and interviews (Fraenkel & Wallen 1993: 550). McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 427) concur that ethnography is interactive research, which requires a relatively extensive time on site to systematically observe, interview and record processes as they occur naturally at the selected location. Ethnographers choose to study particular segments of social life that are naturally occurring and that seem to have clearly defined boundaries, such as activities within a school over a determined time (Scott & Usher 2000: 87). This type of research is based on documents or the portraying of the everyday experiences of
individuals by observing and interviewing them. In this study ethnographic research has been chosen over other strategies because it enable the researcher to observe, interview and record the processes as they happen in a natural setting.

Qualitative designs typically investigate behaviour as it occurs naturally in non-contrived situations and there is no manipulation of conditions or experience (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 40). This provided the researcher with in-depth understanding of the problems that educators are experiencing in different schools.

3.2.3 HISTORICAL METHOD

Gay (1992: 545) postulates that the historical research method is the systematic collection and objective evaluation of data related to past occurrences in order to test hypothesis concerning causes, effects or trends of those events and anticipate future events. Fraenkel and Wallen (1993: 433) describe historical research as the systematic collection and evaluation of data to describe, explain and thereby understand actions or events that occurred some time in the past.

Historical research is a systematic process of searching for the facts and then using the information to describe, analyse and interpret the past (Wiersma 2000: 218). Seale (1999: 72) argues that the researcher examines the past in order to interpret the present. He further mentions that the historical records, locales, objects, and people who have some knowledge of the time and place under investigation play a crucial role in the success of the study.

Using historical research, the researcher was able to ask research questions and use them as guidance to conduct the study. The researcher was in a position to use original documents, newspapers, accounts, photographs and drawings (Charles 1995: 23).

The researcher checked and analysed the records of the educators. This included documents such as learning programmes, assessment sheets, activity sheets, class registers, learners’ workbooks, test sheets, financial records, staff
minutes, departmental minutes and appraisal programmes (workshops) that are attended by the educators. The purpose of checking these documents was to make sure that educators were recording their work in the correct manner. This comparison confirms that what has been observed in the classroom reflects that the educators' work is controlled frequently by the heads of department (HODs).

The historical method was used as the researcher wished to make educators aware that they could learn from the past failures and successes when implementing the appraisal system in their schools.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION, PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES

The researcher was given permission to conduct the interviews in the chosen schools. However, the principals emphasized that interviews should be conducted after teaching and learning had been completed. They further stressed that interviews should not disturb the classes, for that reason, the appropriate time was arranged after school. This implied that the researcher was able to observe and interview the subjects in their natural settings.

Ary et al. (1990: 447) state that, in qualitative studies, the investigator is the data-gathering instrument. They further postulate that the investigator talks to people in a natural setting, observes their activities and reads their documents. The investigator then records the information in field notes and journals.

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993: 384) maintain that there are three techniques commonly used in qualitative research, namely, observation, interviews and document analysis. McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 46) point out that these techniques are used to provide descriptions. They further explain that the goal of qualitative techniques is to capture the richness and complexity of behaviour that occurs in natural settings from the participants' perspective. Instruments that were used in this study include observation, interviews and document analysis. The components are explained as follows:
3.3.1 Observation

The researcher interacted with the subjects during the interviews. The manner in which the respondents explained the meaning of DAS showed that they do not have a clear idea of the concept. From the observer's point of view, educators were not properly informed nor trained about DAS. The majority of educators expressed fears about appraisal, as it might create emnity between the SMT and the educators as well as negatively impact on their teaching. During the interviews the researcher remained a non-participating observer. There are several types of non-participant observation that researchers use but the most common is naturalistic observation (Fraenkel & Wallen 1993: 391). In this regard the researcher used naturalistic observation as the participants were observed in their natural settings. The researcher did not control or manipulate anything in the situation. The intention is to record and study the behaviour as it normally occurs (Gay 1990: 206).

3.3.2 Interviews

Cohen and Marion (1994: 271) define an interview as a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-related information. In this case the researcher interviewed members of the School Development Team (SDT) and educators to explore and attain a deeper understanding of the problems that the educators are experiencing with the implementation of the appraisal system.

Ethnographic interviews are conducted with individuals or small groups to capture participants' perspectives on their world and how they make sense of important events (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 40). Ethnographic interviews are essentially unstructured and open-ended to provide the participants with every opportunity to describe and explain what is most salient to them.

For the purpose of this study, open-ended questions were used. This type of question permits a free response from the subject from his or her own frame or reference (Ary et al. 1990: 418). The researcher applied the standard open-ended interview as the participants were asked the same questions (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 447; Fraenkel & Wallen 1993: 387). These open-ended
questions are used to guide, as well as to allow subjects to express their perceptions and feelings towards the phenomenon being investigated (see Appendix C).

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993: 385) argue that interviewing is an important way for a researcher to check the accuracy of information, to verify or refute information and the impressions he or she has gained through observation. An interview can be used as a means of evaluating or assessing a person in some respect and for gathering data (Cohen & Manion 1994: 271). During the interview the researcher was able to observe the subject in the total situation in which he or she was responding. Furthermore, the researcher was able to repeat or explain the meaning of the question if the respondents did not understand the question. The researcher used interviews in order to obtain a present perception of activities, roles, feelings, motivations, concerns and thoughts as well as to verify the extent to which the information filtered through to educators in their different schools.

During the interview sessions the researcher introduced himself and explained the purpose of the interview and asked the respondents if they had an objection to the use of the tape recorder. The interview schedule served as the guide for the researcher; however, it was not strictly adhered to since the researcher also used probing questions that were guided by the respondents’ responses. Furthermore, the researcher guided the respondents where they responded vaguely. At the end of the interview session, the researcher thanked the respondents.

3.3.2.1 Focus Group Interviews

Focus group interviews were used as the researcher was trying to obtain a better understanding of the problem that educators were encountering with the implementation of the appraisal system in their schools. The focus group was formed by the educators in different schools. Berg (1998: 100) argues that the focus group interview is an interview style designed for a small group. Wragg in Coleman and Briggs (2002: 150) mentions that focus group interviews involve several respondents and one interviewer. This strategy helps to collect correct
information as the respondents may correct each other on points of detail. Furthermore, focus group interviews allow the researcher to observe the process or interaction and to access the substantive content of verbally expressed views, opinions, experiences and attitudes. Prior to the interviews, the researcher obtained the consent of the respondents to be involved in the study that interviews would be recorded, whilst confidentiality of information was guaranteed. The interviews lasted for an hour, at the maximum. The interview session took place after the actual teaching and learning period (that is, from 14H00 to 15H00). A high-quality Dictaphone was used to record responses and capture all information emanating from the discussions; a transcript of recordings was done and prepared for analysis.

During the interviews, the researcher used probing in order to get the information that was not clearly explained. Neuman (2000: 277) state that a probe is a neutral request to clarify and ambiguous answer, to complete an incomplete answer, or to obtain in a relevant response. Throughout the interviewing, the researcher follows up on topic that have been raised by asking specific questions, encourages the informant to provide details, and constantly presses for clarification of the informant's words (Taylor & Bogdan 1998: 106; McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 452). Berg (1998: 67) concurs with the abovementioned authors that probing questions provide interviewers with a way of drawing out more complete stories from the subjects.

### 3.3.3 Document Analysis

For the purpose of this investigation, documents such as the Government Gazette, circulars, memoranda, brochures and wall-charts from the Gauteng Department of Education and the National Department of Education and Educators Labour Relation Councils were studied and analysed. None of the schools investigated had an appraisal policy; they relied on the documents that they received from the abovementioned institutions. The researcher studied the documents in order to gain information on the DAS and its implementation.
3.3.4 The interview protocol

- Appointments and dates of interviews with teachers were arranged via the school principal.
- Questions were formulated in terms of the central concern of this study, namely, the impact of the appraisal system on educators in primary schools.
- The purpose of the interview was stated before the interview session.
- Participants were assured that confidentiality and anonymity would be strictly adhered to in this study.
- Questions were repeated in case respondents did not understand them.
- Permission was obtained from the respondents to use a tape recorder.
- Verbatim transcriptions of the tape recording were used as a basis for data analysis.

3.3.5 The interview schedule

The interview schedule served as a guide to assist the researcher to cover the themes and all areas of the study. The interview schedule consisted of open-ended and probing questions. These questions allowed the respondents to express their views, feelings and opinions (see Appendix C).

The interviews were recorded with the use of a tape recorder. This was done only with the consent of the respondents. Six interviews were recorded on tape and all of them were transcribed.

The data-collection methods utilised indicate that the study was based on both interactive research and non-interactive research. The interactive research included observation and interviews, while the non-interactive research included the study of documents on the appraisal system in South African schools.
3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

Data was collected from educators in different schools. Participants were asked questions that related to the topic of the research. The participants had to state and explain their views about the appraisal system. The researcher had to comprehend the different views of the participants and categorise them according to their individual perspective.

The data collection was presented as raw data. The researcher captured the direct words of the respondents from the interviews that were conducted. Thereafter, data coding was used in order to organise, analyse and categorise the data that was collected. Coding is the process of dividing data into parts by a classification system (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 507; Cohen et al. 1995: 286; Charles 1995: 121). Wiersma (2000: 203) postulates that coding is a process of organising data and obtaining data reduction. In this qualitative research coding was used as a manner of developing and refining interpretations of the data. The coding system accurately captured the information in the data relative to what is being coded and determined what was useful in describing and understanding the phenomenon focused on. The data was categorised and organised according to the main problems and ideas that emerged during the interviews.

Qualitative data analysis is primarily an inductive process of organising the data into categories and identifying patterns (relationships) among the categories (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 501). According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993: 549), data analysis is the process of simplifying data in order to make it comprehensible. Data was collected from observation; and interviews and document analysis were compared. In this study the researcher used the inductive method, as he was in the exploratory or discovery phase. Gay (1990: 4) explained that inductive reasoning involves the formulation of generalisations based on the observation of a limited number of specific events. Neuman (2000: 511) argues that the inductive approach is an inquiry or social theory in which one begins with concrete empirical details, and then works towards abstract ideas or general principles.
Categories are an abstract way of referring to the meaning of similar topics (McMillan & Schumacher 1998: 513). According to Merriam (1998: 181), there are various steps that should be followed when the information is categorised:

- The researcher reads the first interview scripts, the first set of field notes, the first documents collected in the study.
- As the researcher is reading through the transcript, he or she makes comments, observations and queries, which must be jotted down in the margin.
- The researcher then groups the comments and notes that seemed to go together.

3.5 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

For the sake of the validity of this study, six schools were investigated in the Tembisa area. Three educators from each school were observed and interviewed. The research consisted of eighteen subjects who participated in the study.

Validity is defined as referring to the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make based on the data they collect (Fraenkel & Wallen 1993: 139). According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 404), validity is described as the degree to which the explanations of phenomena match the realities of the world. The writers further mention that the validity of qualitative designs is the degree to which the interpretations and concepts have mutual meanings between the participants and the researcher. Validity refers to the degree to which participants observation achieves what it purports to discover (Sherman & Webb 1998: 87). Seale (1999: 134) argues that validity concerns the degree to which the findings of a research study are true. Kumar (1999: 137) concurs that validity is the ability of an instrument to measure what it is designed to measure.
Strategies used to enhance validity in this study were:

- Participant observation and in-depth interviews were conducted in natural settings to reflect the reality more accurately.
- Informant interview questions were phrased according to the participant’s language proficiency and were also less abstract. In the event of a misunderstanding, the researcher took it upon himself to define the meanings of words in order to achieve mutual understanding between the researcher and participants.

The reliability of a measuring instrument is the degree of consistency with which it measures whatever it is measuring (Ary et al. 1990: 268). McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 239) mention that reliability refers to the consistency of measurement, the extent to which the results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasions of data collecting. Reliability measures consistency over time and over similar samples (Cohen et al. 2000: 117). Wiersma (2000: 8) argued that reliability refers to the consistency of the research and the extent to which studies can be replicated. Reliability refers to the extent to which research findings can be replicated and yield the same results (Merriam 1998: 205). Reliability, according to Seale (1999: 329), is the capacity of a measuring device to produce the same results if used on different occasions with the same object of study. Bush in Coleman and Briggs (2002: 60) argues that reliability is the test or procedure that produces similar results under constant conditions on all occasions. Reliability means that similar results should be obtained if the measurement or test is redone on the same samples.

The following techniques were used to confirm the findings for reliability:

- A high-quality tape recorder was used for recording the interviews;
- The interviews were transcribed;
- Analysis strategies were employed.
For data to be of value, it must be valid and reliable. Reliability focuses on replicability, while validity is concerned with the accuracy and generalisability of the findings.

3.6 THE SAMPLE
The population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group on which she or he would like the results of the study to be generalised (Gay 1990: 102; Fraenkel & Wallen 1990: 80). A population is a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects or events, that conform to specific criteria and on which the researcher intends to generalise the results of the research (McMillan & Schumacher 1997: 164; Ary et al. 1990: 169). In this study the population referred to all the educators, HODs, deputy principals and principals from twenty-eight primary schools in Tembisa. A sample is a smaller group or subset of the population from which the researcher collected information. The knowledge gained was representative of the total population under study. The group on which information is obtained is preferably selected in such a way that the sample represents the larger group (population) from which it was selected (Fraenkel & Wallen 1990: 556).

The research took place in Gauteng Province, in the East Rand township of Tembisa. The schools were within the boundaries of Ekurhuleni West in District Six (D6) of the Gauteng Department of Education. The sample was drawn from six public schools. This sample was composed of three educators from each school. The total number of respondents was eighteen. In this regard the researcher was able to study a portion of the population rather than the entire population (Ary et al. 1990: 170).

The researcher used probability sampling, because every member from the population has a chance of being selected for the sample (Wiersma 2000: 269). Gay (1992: 126) argues that probability sampling gives each member of a defined population a chance of being selected for the sample. There are types of probability sampling that are most frequently used in educational research, namely, simple random sampling, stratified sampling, cluster sampling and systematic sampling. In this study simple random sampling was preferred over
the other sampling methods as all members of the population have an equal and independent chance of being selected in the sample (Ary et al. 1990: 172; Cohen et al. 2000: 100; Best & Kahn 2003: 13). All educators have an equal chance of participating in the study.

In probability sampling the results are generalised as the sample was selected from a wider population. McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 165) mention that probability sampling is used to efficiently provide estimates of what is true for a population from a smaller group of subjects (sample).

In this study the sample was educators from primary schools in Tembisa. For the validity and reliability of the study, six out of twenty-eight primary schools in Tembisa were investigated. The study consisted of eighteen participants that were interviewed and observed. The researcher divided the schools into two regions, namely, West and East. This exercise took place at the residence of the researcher where the names of all primary schools in Tembisa were written on pieces of paper and put into two baskets. One basket had all the names of schools in the West, while the other basket contained the names of schools from the East region. The researcher pulled out the names of the schools that were studied randomly. Three schools were drawn from each basket. This exercise was done to avoid bias. The researcher did not investigate all the schools because of time constraints, financial constraints and travelling distances.

3.7 SUMMARY
In Chapter Three, a detailed description of the research paradigm, research design, data-collection procedures and techniques, data analysis, validity and reliability as well as the sample was given. Data was collected from six schools in Tembisa area; three educators from each school were observed and interviewed.
The following chapter presents the raw data that emerged from the interviews. The researcher analysed the data according to main problems and ideas that emerged from the interviews. Furthermore, the researcher interpreted the finding based on his opinions and related literature.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

4. INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this chapter is to present the research findings that were obtained from the respondents. The researcher provided the discussion from the interviews. Data consisted of verbal description rather than statistical information. The researcher attempted to provide the clearest and most complete narrative of what happened in the study. This was done in order to allow the reader to develop insights, which would not have been possible had a mere reporting of the results been undertaken.

The major problems that emerged from data were classified into categories. The categories identified were lack of staff development, the formation of the Staff Development Team (SDT), the implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System, the lack of strategies for implementation of the Developmental of Appraisal System, difficulties concerning the appraisal system and the importance of feedback from the Developmental Appraisal System (see Appendixes C1 & C2).

4.1 LACK OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Most of the respondents indicated that the development of an appraisal system is of importance to their work. However, they mentioned that no such development had taken place. They were very dissatisfied about the following aspects:

The majority of the participants indicated that they did not receive quality training on the appraisal system, and for this reason they were unable to implement the DAS at their schools. The principals and the SDTs were unable to implement the DAS also as a result of a lack of proper training and this meant that the system failed totally. Furthermore, the SDTs and principals did not have any training programmes that could have assisted educators to have confidence in them and to support the DAS.
The respondents were concerned about the limited time that was allocated to the educators on the training of the appraisal system. In addition to this problem educators were expected to travel to the neighbouring schools for training (Former Model C). Most of the respondents stated that the “workshops” that they attended were briefing sessions and were not informative.

The majority of the respondents had a common understanding that appraisal was a way of allowing an individual to perform better and set high standards at work. They indicated that they were unable to implement the theory that they acquired during the training. Most of the respondents mentioned that they were able to explain the appraisal at face value, but they had not gained a deeper understanding of it. They further expressed the view that the facilitators could not explicate the concept in greater detail.

4.2 FORMATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENTAL TEAM (SDT)

From the schools that were investigated, the majority of the respondents indicated that their SDTs were formed in accordance with the guidelines from the National Department of Education. Most respondents mentioned that their SDTs were democratically formulated and all the staff members participated in the process of electing the members of the teams. The respondents indicated that the SDTs failed to perform their duties as stipulated in the DAS document.

The National Department of Education has specific guidelines that should be followed when SDTs are formed at schools. The formation of the SDTs should include the following stakeholders: the head of an institution (principal), elected educators who were democratically elected, and a chairperson who the SDT would democratically elect at its first meeting. In this regard the principal is not necessarily the chairperson: any person may be elected. The principal as the head of an institution had the responsibility to convene a staff meeting to establish the SDT. The establishment of SDTs should be openly discussed in the staff meeting. The roles of the SDTs must be discussed in the staff meeting.
4.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

The implementation of the DAS was very difficult because many respondents indicated that they were not sure of what to do during appraisal. The respondents further mentioned that the principals, the SDTs and educators were not well prepared for the implementation of the DAS.

The majority of the respondents observed that the principals had convened the first meeting to explain the appraisal (DAS), the purpose, election of the SDT and the benefits of the DAS. Most respondents elaborated that the principals did not have much influence on the implementation of the appraisal. This proved that the principals did not have a clear understanding of appraisal because they failed to set the process in motion. The respondents gave the following reasons for the failure of the DAS:

Most respondents mentioned that educators were not properly trained on the DAS, and this contributed to the failure of the programme. They further revealed that the facilitators were not sure about their training: this was revealed when they were unable to lay down the implementation process. The participants indicated that the implementation period was incorrect, as many educators were not prepared for the programme. They stressed that educators must be well trained before the DAS could be implemented in schools. The principals and the SDTs had a problem in taking the lead in the implementation of the programme. This proved that the principals and the SDTs did not play their roles. The majority of the respondents mentioned that the DAS was not properly introduced; for this reason, educators were not motivated to implement the DAS.

The participants’ concerns were that the DAS involved a lot of work that should be prepared prior to the appraisal: this includes the learners’ assessments, extra-curricular activities, a good relationship with the rest of the colleagues and a lot of paperwork that must be completed by the appraisees.
4.4 LACK OF STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

The respondents indicated that they had used various strategies. They cited that the following as examples of the strategies:

Timetables were used as instruments that indicated the time, periods, appraisal panel, appraisee and the Learning Area that was due to be evaluated. It was initially thought that educators would be free to choose their own dates and periods. It was also expected that their work would be up to date; unfortunately, this strategy did not succeed.

Most respondents indicated that they used the timetable as a strategy to guide the educators on the specific dates of the appraisal. In some schools, educators were given the chance to choose their own dates while in other schools the SDTs drew up the roster on behalf of the staff members. However, all of these strategies failed as the appraisal system was not implemented in all the schools. This suggests that the principals, SDTs and educators did not have good strategies for the implementation of the DAS in the various schools.

4.5 DIFFICULTIES ABOUT APPRAISAL SYSTEM

The majority of the respondents revealed that there were many problems experienced with the appraisal system. The respondents mentioned the problems encountered as follows:

The majority of the respondents indicated that educators were not trained on the appraisal system; and for this reason they were unable to implement the programme. The majority of the participants remarked that favouratism (a bias towards certain educators) was a problem and this caused the appraisal system to become a total failure. It was established that some educators were favoured by both the principal and the appraisal panels; these educators were warded good marks whilst other educators were unfairly evaluated.

Most respondents indicated that most educators were suspicious that the National Department of Education was using this programme (DAS) to evaluate whether they were working or not. Most educators believed that the DAS was
focusing on rooting out the educators who were not capable of producing excellent results. For this reason educators associated the DAS with a fault-finding programme.

The majority of the participants indicated that neither the National Department of Education nor the principals motivated educators. Most participants mentioned that educators thought that this appraisal programme might assist them to get promoted or to get a salary increase, as was the case in the private sector. They further stated that the remuneration that they were earning is not enough because there was a lot of work that they were doing during tuition. Most respondents indicated that a salary increase after appraisal would be of importance.

The majority of the participants mentioned that there were many problems encountered during the implementation of the appraisal system. The participants also indicated that these problems remained unsolved as the schools and the National Department of Education did not have the goods or strategies to motivate educators during the implementation of the DAS. Most respondents stressed that the training of educators would play an important role in changing the perception of the appraisal system.

4.6 IMPORTANCE OF FEEDBACK FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

The respondents indicated that many of the appraisal problems could be eliminated if educators were informed about the aspects that the appraisers were due to appraise the appraisees on. The respondents suggested that:

The respondents indicated that the appraisers must be given feedback after they had been appraised. The HODs, deputy principals and colleagues had to check their work from time to time. Teamwork must be encouraged so that educators in the same grade can help each other to evaluate their work. Participants also mentioned that a meeting between the appraisees and the appraisers before and after the appraisal process is of importance. The
appraisee and the appraisers would then be able to discuss the areas that needed attention and improvement.

The majority of the respondents indicated that the appraisal panel must be neutral. The appraisal panel must practise fairness when appraising the appraisees, and favourtism should be stopped as this demotivates educators. Most participants stated that more workshops must be organised and educators should attend them. They further mentioned that the facilitators must be well informed about the appraisal system.

From the schools that were investigated, the majority of the respondents stressed that for the employees to perform well they must be trained, know the purpose and targets as well as have a full understanding of what they were doing. They further mentioned that educators needed workshops on the appraisal system at their schools so that the training becomes practical. The respondents argued that they needed to understand the manner in which DAS could be of benefit to the educators. They further indicated that they should be involved in the planning of the appraisal and to note the aspects in which educators needed development.

4.7 SUMMARY

In this chapter, the researcher has presented the research findings drawn from the participants. These research findings were derived from the transcripts of interviews with the participants (see Appendix C). The researcher has presented the findings in an unprocessed manner – i.e. as they emerged from the interviews. The data gathered clearly indicated that educators were not in a position to implement the DAS in their schools. Therefore, the training of educators is of paramount importance for the success of the appraisal system in schools.
In the next chapter the researcher will deal with findings, recommendations and conclusions of the study. The researcher will further analyse the research findings that emerged from Chapter Four. The analysis of the research findings will be based on the documents studied and related literature.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5. INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings, recommendations and conclusions of the study. The discussions of the findings were based on the raw data reported on in Chapter Four. From the discussions, it was clear that the implementation of the DAS in schools needs to be reviewed so that educators are able to participate in the system.

5.1 DISCUSSIONS OF THE FINDINGS
Many authors view the appraisal system as the most important instrument to measure the performance of an individual in his or her work (see 2.3). Those authors, who focused on the world of business, stressed that an appraisal system is used to determine salary increases, promotions, retention, redeployment or dismissal of the employees who are not performing according to the set performance levels as expected by the employers.

In schools that were investigated, the respondents revealed that they were not trained in the DAS. They further mentioned that they do not have a clear understanding of the appraisal system. Although the respondents explained that they had attended workshops, they remarked that these were not of assistance to them. Furthermore, the respondents stated that it was very difficult for them to implement a system that they did not understand.

The respondents had the suspicion that the facilitators similarly had little knowledge of the DAS, and this was justified when the facilitators could not answer their questions when clarification on the phenomenon was sought. This confirmed that the facilitators did not have enough knowledge on the DAS. The respondents indicated that educators were not taken through the process of the appraisal step-by-step; hence there was a lot of confusion and resistance to the system. They further highlighted that, as the appraisal system was introduced to educators, it was interpreted as way of classifying educators according to
their abilities, in order to discredit those who are not performing well and promote those who were doing excellently.

In reality, employees must know what is expected of them and have a clear understanding of what they are supposed to do (see 2.4). Furthermore, employees must be remunerated so that they are more committed to their work.

The Staff Development Teams (SDTs) are regarded as bodies that have the legitimate power to conduct the appraisal system in the schools. The respondents indicated that they used guidelines on the formation of the SDTs in schools (ELRC 2003: C86) (see 2.8). The principals as the heads of the schools form part of the team, and the rest of the members were democratically elected in a staff meeting. Some of the respondents mentioned that in their schools they had elected members from each grade to form part of the SDT.

The respondents explained that they had nominated people and then voted them to form part of the SDT. From the responses, the study could conclude that the respondents had followed the guidelines correctly when they formulated the SDTs in different schools. Although the SDTs had been formed democratically, they lacked the support and cooperation of other staff members. The SDTs were unable to function properly due to the fact that they had never been trained to perform the roles that they were supposed to perform.

The respondents indicated that their principals convened the first meeting in which the appraisal system, purpose, procedures and the formulation of SDT were explained. The respondents mentioned that each principal had initiated the first meetings to set the DAS programmes off the ground (see 2.9). As head, each school principal was responsible for making sure that all the activities at school were operational.

The respondents revealed that most principals did not play their roles, as they were unable to implement the appraisal system in the schools. It was quite clear that the principals and the SDTs did not have comprehensive background on the implementation of the appraisal system. The respondents further
elaborated that the principals were not sure of the roles they were supposed to perform. The research findings revealed that all the principals initiated the first meeting in their different schools. It was clear that the principals did not play a vital role in the implementation of the DAS. This was confirmed by the failure to implement the DAS in the schools that were investigated.

According to the respondents, a timetable was drawn up so that every educator would know the time at which he or she would be appraised (see 2.4). They further indicated that educators had to choose their own dates on which an individual would be free and more comfortable to be appraised. The respondents mentioned that even though the educators were given management’s plan in advance, the appraisal did not take place as planned in certain schools. In some cases the dates (management plan) had been drawn up by the STD members only; the respondents indicated that educators rejected this form of planning. Most educators would plead with the STD committee or the chairperson to postpone the stipulated dates. It was further mentioned that in schools where appraisals took place, the staff members drew up the timetable on their own to avoid allegation of favouritism. This indicates that the strategies that were used failed owing to a lack of proper training of educators. The respondents mentioned that the workshops that they had attended had not been of value to them. They further elaborate that they were unable to implement what they had acquired during the training sessions on the appraisal system.

It has been discovered that different schools applied the strategies that suited them best as they had unique characteristics. The research revealed that schools had used the management plans that included the times (periods) in which educators could be appraised, the dates and learning areas. The successful application of any strategies depended on the co-operation of the staff members and proper procedures during the implementation.

The respondents mentioned that the appraisal panels were not sure of the aspects that were supposed to be appraised. The respondents also indicated that they did not know exactly what was expected of them as they were being
appraised. They further mentioned that the selection of panels also created problems because some educators chose peers that might not contribute towards the development owing to lack of expertise in particular fields of learning. Some respondents stated that appraisals were used to make judgements about their performance in the classrooms. The respondents that were appraised at certain schools mentioned that they did not have any feedback after they were appraised. For this reason, they viewed appraisals as a waste of time. This clearly indicates that appraisal panel members were not trained on assessing appraisees.

According to the respondents all the problems experienced were caused by the inadequate training of educators in the appraisal system. These problems were compounded by the misconception of educators who believed that the appraisal was used as a mechanism to help redeploy or retrench them from their current schools.

The respondents also indicated that the issue of favouritism caused division among the staff, as some educators were scored highly whilst some were scored very low. The respondents further mentioned that the educators who had a good relationship with the principals always scored highly, while the rest received average scores. The respondents pointed out that the appraisal system was used as a tool to intimidate educators and as a mechanism for fault-finding so that the National Department of Educators could retrench teachers who scored poorly.

The respondents revealed that they were not at all motivated in their work. The respondents confirmed that their demotivation stemmed from the fact that they already had a large burden of work even before the appraisal system was implemented, and yet they had received no extra remuneration for this from the National Department of Education. The respondents further stated that their problems were caused by their workloads, the conditions in which educators worked, and also the relationships amongst staff members (see 2.10).
According to the respondents, more workshops should be conducted at individual or twinned schools. April (2001: 89) concurs when he states that this would help to minimize the problem of poor coordination, and the training would also be context-specific, taking into cognisance the situation prevailing in schools in terms of resources and other problems. This meant that educators should be involved in the planning of their training. School-based training could help educators to have a clear comprehension of the appraisal system.

The respondents indicated that educators should be appraised from time to time, as this would assist the educator to be aware of the areas that needed development before the next appraisal cycle. They also mentioned that the appraisees must have a meeting or interviews with the appraisal panels before and after the appraisal process. The appraisees must be given feedback so that they could improve before the next appraisal programme.

The respondents mentioned that the educators should write down the problems that they had encountered during the DAS to the National Department of Education. The respondents also agreed that this avenue would assist the National Department of Education to address the issues that caused a failure of the implementation of the DAS in schools.

All the respondents mentioned that the problems encountered during the implementation of DAS could be eliminated if the SDTs and appraisal panels knew exactly what they were supposed to appraise (see 2.7). As has been indicated by the respondents, appraisal should be linked to most of the work that is done throughout the year. The respondents also indicated that educators should have access to the information that concerns them: for example, the feedback for appraisal system should be available whenever needed by an educator.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS
This study has established that educators in Tembisa primary schools have encountered problems in the implementation of the appraisal system. The following recommendations are based on the findings from Chapter Four:
The training of educators on the appraisal system should be reviewed. The implementation should unfold in steps.

SDT members, including the principals, should have special workshops from time to time, so that they can assist educators in the implementation of the appraisal system.

Performance rewards (incentives) should be recognised as this will boost the morale of educators and encourage them to support the appraisal system.

The Gauteng Department of Education in conjunction with the district offices should introduce an instrument that can be used to monitor the progress of the appraisal system in schools. The introduction of a unit that solely deals with the DAS would be more suitable. The units should be responsible for training educators at their individual schools. This could be of assistance to educators as the problems and unanswered questions are to be directed to that unit specifically.

As a starting point a pilot project should be done. This will inform educators that the appraisal system is meant to develop educators’ personal and professional aspects to improve the quality of teaching practice as well as educational management.

The possibility of accreditation for the successful competition of an appraisal system programme should be considered.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to investigate the problems that educators encountered during the implementation of the appraisal system in Tembisa primary schools. It was found that the training sessions conducted were not successful as a result of a lack of understanding of the appraisal system. The competence of the facilitators was found to be of questionable quality and this resulted in perceptions of incompetence and ultimately the failure of the implementation of the appraisal system.

The findings of this research revealed that it is very important that a more structured training of educators be introduced for the effective and successful
implementation of the DAS in schools. For educators to develop professionally to meet the new challenges that have come with the new education system, educators need to be ready to evaluate themselves and also agree to be evaluated.

It is evident that before any attempt is made to implement the Developmental Appraisal System, educators should be properly trained and be motivated throughout the programme, and this will change their negative attitude towards the DAS.
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APPENDIX A

FORMS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL

(a) Personal details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank/Post Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Date of Appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Where obtained (Institution)</th>
<th>When obtained (Year)</th>
<th>Major learning area(s)</th>
<th>Secondary learning area(s) (at least second year courses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning area and Grade currently being taught (School based only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning area</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other relevant certificates/diplomas/credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates/Credits</th>
<th>Where obtained</th>
<th>When obtained</th>
<th>Content and nature of qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period (Dates)</th>
<th>Department/Institution/School/Other</th>
<th>Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Professional growth plan (PGP)

This section is to be completed by the appraisee and finalised in consultation with appraisal Panel. A new form will be used for each cycle.

- Formulate objectives
- Identify specific activities that will be necessary to achieve these objectives.
- State resources needed to achieve these objectives.
- State your key performance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion paper with Panel

Form to be completed by appraisee before the post appraisal meeting

1. Were your objectives for the period under review realistic?

   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
2. Given your programme, what has not been completed?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

3. What are the reasons for the backing or shortfall if any?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

4. What have been the most difficult problems you have had to cope with during this period?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

5. To what extent have you managed to improve your skills?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

6. Is there anything you need that could help you develop your job and become more effective?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

7. Do you receive sufficient support from your colleagues/senior staff/principal/governing body/department officials?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

8. Are there any other general matters you would like to discuss? e.g. factors affecting your work?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................................

(d) The appraisal report
- All forms that have been filled during appraisal form part of the Appraisal Report
- The following information must also be filled
- This Report must be signed by all parties to the Appraisal Panel
1. Prioritised Criteria

2. Identified Needs

3. Strengths of the Educator

4. Suggested Development Programme

5. Suggested Provider of Developmental Programme

6. Dates for developmental programme delivery

Signatures:

Appraisee: ............................................. Date: .............................................

Appraisal Panel Members:
1. ............................................. Date: .............................................
2. ............................................. Date: .............................................
3. ............................................. Date: .............................................
(e) **Feedback Questionnaire**

TO BE COMPLETED BY LEARNERS

The following are some statements about our teaching/learning practices. Indicated your personal opinion about each statement by writing one of the following responses:

Agree [A]        Uncertain [U]        Disagree [D]

1. Learners have a clear understanding of what the lesson is all about

2. Our teacher finds out what we know and understand about the topic

3. My teacher helps me to make sense of new ideas through his/her explanations

4. Our teacher encourages learners to work in co-operation to share ideas and solutions

5. Our teacher gives praise for achievements, however small.

6. We are free to contradict the views of others including that of our teacher, provided we give good reasons for doing so

7. Our teacher encourages us to ask questions in class

Teaching/learning in our class could be improved if:

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

a. In your opinion, what is appraisal?
b. How is Staff Development Team formed in your school?
c. What is the significant role played by the Principal in initiating DAS in your school?
d. What strategies (plans) are used to implement the Appraisal System?
e. What problems are experienced by educators regarding the Appraisal System in your school?
f. What should be done to eliminate problems encountered by educators in the current appraisal system?
APPENDIX C 1

TRANSCRIPT OF GROUP INTERVIEW AND RESPONSES

KEY: RESEARCHER = RES
RESPONDENTS = Ms
       Mrs
       Mr

Before each interview session, the researcher introduced himself to the respondents and briefly outlined the purpose of the interview session. After the interview session, the researcher thanked the respondents.

Research Question: What do you understand by appraisal system?

Mr H: I think appraisal is a way in which educators are developed in different aspects of their work. This includes teaching methods, classroom management and good relationship between the learners and colleagues.

Res: What do you mean by good relationship?

Mr H: Good relationship means the way in which educators communicates with other educators, SMT and learners. The cooperation amongst themselves and other stakeholders.

Mrs K: Appraisal means the manner in which the educators are evaluated on different aspects that affect their work, for example, the teaching methods that are applied in different Learning Areas. I think appraisal can also help the educators to be able to rectify or improve their weaknesses that they may have in their duties.

Mrs L: According to my understanding, appraisal is a system in which educators are checked and developed on the areas that they are lacking. An educator may seek assistance in the classroom
management, in this regard HOD or Deputy Principal should be approached so that the educator can be guided on how to manage the classroom effectively.

**Mrs M:** I think Appraisal System is the way in which an individual educator can be developed in aspect that he or she is lacking.

**Res:** What do you mean by development?

**Mrs M:** This means that an educator can be taught new ways of doing things, for instance, teaching methods of OBE as this is a new educational system.

**Research Question:** How is Staff Development Team formed in your school?

**Mrs K:** When the Staff Development Team was formed educators were nominated and voted to be in that team. Educators were elected by the other educators in the staff meeting at some time we were working in accordance with the guidelines that we had received from National Development of Education.

**Res:** What are those guidelines?

**Mrs K:** The guidelines are that SDT must be elected democratically in a staff meeting. The combination must include the Principal and elected educators as well as other stakeholders. The Principal ought to assist the SDT members in the implementation of DAS.

**Mrs M:** The Staff Development Team was elected democratically as the members were voted in a staff meeting by other educators. I think we used the correct channels as we had followed the guidelines from Gauteng Department of Education, whereby the Principal, elected educators and other stakeholders constitute the Staff Development Team in a school.
Research Question: What role did your Principal play in initiating DAS?

Ms L: Eh... the Principal convened the first meeting whereby she explained the appraisal system, purpose and the procedures that need to be followed when we elect the Staff Development Team. The Principal also encouraged us to participate in the implementation of DAS.

Mr H: I felt that my Principal did not play any role in the implementation as he did call the first meeting to talk about DAS. Thereafter, nothing had transpired, he is also a contributory factor to the total collapse of this DAS.

Mrs K: Yes, my Principal called the first meeting in which the appraisal system was explained to the members of staff who attended the meeting. Unfortunately, the Principal could not answer the questions to the satisfactory of the educators, this lead to the impression that the Principal did not have a broader knowledge in this DAS. For me, the Principal did not play any significant role in the implementation of DAS.

Res: Do you want to tell me that your Principal contributed towards the failure of DAS in this school?

All respondents: Yes, the Principal is the cause.

Research Question: What strategies were used to implement the appraisal system in your school?

Mr H: The strategy that we implemented the time-table that had been drawn by the SDT committee. On this time-table the name of the educator, period, Learning Areas and the appraisal panel was reflected. However, other educators were not satisfied about this arrangement they had caused some misunderstanding about the whole DAS timetable. This resulted in the failure of the whole process of DAS.
Mrs K: In our school, staff members were requested to choose their own dates so that they can be brought together to draw a composite time-table. In some instances educators would choose one date and in this case one educator would be given the next day. Although educators had chosen their own dates still has problems because they were not sure of what they were supposed to do in this appraisal.

Mr T: It had been agreed in the staff meeting that a time-table must be drawn by the whole staff. Different dates were written on pieces of paper whereby each educator was to pickup one paper on which the date was reflected. The educator would announce and present that paper to the SDT committee to make the entry to draw the composite time-table and all these pieces were in a one litre container (bowl).

Research Question: What problems did educators experience during the appraisal?

Mr T: The main problem that educators faced, was that they were not trained on the system, for that reason, they were not sure of what they were doing or preparing for evaluation. The appraisers were not trained, this created a serious problem for them to be able to evaluate other educators professionally.

Mr K: Educators felt that this appraisal was a tool to find faults from them. The Principal tried to use this instrument as a way of oppressing some of the educators within the school. The appraisers were not sure of what to assess during appraisal. I think that educators and appraisers need to be trained on this aspect.

Mrs L: The problem that we encountered was that educators did not know the things that they were supposed to be appraised on. Lack of training of educators and appraisal panel had cause a serious drawback of DAS in schools. Educators could not allow themselves
to be appraised on the system that they were not sure of. They were also demotivated as they could not receive any remuneration after the appraisal. Educators experienced the problem of favouritism whereby other educators would be awarded the high marks that they do not deserve.

Research Question: What should be done to eliminate problems encountered by educators?

Mr H: I think educators should be workshopped about the whole appraisal system. The workshops should be based at school so that facilitators could put theory into practice. In this regard educators would be able to participate in the planning of the appraisal programme.

Mr K: I strongly believe that educators should be well trained so that they are able to implement DAS in their schools. The educators must know what does this DAS entail and the things that are expected from them. The DAS programmes must be transparent to all educators. Each appraisee must know the results after being appraised so the educator can improve on the areas that needed attention.

Ms L: Educators need to be trained in the appraisal system. They should know what the system entails so that they become well prepared for the whole system. The Principals and SDTs need to be workshopped more often as this would be assisting on the evaluation during the appraisal. The National Department of Education must also consider the issue of incentives after the educators have completed the appraisal programme.
APPENDIX C 2

TRANSCRIPT OF GROUP INTERVIEW AND RESPONSES
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Before each interview session, the researcher introduced himself to the respondents and briefly outlined the purpose of the interview session. After the interview session, the researcher thanked the respondents.

Research Question: What do you understand by appraisal system?
Ms A: Appraisal is the development of the teachers on how to run or how to work with the curriculum at their school. The development includes the new approaches that teachers may be shown on how to deal with different problems.

Res: I heard you mentioning development in your explanation, could you please elaborate on development.
Ms A: Development in this context means that someone imparting or training other educators to gain certain skills and knowledge in a specific field in order to have an improved performance in work related situation. The skills and knowledge may include teaching techniques in a Learning Area, classroom management, inclusion of learners with learning barriers and approach to school activities as well as relationships with both learners and colleagues.
Mr B: My understanding on the appraisal system is basically the system in which is based on teacher development, if it is correctly implemented. In this regard appraisal is to trying to correct the previous way of doing things. The appraisal will also help educators to see it as a system which aims at detecting challenges of problems, to improve individual performance, to realise potential and achieve better results for the school.

Ms C: Appraisal system is a way of developing skills and assessing educator's work and setting performance levels.

Res: What do you mean by setting performance levels?
Ms C: This means that educators must have specific targets to achieve. The schools must have targets that are laid down and be used as measuring stick for individual performance. In this case educators must work very hard to meet the standards laid down by the schools. This also assisted on individual educator to determine how well he or she can perform the work given.

Mrs D: Appraisal is one way of trying to lift educators' teaching standards as well as developing teachers in their field of teaching. It also assisted educators to gain new teaching methods on Learning Areas and management of various activities inside and outside the classroom, this included sports management as well as contact with parents.

Ms E: Appraisal is the manner in which educators are taught new methods of approaching a problem they are facing within their working environment. It helps educators to have a better understanding of what they are supposed to do in their classroom and have improved techniques to teach their Learning Areas with confidence.
Research Question: How is Staff Development Team formed in your school?

Mrs D: In our school the Principal convened the staff meeting and explained the procedures on the formation of the SDT. The names of educators were nominated and voted for. In this regard, the educators were democratically elected to form the SDT. The guidelines from National Department of Education were used in the formation of SDT.

Res: What are the guidelines in the formation of SDT?

Mrs D: The guidelines mean the specific format that should be used when the SDT is formed in schools and it stated that the SDT must include the Prinicipal, elected staff members and other stakeholders. The staff members must be elected by other staff members.

Mr E: Each grade elected a representative in a staff meeting. Educators that were elected formed the SDT. This created a strong relationship between the educators and SDT members. At the same time educators would be able to discuss some of their problems that they are encountering during the appraisal with their different representatives.

Mrs C: When the SDT was formed, a staff meeting was convened and the members were chosen democratically about five members excluding the Principal. These educators were voted by other staff members.

Mr B: The SDT was formed in terms of regulations from the guidelines which had been received from the Department of Education. These guidelines were followed step-by-step in order to have democratically elected SDT. The Principal was automatically in as ex-officio, she was compelled to oversee the smooth running of DAS at school.
Ms G: Our SDT was formed democratically because as staff, we nominated and voted for these elected people in the staff meeting. Most educators participated in the process. We also followed the guidelines from the National Department of Education.

Ms A: The Staff Development Team was formed by way of committees. These committees were from different Learning Areas. The HODs and subject head formed the larger number of team members. The Principal was included as the head of the school so that she managed the activities around the appraisal.

Mrs N: The Principal and HODs must be part of that group (SDT). They must control the activities of the SDT and monitor whether they are doing things correctly. Members in the SDT were democratically elected in the meeting.

Mr K: The members of the SDT were elected in a staff meeting. This indicated that all staff members participate in the process; therefore the SDT was democratically elected. The Principal and other staff members formed the SDT and in their first meeting the executive must be elected so that they can coordinate the programme.

Research Question: What role did your Principals played in initiating DAS?

Ms A: Yes ... our Principal was very much cooperative concerning this appraisal. She invited the District Officials to explain more about DAS, although the implementation did not materialise. The Principal was encouraging the educators to participate in the appraisal programme. She emphasized that this might assist educators to improve the working system that were previously used. I think she played her part.
Mr Q: She was positively involved because she was among the team that went out for DAS workshop. She had been encouraging us to participate in the programme as we might gain new skills in Learning Areas and management classes.

Res: I heard you mentioning classroom management. What do you mean by classroom management?

Ms Q: Classroom management means the way in which the educator controls his or her class. This might include things such as discipline of learners, assessment of work given to the learners, teaching methods in different Learning Areas, relationships with learners and colleagues.

Mr B: The Principal was the one who initiated the first meeting. She explained the DAS, its purpose and the staff members were chosen for the SDT as well as the time-table for appraisal was formed. She was the overseer of everything that happened from initiation point of view up until the implementation of DAS. However, the implementation of appraisal system failed as educators and SDTs were not sure of what to do during the appraisal.

Mr R: The role of the Principal was to interact with educators to encourage them to be free during appraisal so that we should be rectified, if there was mistakes committed, and this process would help us to identify our difficulties in various aspects. The Principal motivated us to participate in this programme as this may assist with the development. Unfortunately the appraisal failed due to the fact that educators did not have a understanding of the appraisal system.
Mrs D: The Principal convened the first staff meeting where the concepts of DAS was explained and formation of SDT. The functions of SDT, the procedures and the process of implementation were highlighted so that educators might understand the appraisal system. The Principal stressed that this system was meant to develop educators professionally and have an improved performance. The appraisal implementation failed as educators felt that they were not workshopped to the extent on the system as such they had limited understanding of the concept.

Mrs S: The role of the Principal during appraisal was to make sure that every teacher was appraised and give guidance where it is necessary. Although the Principal was encouraging us to participate in the programme, the implementation was unsuccessful. Most educators did not have an understanding of this concept, hence they displayed a negative thinking towards the appraisal.

Research Question: What strategies were used to implement the appraisal system in your school?

Mr M: The time-table was drawn whereby educators were involved in the process. Every educator knew the time of appraisal as well as the appraisal panel involved. The educators were informed well in advance to prepare their work for evaluation by the appraisers.

Ms E: Educators would choose their dates and the relevant committee recorded the dates for the individual. The educators were given a chance to decide upon the dates that suite them. For this, the educators had enough time to prepare themselves for appraisal.
Mrs F: Educators tossed and randomly picked pieces of paper on which the date had been reflected. At the end those papers were taken to be joined to assemble the time-table for the implementation of the appraisal to the programme. The SDT was responsible to join the final time-table and distribute it to individual educators.

Mrs D: The first strategy failed because educators felt that the SDT did not consult them about the dates that were suitable for them to be evaluated. The second strategy was that, educators were free to choose their own dates and periods as well as inviting the other stakeholders they wanted as appraisers.

Mr R: The plans of appraisal in our school were always objective and know why we needed to be appraised. All the staff members drew up the time-table for appraisal. Although the time-table was drawn the implementation did not took off the ground.

Research Question: What problems did educators experience during the appraisal?

Mr B: During our time of appraisal, the problem that we encountered was the appraisal panel that we had chosen. The appraisers were not trained as such they were not sure of what they were supposed to do. An educator would choose a panel that was not effective, at the end the whole appraisal system becomes a failure.

Ms E: One of the problems was that when we knew of this appraisal, we were not to sure of what exactly to do, whether to tackle all the questions or had to evaluate an individual according to all the aspects that were mentioned in the Government Gazette and documents received from Gauteng Department of Education.
Mr M: There were lots of problems encountered, what happened in certain cases were problems experienced by the educators and in other cases by the appraisal panelists. The educators did not know the correct approach of the appraisal, at the same time they were not well trained as the facilitators were not sure of most aspects of the appraisal system. On the other hand, the panelists were not sure of what they were not doing.

Ms R: Some people were afraid of being appraised. I think what made them afraid was favouritism at school and this created a sense of distrust amongst the teachers. The suspicion was that educators who were in good terms with the Principal were scored very high while those who were not his favourites were awarded low scores. This created a serious problem amongst the staff members and it proved beyond doubt that the appraisers did not know exactly what they were suppose to do.

Mrs I: The problem with appraisers was that in most cases some of them were not fair enough or others were prejudiced because they did not like the teacher and they would give the appraisee poor marks for any kind of performance.

Mrs S: Actually, appraisal was perceived by educators as a plan for fault-findings, it did not go down well with teachers. In fact, it was seen as a tool used to intimidate teachers. The National Department of Education was using this appraisal system so that it could be able to weed out educators who were scoring low marks or unwanted educators by the Principals in their respective schools.
Mrs O: We never receive any motivation for these appraisals because one could be appraised but there would be nothing happening after that. According to the documents received there were so many aspects that needs to be treated and adhered to. For the appraisal system to be successful, the Department of Education must have a good incentive for the educators.

Mr J: Let me answer like this, the reason why possible appraisal has not started off, is that it is not incentive – driven. As it is not related to salary that could be the reason why people are not motivated.

Research Question: What should be done to eliminate problems encountered by educators?

Mr J: Another way of eliminating problems with the appraisal programme is to send the appraisal team individually to educators. Thereafter when the whole process has been completed a meeting should be convened where everything (procedures and results) are deliberated and evaluated.

Ms P: Another method hopefully to eliminate problems would be for teachers to be visited frequently to that during the appraisal periods they should not feel inferior or threatened. The teachers should have an interview with the panels before and after the appraisal. The appraisee would be able to mention the areas development is needed. The appraisal panel must give the appraisee the feedback after the appraisal process.

Mr F: The teachers needed to be interacted with so that a better model should be implemented. The teachers should be informed about what the whole system entails. The meeting between the appraisees and the appraisers must be held before the appraisal process.
Ms B: I think it would help if educators write their problems down and send them to the Department of Education. Possible changes to the whole appraisal system would ensure that educators are developed accordingly.

Ms G: I think one has to choose criteria for one's own appraisal programme and let this be a guide for the appraisers. The appraisers must know the problems that the appraisees are having before the appraisal take place. Their evaluation must be based on those problems.

Mrs S: If all educators could go for a workshop for the purpose of appraisal and know how it should be done, educators could benefit and have a positive attitude. The involvement of educators might play a significant part in the implementation and success of the appraisal system.
This item must be returned on or before the last date stamped. A renewal for a further period may be granted provided the book is not in demand. Fines are charged on overdue items.