

## References

- Adey P. (2000), Models of effective continuing professional development, *Proceedings of International Conference on Teacher Education 1999*, Hong Kong, Institute of Education.
- Adler M.J. (1982), *The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*, New York, Macmillan.
- Anderson J. (1998), Managing and evaluating change: The case of teacher appraisal, In P. Rea-Dickins and K.P. Germaine (eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building bridges*, pp.159-186, Harlow, Essex, England, Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Anderson S., Rolheiser C. and Gordon K. (1998), Preparing Teachers to be Leaders, *Journal of Educational Leadership*, Vol.55 (5), pp.38-51.
- Andrews P. and Herschel R. (1996), *Organisational communication: Empowerment in a technological society*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Argyris C. (1990), *Overcoming organisational defences: Facilitating Organisational Learning*, Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, USA.
- Bascia N. (2000), The impact of mandated change on teachers, In A. Hargreaves and N. Bascia (eds.), *The sharp edge of change: Teaching, leading and the realities of reform*, London, Falmer Press.
- Berg G.A. (1998), Public policy on distance learning in Higher Education: California State and Western Governors Association initiatives, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Vol. 6, No. 11, <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa>
- Birch B. (2000), Building community among personnel in an intensive English program, *TESOL Matters*, Vol.10, No.3, p.17.
- Bodilly S.J. (1996), *Lessons from New American Schools Development Corporation's Demonstration Phase*, Santa Monica, CA, RAND (MR-729-NASDC).
- Bodilly S.J. (1998), *Lessons from the New American Schools' scale-up phase: Prospects for bringing designs to multiple schools*, Santa Monica, CA, RAND (MR-942-NAS)

- Bogdan R.C. and Biklen S.K. (1998), *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (3rd ed.)*, Needham Heights, MA, Allyn and Bacon.
- Borg W.R. and Gall M.D. (1989), *Educational research: An introduction (5th edition)*, New York, Longman Inc.
- Boser J.A. and Clark S.B. (1992), Desirable mail questionnaire characteristics in teacher education research, *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco.
- Burns R.B. (1997), *Introduction to research methods (3rd ed.)*, South Melbourne, Longman.
- Cardno C. and Piggot-Irvine E. (1997), *Effective Performance Appraisal: Integrating Accountability and Development in Staff Appraisal*, Auckland, Longman.
- Carrim N.H. (2001), Democratic participation, decentralisation and educational reform, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen, *Implementing Education Policies: The South African experience (1st edition)*, pp.98-109, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- Carspecken P.F. (1996), *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*, New York, NY, Routledge.
- Cheng Y.C. and Cheung W.M. (1995), A framework for the analysis of educational policies, *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol.9 (6), pp.10-21.
- Chetty D., Chisholm L., Gardiner M., Magan N. and Vinjevold P. (1993), *Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa: Policy Options and Strategies*, Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand.
- Chisholm L. (2001), *Values, multiculturalism and Human Rights in Apartheid and post-Apartheid South African curriculum*, Paper delivered at Conference on Values, Education and Democracy, Cape Town.
- Chisholm L. and Vally S. (1996), *The culture of learning and teaching in Gauteng schools: Report of the committee on the culture of learning and teaching*, Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit, University of the

Witwatersrand.

- Chow A.P.Y. (2000), A study on the promotion of school-based management in Hong Kong primary schools, *Proceedings in International Conference on Teacher Education, 1999*, Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Chung C. (2000), From teaching to learning through activity approach: An in-the-field teacher development endeavour, *Proceedings of International Conference on Teacher Education 1999*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Clay M. (1985), Engaging with the school system: A study of interaction in new entrant classrooms, *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol.22 (1), pp.20-38.
- Cochran-Smith M. (2000), The questions that drive reform, *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol.51 (5), pp.331-333.
- Comer J.P. (1988), Educating poor minority children, *Scientific American*, Vol.259 (5), pp.42-48.
- Considine M. (1992), Shooting dingoes: Public administration in Australia, In M. Muetzelfeldt (ed.), *Society, state and politics in Australia*, Leichhardt, Pluto Press.
- Cousins B. and Simons M. (1996), The nature and impact of policy-induced partnerships between research and practice communities, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol.18 (3), pp.199-218.
- Crookes G. (1999), An author responds, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.33 (2), pp.279-285.
- Crouch L. (1998), Report on Education Indicators workshop, *Department of Education*, Republic of South Africa
- Dalin (2000), Developing the twenty-first century school: A challenge to reformers, pp. 1059-1073, In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.), *International handbook of educational change, Part One*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.
- Darling-Hammond L. (1989), Evaluation and the teaching profession, In A. Evans and T. Tomlinson (eds.), *Teacher appraisal: A nationwide approach*, Jessica

Kingsley, London.

Darling-Hammond L. (2000), Policy and change: Getting beyond bureaucracy, In Hargreaves A., Lieberman A., Fullan M. and Hopkins D. (eds.) (2000), *International handbook of educational change (Part One)*, pp.642-667, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.

De Clercq F. (2002), Education policy implementation and the bureaucratic struggle for efficiency, equity, quality and democracy, *Journal of Education*, No.27, pp.81-102

Denzin N.K. and Lincoln Y. (eds) (1994), *Handbook of qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Duemer L.S. (1999), Integration in "The last capital of the Confederacy": Case study of Black clergy involvement in the integration process, *The Negro Educational Review*, Vol. XLIX, pp.107-117.

Dunn W.N. (1994), *Public policy analysis: An introduction*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA, Prentice Hall.

Dwyer M.A. (1998), Creating and sustaining change for immigrant learners in secondary schools, *TESOL Journal*, 7 (5), pp.6-10.

Education Labour Relations Council (1997), *Resolution 4 – Developmental Appraisal Scheme (DAS)*, November.

Evans A. and Tomlinson J. (eds.) (1989), *Teacher appraisal: A nationwide approach*, Jessica Kingsley, London.

Fashola O.S. and Slavin R.E. (1998), School-wide reform models: What works?, *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol.79 (5), pp.370-379.

Fehnel (1993), *Education planning and systems management: An appraisal of needs in South Africa*, Work Bank Consultancy Report, April.

Felner R., Jackson A.W., Kasak D., Mulhall P., Brand S. and Flowers N. (1997), The impact of school reform for the middle grades: A longitudinal study of network engaged in turning points based comprehensive school transformation, In R. Takanishi and D.A. Hamburg (eds.), *Preparing adolescents for the twenty-first Century: Challenges facing Europe and*

*the United States*, pp.38-69, New York, Cambridge University Press.

- Fine M. (1992), *Chart(er)ing urban school reform: Philadelphia style*, Philadelphia, CUNY Graduate Center, Philadelphia Schools Collaborative.
- Firestone W.A. (1987), Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research, *Educational Researcher*, Vol.16, No. 7, pp.16 – 21.
- Fogarty R. (1999), Architects of the intellect, *Educational Leadership*, Vol.57 (3), pp.76-78, November.
- Fontana A. and Frey J. (1994), Interviewing. The art of science, In Denzin N.K. and Lincoln Y. (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, pp.361-376, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Fox R.J., Crask M.R. and Kim J. (1988), Mail survey rate – a meta-analysis of selected techniques for inducing responses, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 52, pp. 467 – 491.
- Fraenkel J.R. and Wallen N.E. (1993), *How to design and evaluate research in education*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Fraser and Tobin (1991), Combining qualitative and quantitative methods in classroom environment research, In J.B. Fraser and J.H. Walberg (eds.), *Educational environments: Evaluation, antecedents and consequences*, pp. 271 – 292, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Freeman D. (2001), Imported theories/local understandings: Part 2, *TESOL Matters*, Vol.11 (1), p.5.
- Fullan M.G. (1985), Change strategies at the local level, *Elementary School Journal*, Vol.85 (3), pp.391-421.
- Fullan M.G. (1991), *The new meaning of educational change*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- Fullan M.G. (1995), Contexts: Overview and framework, In M.J. O'Hair and S.J. Odell (eds.), *Educating teachers for leadership and change*, Vol.3, pp.1-10, California, Corwin Press Inc.
- Fullan M.G. (1998), The meaning of educational change: A quarter of a century of learning, In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins

(eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Change*, pp.214-228, Boston and Dordrecht, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fullan M.G. (2001), *Leading in a culture of change*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Gallie M. (1997), National curriculum monitoring and evaluation report, Mimeo.

Gallie M., Sayed Y. and Williams H. (1997), Transforming educational management in South Africa, *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol.66 (4), pp.460-468, Howard University Press, Washington D.C.

Gauteng Department of Education (2002), *Gauteng – DAS Workshop - Training Manual for DAS District Teams*, (24 to 26 April).

Gebhard M. (1998), A case for professional development schools, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.32 (2), pp. 501-510.

Gee J.P. (1999), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and practice*, New York, Routledge.

Geertz C. (1973), *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*, New York, Basic Books.

Gitlin A. and Smyth J. (1990), *Teacher evaluation: Educative alternatives*, Falmer Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Glennan T.K. Jr. (1998), *New American Schools after six years*, Santa Monica, CA, RAND (MR-945-NAS).

Glesne C. (1999), *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*, 2nd ed., New York, NY:Longman.

Goodson I.F. (2000), The principled professional, *Prospects*, Vol.30 (2) June, pp.181-188.

Guskey T. (ed.) (1994), *High stakes performance assessment: Perspectives of Kentucky's educational reform*, Corwin Press, Inc. Thousand Oaks, California.

Hafner A.L. and Slovacek S. (2000), Improving teaching effectiveness by chartering a school of education, *Proceedings of International Conference on Teacher Education 1999*, Hong Kong, Hong Kong Institute of Education.

- Hall P.M. (1992), *The policy process: A meso domain analysis of the Missouri Career Ladder Program*, Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of AERA, San Francisco.
- Hall P.M. (1995), The consequences of qualitative analysis for sociological theory: Beyond the micro-level, *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol.36 (2), pp.397-423.
- Hannay L.M., Smeltzer Erb C. and Ross J.A. (2001), Building change capacity within secondary schools through goal-driven and living organisations, *School Leadership and Management*, Vol.21 (3), pp.271-287.
- Hickcox E. and Musella D. (1992), Teacher performance appraisal and staff development, In M. Fullan and A. Hargreaves (eds.), *Teacher development and educational change*, Falmer Press, Philadelphia.
- Hickcox S. and Musella D.F. (1989), *Making a difference through performance appraisal*, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Hirsch E.D. Jr. (1996), *The schools we need and why we don't have them (1<sup>st</sup> ed.)*, Doubleday, New York.
- Hodder I. (1994), The interpretation of documents and material culture, In N.K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, pp. 393 – 402, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Hodgkinson C. (1983), *The philosophy of leadership*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Hopkins D., Ainscow M. and West M. (1994), *School improvement in an era of change*, Cassell, London.
- Huberman A.M. (1994), Research utilisation: The state of the art, *Knowledge and Policy*, Vol.7 (4), pp.13-33.
- Huberman A.M. and Miles M.B. (1994), Data management and analysis methods, In N.K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, pp.428 - 443, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Human Science Research Council / Education Labour Relations Council (2004), *Workplace policies in public education*, HSRC press, Pretoria.

- Ingvarson L. (1989), A professional development system fit for a profession, *IARTV-Seminar Series*, Vol.72, pp. 1-19.
- Jackson A.W. (1990), *Turning points: Preparing youth for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Carnegie Corporation.
- Jansen J.D. (2000), *Framing education policy after Apartheid: On the politics of non-reform in South African education, 1990-2000*, Johannesburg, Centre for Development Enterprises.
- Jansen J.D. (2001), Explaining non-change in education reform after apartheid: Political symbolism and the problem of policy implementation, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen (eds.), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, pp.271-292, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- Johnson K.E. (1992), The instructional decisions of pre-service English as a Second-Language teachers: New directions for teacher preparation programs, *Perspectives on second language teacher education*, Hong Kong, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Johnson K.E. (2002), Second language teacher education, *TESOL Matters*, Vol.12 (2), p.1-8.
- Johnson K.E. and Freeman D. (1998), Reconceptualising the knowledge-base of language teacher education, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.32, pp.397 – 417.
- Jones J. (1993), *Appraisal and staff development in schools*, David Fulton Publishers, London.
- Joyce B. and Showers B. (1995), *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*, White Plains, New York: Longman.
- Joyner E. (2000), Large-Scale Change: The Comer perspective, In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.), *International handbook of educational change (Part One)*, pp.855-876, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.
- Karavas-Doukas K. (1998), Evaluating the Implementation of Educational Innovation: Lessons from the Past, In P. Rea-Dickins and K. Germaine (eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building*



*bridges*, pp.25-50, Harlow, Essex, England, Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

- Kiely R. (1998), Programme evaluation by teachers: Issues of policy and practice, In P. Rea-Dickins and K. Germaine (eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building bridges*, pp.78-104, Harlow, Essex, England, Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Kilgore S., Doyle D. and Linkowsky L. (1996), The modern red schoolhouse, In S. Stringfield, S. Ross and L. Smith (eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: The new American school development corporation designs*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Lang C. (2000), When does it get any easier?: Beginning teachers' experiences during their first year of teaching, *Proceedings of International Conference of Teacher Education 1999*, Hong Kong, Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Le Compte M.D. (2000), Analysing qualitative data, *Theory and Practice*, Vol.39 (3), p.146-154.
- Leibowitz B. (2000), Is research into education policy a priority? *Curriculum Research and Development Review 2000*, Pretoria, DoE/NCCRD, pp.6-8.
- Levin H.M. (1987), Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership*, Vol.44 (6), pp.19-21.
- Lindsay R. (1985), Ethical regulations and their impact on research practice, *American Psychologist*, Vol.40, pp. 59 – 72.
- Little J.W. (1994), *Teacher's professional development in a climate of education reform*, Systemic Reform, Perspectives of personalised reform, <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/EdReformStudies/SysReforms/little1.html>
- Lugg (2002), Exploring policy communities and the NQF: A poverty of positioning?, *Journal of Education*, No.27, p.137-155
- Lungu G.F. (2001), The educational policy process in post-apartheid South Africa: An analysis of structures, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen (eds.), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, pp.92-97, Cape Town, University of Cape Town Press.

- Lyons C.A., Pinnell G.S. and DeFord D.E. (1993), *Partners in learning: Teachers and children in Reading Recovery*, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Manganyi N.C. (2001), Public policy and the transformation of education in South Africa, p.25-37, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen (eds.), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, pp.25-37, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- Manning D. (1990), *Hill country teacher: Oral histories from the one-room school and beyond*, New York, New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- McLaughlin M.W. (1998), Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementation and situated practice, In A. Hargraves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Change (Part One)*, Boston, MA, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mentzer D. and Shaughnessy T. (1996), Hawthorne elementary school: The teachers' Perspective, *Journal of Education for Students Place at Risk*, Vol.1 (1), pp.12-23.
- Meyer S. (2002), Picture imperfect: A case of conceptual poverty in education research and development, *Journal of Education*, No.27, pp.103-116.
- Michael G.J. (2000), The Toyota teach primary school project: A case study of teacher development in South Africa, *Proceedings of International Conference on Teacher Education 1999*, Hong Kong, Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Mokgalane E., Carrim N., Gardiner M. and Chisholm L. (1997), *National teacher appraisal pilot project report*, Education policy unit, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Moletsane R. (2002), Swimming against the tide: External intervention in a 'non-resilient' school?, *Journal of Education*, No.27, pp.117-136.
- Moore R. and Muller J. (1999), The discourse of 'Voice' and the problem of knowledge and identity in the sociology of knowledge, *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, Vol.20 (2), pp.189-206.
- Motala E. (2001), Policy analysis capacity in South Africa, p.240-247, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen (eds.), *Implementing education policies: The South African*

*experience*, UCT Press, Cape Town.

Mpumalanga Department of Education (2002), Mpumalanga – Teacher Development Appraisal System Training Manual.

Muller J. (2000), *Critics and reconstructors: On the emergence of progressive educational expertise in South Africa*, Cape Town, Education Policy Unit, University of the Western Cape.

Murray S. (2002), Get real? Some thoughts on research for teaching and research for policy, *Journal of Education*, No.27, p.59-79

National Department of Education (1998), *Developmental appraisal system for teachers*, Government Printers, Pretoria.

National Education Policy Investigation (1992), *Governance*, Cape Town, Oxford University Press/NECC.

Nekwhevha F. (2000), Education transformation and the African Renaissance in a globalising world, *Journal of Education*, Vol.25, pp.18-47.

Neuman W.L. (2000), *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, (4th ed.), Needham Heights, MA, Allyn and Bacon.

Newmann F.M. (1990), *Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement*, Paper presented to the Indiana University Annual Education Conference, Madison: National Center of Effective Secondary Schools and National Center for Educational Research, University of Wisconsin.

Oakes J., Welner K., Yonezawa S. and Allen R.L. (2000), Norms and politics of equity-minded change: Researching the 'zone of mediation', p.952-975, In Hargreaves A., Lieberman A., Fullan M. and Hopkins D. (eds.) (2000), *International handbook of educational change (Part One)*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.

Odden A.R. (1991), The evolution of education policy implementation, In A.R.Odden (ed.), *Education Policy Implementation*, pp.1-12, Albany New York, State University of New York Press.

Olssen M., Codd J. and O'Neill A.M. (2004), *Education policy. Globalisation, citizenship and democracy*, London, Sage.

- Orrell C. (1996), ATLAS Communities: Authentic Teaching, Learning, and Assessment for all Students, In S. Stringfield, S. Ross and L. Smith (eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: The New American Schools designs*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pal L.A. (1992), *Public policy analysis: An introduction (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Scarborough, Canada, Nelson.
- Patton M.Q. (1990), *Qualitative evaluation methods (2nd Edition)*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Pendergast D. (2000), Marginal subjects: Towards a site of possibility in the teaching of home economics, *Proceedings of International Conference on Teacher Education 1999*, Hong Kong, Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Piggot-Irvine, E. (2001), *Appraisal - Reducing Control: Enhancing Effectiveness*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Massey University.
- Pinnell G.S. (1989), Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read, *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol.90 (2), pp.161-183.
- Pollitt C. (1988), Models of staff appraisal: Some political implications, *Higher Education Review*, Vol. 20, No.2, pp. 7 – 17.
- Powney J. (1991), Teacher appraisal: The case for a developmental approach, *Educational Research*, Vol.33 (2), Summer.
- Punch K. (1998), *Introduction to research in the social sciences*, London, Sage.
- Ramsden P. (1992), *Learning to teach in higher education*, London, Routledge.
- Rensburg I. (1998), Qualifications, curriculum, assessment and quality improvement: Laying the foundations for lifelong learning, *Report on the National Policy Review Conference on Education and Training*, 9 – 12 October, Johannesburg.
- Rolheiser C. and Hundey I. (1995), Building norms for professional growth in beginning teachers: A learning consortium initiative, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol.6, pp.205-222.
- Ross S., Troutman A., Horgan D., Maxwell S., Laitinen R. and Lowther D. (1997), The Success of Schools in Implementing Eight Restructuring Designs: A

Synthesis of First Year Evaluation Outcomes, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 8 (1), March.

- Rothman R. (1996), Reform at all levels: National alliance for restructuring education, In S. Stringfield, S. Ross and L. Smith (eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: The New American Schools Development Corporation Designs*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Erlbaum.
- Samoff J. (1999), Institutionalizing International Influence, In R.F. Arnove and C.A. Torres (eds.), *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, pp.51-89.
- Sayed Y. (2001), Post-apartheid educational transformation: Policy concerns and approaches, p.250-270, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen (eds.), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- Sayed Y. and Jansen J.D. (editors) (2001), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- Scheerens J. (2000), The school effectiveness knowledge base as a guide for school improvement, p.1096-1115, In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.), *International handbook of educational change*, Part One, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.
- Schneider C.G. (1997), From diversity to engaging difference: A framework for the higher education curriculum, In N. Cloete, J. Muller, M.W. Makgoba and D. Ekong (eds.), *Knowledge, identity and curriculum transformation in Africa*, Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman, pp.101-132.
- Schwahn C.J. and Spady W.G. (1998), *Total leaders*, Arlington: VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Scriven M. (1991), Beyond formative and summative evaluation, In M.W. McLaughlin and D.C. Phillips (eds.), *Evaluation and Education: A quarter century*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Seepe S. and Kgaphola M. (1999), Educator as researcher: Moving from the periphery to the centre of research using the black experience as metaphor for engagement, In T. Mathiba et. al., *Consultative conference*

*on the educator as researcher: Proceedings*, Gauteng Department of Education Research Unit.

Seidman I.E. (1990), *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*, New York, Teachers College Press.

Seller W. (2001), Introduction. Reforming schools: Building the capacity for Change, *School Leadership and Management*, Vol.21 (3), pp. 255-259.

Senge P., Scharmer C.O., Jaworski J. and Flowers B.S. (2004), *Presence: Human purpose and the field of the future*, Society for Organisational Learning, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.

Sizer T.R. (1992), *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Skinner J. (2003), Why (education) policy can't be implemented these days: Some philosophical considerations, *Journal for Education*, Vol.30, pp.41-56.

Slavin R.E. (1995), *Bricks, Sand, and Seeds: School Change Strategies and Readiness for School Reform*, Mimeo, Center for Research on Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University, June.

Slavin R.E., Madden N.A., Dolan L. and Wasik B.A. (1996), *Every child, every school: Success for All*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press.

Slavin R.E., Madden N.A., Dolan L.J., Wasik B.A., Ross S., Smith L. and Dianda M. (1996), Success for All: A summary of research, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, Vol.1 (1), pp. 41-76.

Smith M. and O'Day J. (1991), *Putting the Pieces Together: Systemic School Reform*, CPRE Policy Brief, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Eagleton Institute of Politics.

Smyth (2000), Three rival versions and a critique of teach staff development, pp. 1242-1256, In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.), *International handbook of educational change, Part One*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.

Soudien C., Jaclin H. and Hoadley U. (2001), Policy values: Problematizing equity and redress in education, p.78-91, In Y. Sayed and J.D. Jansen (eds.),

*Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, UCT Press, Cape Town.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (1999), *Teacher Appraisal; Development and Accountability – Discussion paper by M. Gallie*, January/February 1999, Cape Town.

Sprinthall, Reiman and Theis-Sprinthall (1996), Teacher professional development, In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, and E. Guyton (eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Stake R. (1989), The evaluation of teaching, In H. Simons and J. Elliot (eds.), *Rethinking appraisal and assessment*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Stake R.E. (1995), *The art of case study research*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.

Stout R.T. (1996), Staff development policy: Fuzzy choices in an imperfect market, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Vol.4 (2), February 17 (<http://epaa.asu.edu>).

Strauss A.L. and Corbin J. (1998), *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd edition), Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Stringfield S., Millsap M. and Herman R. (1997), *Special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: Results and policy implications*, Washington, DC, U.S. Department of Education.

Sudman S. (1985), *Asking questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Taylor N. and Vinjevold P. (editors) (1999), *Report of the President's Educational Initiative Research Project*, Johannesburg, JET.

Tse K.K. (1982), Analysing education policies of Hong Kong, *A Perspective of Hong Kong Education*, Wide Angle Publishing Co., Hong Kong.

Vidovich L. (2003), Methodological framings for a policy trajectory study, In T.A O'Donoghue and K. Punch (eds.), *Qualitative educational research in*

*action. Doing and reflecting*, pp. 70 – 96, London, Routledge Falmer.

- Welton J. (2001), Building capacity to deliver education in South Africa?, p.174-187, in Sayed Y. and Jansen J. (eds)(2001), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- White K. (1990), *The implementation of state-mandated program review: A case study of governance and decision making in community colleges*, Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Saint Louis, MO.
- Wilson K. and Daviss B. (1994), *Redesigning education*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- Wolcott H.F. (1981), Confessions of a trained observer, In B.R. Tabachnick (ed.), *The study of schooling: Field based methodologies in educational research and evaluation*, pp. xiii, 301), New York, Praeger.
- Yin R.K. (1994), *Case study research: Design and methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.



## Appendix A

University of Pretoria etd – Gallie, M (2007)

---

### Interview Questions

- (1) Who are you? How long have you been teaching? and, What is your position at the school?
- (2) What is your role in the DAS policy implementation process?
- (3) What are the skills that you bring to the Staff Development Team and to the school in general?
- (4) What is your opinion of the DAS Information Sharing workshops which were organised to empower the staff?
- (5) Did you implement the Developmental Appraisal Scheme at your school? How? or Why not?
- (6) What is your perception about the DAS policy? and, How does it compare with the previous Inspection policy?
- (7) What is the climate at your school right now? and, How does it contribute or militate against the implementation of DAS policy?
- (8) What is your perception about the management of your school and its contribution to the implementation of this policy?
- (9) Give us a sense of the power relationships at your school, if any, and whether different cliques exist, and why, at your school? and
- (10) Is there anything else that you want to raise (that needs to be said) during this interview?



# Appendix C University of Pretoria etd – Gallie, M (2007)

## CFSS - Questionnaire on School Functionality

### A. School Ethos

Questions

1. Are attendance, discipline and vandalism by learners major problems in school?
2. Are most of the parents proud that their children are attending this school?
3. Is there a general concern through the teaching and learning process to provide quality education?
4. Is a questioning, critical attitude actively encouraged, and a complacency attitude actively discouraged among staff?
5. Is there a continual striving for improvement and growth among teachers?
6. Are teachers holding high expectations of learner behaviour and achievements through displaying confidence in them?
7. Is there an open atmosphere for change in the school?
8. Are teachers talking freely about professional matters?
9. Are learners and teachers feeling safe and secure at school?
10. Are teachers working in a stimulating, enjoyable and satisfying atmosphere?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

### B. Vision, Aims and Strategic Planning

Questions

1. Do the principal and you, as staff member share a common vision about the school's future development?
2. Is there a plan about how to move in the direction of achieving the shared vision?
3. Is there a common set of educational values and purpose among most staff members?
4. Is the school's aim and whole school policies set down clearly in writing, and owned by teachers?
5. Is part of the school aims to help individual learners to achieve their potential (both personal and social) by adopting support material and a teaching and learning style that are sufficiently differentiated to cater for individual needs?
6. Is part of the school aims to provide an environment in which learners are happy, feel valued as individuals and acquire universal moral values?
7. Is part of the school aims to provide an environment in which learners learn to cooperate with one another?
8. Is the management team thinking and planning strategically, paying attention to current practice by being proactive and keen to stay in the forefront of change?
9. Is the management team competent at anticipating future developments and implications these might have for school?
10. Is the management team displaying the capacity to avoid crisis management?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

### C. The Principal

Questions

1. Does the principal provide strong leadership and a definite sense of direction through a clear vision based beliefs and values?
2. Does the principal actively shape the culture and ethos of the school through strategic thinking and planning?
3. Does the principal encourage quality teaching and high expectations, but supportive to colleagues in crisis?
4. Does the principal discourage complacency through motivation?
5. Does the principal display enthusiasm, optimism, being positive and constructive?
6. Does the principal regularly express appreciation to staff, and celebrate special achievements?
7. Is the principal prepared to help out instead of putting him/her self above colleagues?
8. Does the principal generally act as a buffer, protecting staff from political and other external interference?
9. Is the principal well organised and in touch with events in school, as well as keeping abreast of new initiatives?
10. Is the principal strongly supporting and regularly participating in staff and management development?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

### D. The Principal and the Senior Management Team

Questions

1. Are they working well together as a team through clearly defined roles and responsibilities known to staff?
2. Are they highly visible and approachable?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

3. Are they highly visible and approachable, and face up to differences of opinion by working for a negotiated solution?
4. Do they have a sense of joint ownership of school developments when making decisions?
5. Do they set out a broad strategy for change and support teachers during the implementation of change?
6. Do they model desired behaviours and attributes e.g. hard work, commitment, mutual support and team-work?
7. Do they acknowledge that they are accountable to staff by providing clear evidence of the outcomes of their actions?
8. Do they behave with openness, honesty and integrity, and are they ready to admit mistakes and to consider alternatives?
9. Are they adept at managing people, including identifying and mobilising individual talents and energies?
10. Are they delegating meaningful tasks in order to develop and empower staff?

University of Pretoria etd – Gallie, M (2007)


**E. Structures, Roles and Responsibilities**

Questions

1. Is there a clear organisational structure that is appropriate for meeting the school's aims?
2. Are the staff roles and responsibilities defined within the structure?
3. Are the lines of accountability known to everyone within the structure?
4. Is the structure flexible enough to be altered to meet changing circumstances?
5. Are systems in place for monitoring and reviewing practice?
6. Is there a readiness to modify and adapt the practice where necessary?
7. Is a whole-school approach in achieving school goals encouraged?
8. Are teachers having easy access to school policy documents and support materials?
9. Are women teachers in promotion posts assigned traditional female responsibilities?
10. Are the proportion of women on the staff reflected in the number of managerial positions held by women?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

**F. Decision Making and Communication**

Questions

1. Are staff meetings used for the discussion of major policy issues?
2. Are working parties or small groups used to investigate particular issues and make policy recommendations?
3. Are teachers sharing in major decision making?
4. Are meetings well-chaired?
5. Are meetings purposeful?
6. Are meetings kept to a minimum?
7. Is there frequent, direct and open communication between staff and management?
8. Are channels of communication operating in both directions?
9. Are teachers regularly briefed by the principal about day-to-day issues?
10. Are teachers generally feeling well-informed?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

**G. Professional Working Relationships**

Questions

1. Is there a good team spirit?
2. Are the staff feeling valued?
3. Are teachers able to express their views openly and honestly?
4. Are teacher contributions given recognition and taken seriously in staff meetings?
5. Is there a concern to build a learning environment for both staff and learners?
6. Are teachers striving to improve their professional practice?
7. Are teachers regularly engaging in joint planning?
8. Are teachers encouraged to share ideas, experiences and success?
9. Is professional development an integral part of the job of teachers, in order to acquire new skills?
10. Are experimentation and reasonable risk taking encouraged?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know

**H. Links with Parents and the Community**

Questions

1. Are teachers working to build and maintain good relations with parents?

Responses		
Yes	No	I don't know



## Appendix D University of Pretoria etd – Gallie, M (2007)

### Summary of Analysis of Questionnaire responses

Y=n		Summary Responses			Diff.	Pos %	Percentage		
Y=p	Questions	Yes	No	Don't know			Yes	No	Don't know
<b>A. School Ethos</b>									
	1.1 Are attendance, discipline and vandalism by learners major problems in school?	23	1	0	2	4	96%	4%	0%
	1.2 Are most of the parents proud that their children are attending this school?	4	4	16	2	17	17%	17%	67%
	1.3 Is there a general concern through the teaching and learning process to provide quality education?	19	3	2	2	79	79%	13%	8%
	1.4 Is a questioning, critical attitude actively encouraged, and a complacency attitude actively discouraged among staff?	11	10	3	2	46	46%	42%	13%
	1.5 Is there a continual striving for improvement and growth among teachers?	10	9	5	2	42	42%	38%	21%
	1.6 Are teachers holding high expectations of learner behaviour and achievements through displaying confidence in them?	4	15	4	3	17	17%	65%	17%
	1.7 Is there an open atmosphere for change in the school?	8	9	6	3	35	35%	39%	26%
	1.8 Are teachers talking freely about professional matters?	16	6	2	2	67	67%	25%	8%
	1.9 Are learners and teachers feeling safe and secure at school?	4	17	2	3	17	17%	74%	9%
	1.10 Are teachers working in a stimulating, enjoyable and satisfying atmosphere?	1	21	2	2	4	4%	88%	8%
<b>B. Vision, Aims and Strategic Planning</b>									
	2.1 Do the principal and you, as staff member share a common vision about the school's future development?	2	13	9	2	8	8%	54%	38%
	2.2 Is there a plan about how to move in the direction of achieving the shared vision?	3	17	4	2	13	13%	71%	17%
	2.3 Is there a common set of educational values and purpose among most staff members?	9	15	0	2	38	38%	63%	0%
	2.4 Is the school's aim and whole school policies set down clearly in writing, and owned by teachers?	6	15	3	2	25	25%	63%	13%
	2.5. Is part of the school aims to help individual learners to achieve their potential (both personal and social) by adopting support material and a teaching and learning style that are sufficiently differentiated to cater for individual needs?	9	11	4	2	38	38%	46%	17%
	2.6 Is part of the school aims to provide an environment in which learners are happy, feel valued as individuals and acquire universal moral values?	13	9	2	2	54	54%	38%	8%
	2.7 Is part of the school aims to provide an environment in which learners learn to cooperate with one another?	12	7	4	3	52	52%	30%	17%
	2.8 Is the management team thinking and planning strategically, paying attention to current practice by being proactive and keen to stay in the forefront of change?	3	14	6	3	13	13%	61%	26%
	2.9 Is the management team competent at anticipating future developments and implications these might have for school?	3	11	10	2	13	13%	46%	42%
	2.10 Is the management team displaying the capacity to avoid crisis management?	5	16	3	2	21	21%	67%	13%
<b>C. The Principal</b>									
	3.1 Does the principal provide strong leadership and a definite sense of direction through a clear vision based beliefs and values?	5	13	6	2	21	21%	54%	25%
	3.2 Does the principal actively shape the culture and ethos of the school through strategic thinking and planning?	4	14	6	2	17	17%	58%	25%
	3.3 Does the principal encourage quality teaching and high expectations, but supportive to colleagues in crisis?	10	10	4	2	42	42%	42%	17%
	3.4 Does the principal discourage complacency through motivation?	9	12	2	3	39	39%	52%	9%
	3.5 Does the principal display enthusiasm, optimism, being positive and constructive?	9	12	3	2	38	38%	50%	13%
	3.6 Does the principal regularly express appreciation to staff, and celebrate special achievements?	15	8	1	2	63	63%	33%	4%
	3.7 Is the principal prepared to help out instead of putting him/her self above colleagues?	7	11	5	3	30	30%	48%	22%
	3.8 Does the principal generally act as a buffer, protecting staff from political and other external interference?	10	8	6	2	42	42%	33%	25%
	3.9 Is the principal well organised and in touch with events in school, as well as keeping abreast of new initiatives?	10	8	6	2	42	42%	33%	25%
	3.10 Is the principal strongly supporting and regularly participating in staff and management development?	12	9	3	2	50	50%	38%	13%

		Responses			Diff.	Yes	No	Don't know	
		Yes	No	Don't know					
<b>D. The Principal and the Senior Management Team</b>									
University of Pretoria etd - Galle, M. (2007)									
Questions									
p	4.1 Are they working well together as a team through clearly defined roles and responsibilities known to staff?	6	11	7	2	25	25%	46%	29%
p	4.2 Are they highly visible and approachable?	15	5	4	2	63	63%	21%	17%
p	4.3 Are they facing up to differences of opinion by working for a negotiated solution?	10	9	4	3	43	43%	39%	17%
p	4.4 Do they have a sense of joint ownership of school developments when making decisions?	6	10	8	2	25	25%	42%	33%
p	4.5 Do they set out a broad strategy for change and support teachers during the implementation of change?	9	8	7	2	38	38%	33%	29%
p	4.6 Do they model desired behaviours and attributes e.g. hard work, commitment, mutual support and team-work?	10	9	5	2	42	42%	38%	21%
p	4.7 Do they acknowledge that they are accountable to staff by providing clear evidence of the outcomes of their actions?	11	9	4	2	46	46%	38%	17%
p	4.8 Do they behave with openness, honesty and integrity, and are they ready to admit mistakes and to consider alternatives?	8	9	7	2	33	33%	38%	29%
p	4.9 Are they adept at managing people, including identifying and mobilising individual talents and energies?	8	11	5	2	33	33%	46%	21%
p	4.10 Are they delegating meaningful tasks in order to develop and empower staff?	7	12	5	2	29	29%	50%	21%
<b>E. Structures, Roles and Responsibilities</b>									
Questions									
p	5.1 Is there a clear organisational structure that is appropriate for meeting the school's aims?	8	8	8	2	33	33%	33%	33%
p	5.2 Are the staff roles and responsibilities defined within the structure?	9	7	7	3	39	39%	30%	30%
p	5.3 Are the lines of accountability known to everyone within the structure?	9	12	2	3	39	39%	52%	9%
p	5.4 Is the structure flexible enough to be altered to meet changing circumstances?	8	10	5	3	35	35%	43%	22%
p	5.5 Are systems in place for monitoring and reviewing practice?	6	12	5	3	26	26%	52%	22%
p	5.6 Is there a readiness to modify and adapt the practice where necessary?	6	10	7	3	26	26%	43%	30%
p	5.7 Is a whole-school approach in achieving school goals encouraged?	9	11	4	2	38	38%	46%	17%
p	5.8 Are teachers having easy access to school policy documents and support materials?	16	4	4	2	67	67%	17%	17%
p	5.9 Are women teachers in promotion posts assigned traditional female responsibilities?	6	13	5	2	25	25%	54%	21%
p	5.10 Are the proportion of women on the staff reflected in the number of managerial positions held by women?	2	16	6	2	8	8%	67%	25%
<b>F. Decision Making and Communication</b>									
Questions									
p	6.1 Are staff meetings used for the discussion of major policy issues?	22	1	0	3	96	96%	4%	0%
p	6.2 Are working parties or small groups used to investigate particular issues and make policy recommendations?	13	6	5	2	54	54%	25%	21%
p	6.3 Are teachers sharing in major decision making?	18	2	3	3	78	78%	9%	13%
p	6.4 Are meetings well-chaired?	14	5	4	3	61	61%	22%	17%
p	6.5 Are meetings purposeful?	12	6	5	3	52	52%	26%	22%
p	6.6 Are meetings kept to a minimum?	8	15	1	2	33	33%	63%	4%
p	6.7 Is there frequent, direct and open communication between staff and management?	13	6	5	2	54	54%	25%	21%
p	6.8 Are channels of communication operating in both directions?	14	6	4	2	58	58%	25%	17%
p	6.9 Are teachers regularly briefed by the principal about day-to-day issues?	22	2	0	2	92	92%	8%	0%
p	6.10 Are teachers generally feeling well-informed?	16	5	3	2	67	67%	21%	13%
<b>G. Professional Working Relationships</b>									
Questions									
p	7.1 Is there a good team spirit?	9	12	3	2	38	38%	50%	13%
p	7.2 Are the staff feeling valued?	7	15	2	2	29	29%	63%	8%
p	7.3 Are teachers able to express their views openly and honestly?	16	6	2	2	67	67%	25%	8%
p	7.4 Are teacher contributions given recognition and taken seriously in staff meetings?	10	7	7	2	42	42%	29%	29%
p	7.5 Is there a concern to build a learning environment for both staff and learners?	11	7	6	2	46	46%	29%	25%
p	7.6 Are teachers striving to improve their professional practice?	16	2	5	3	70	70%	9%	22%
p	7.7 Are teachers regularly engaging in joint planning?	8	14	1	3	35	35%	61%	4%
p	7.8 Are teachers encouraged to share ideas, experiences and	13	8	3	2	54	54%	33%	13%

	success?									
p	7.9 Is professional development an integral part of the job of teachers in order to acquire new skills?	10	11	3	2	42	42%	46%	13%	
p	7.10 Are experimentation and reasonable risk taking encouraged?	4	14	6	2	17	17%	58%	25%	
<b>H. Links with Parents and the Community</b>										
<b>Responses</b>										
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Diff.</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	
	<b>Questions</b>									
p	8.1 Are teachers working to build and maintain good relations with parents?	12	8	4	2	50	50%	33%	17%	
p	8.2 Is there an active and supportive school governing body?	7	12	5	2	29	29%	50%	21%	
p	8.3 Are parents made to feel welcome in the school?	16	5	3	2	67	67%	21%	13%	
p	8.4 Are parents informed about significant developments in the school?	17	3	3	3	74	74%	13%	13%	
p	8.5 Are parents consulted about significant developments affecting their children?	18	4	2	2	75	75%	17%	8%	
p	8.6 Are parents widely encouraged to help out in the classroom?	1	20	3	2	4	4%	83%	13%	
p	8.7 Are parents invited to joint educational excursions?	0	21	3	2	0	0%	88%	13%	
p	8.8 Are teachers working to build and maintain community links?	5	13	6	2	21	21%	54%	25%	
p	8.9 Is the school responsive to the culture of the local community?	9	11	4	2	38	38%	46%	17%	
p	8.10 Are there good links with local business?	2	17	5	2	8	8%	71%	21%	
<b>I. The Governing Body and Department of Education</b>										
<b>Responses</b>										
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Diff.</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	
	<b>Questions</b>									
p	9.1 Are the staff and governing body enjoying a positive and harmonious relationship?	2	15	7	2	8	8%	63%	29%	
n	9.2 Are teachers resenting the powers of the governing body?	5	12	7	2	50	21%	50%	29%	
n	9.3 Is there evidence of serious disagreement between school staff and the governing body?	5	13	6	2	54	21%	54%	25%	
n	9.4 Is the governing body very content to follow the principal's advice on educational issues?	8	5	11	2	21	33%	21%	46%	
p	9.5 Are all members of the governing body well-acquainted with the internal workings of the school?	0	13	11	2	0	0%	54%	46%	
p	9.6 Are governing body members provided the opportunity in sub-committees and working parties to work with staff on reviewing specific aspects of school policy and practice?	0	14	9	3	0	0%	61%	39%	
p	9.7 Are governing body members involved in exercises concerned with institutional review?	1	12	11	2	4	4%	50%	46%	
p	9.8 Is there a sound relationship between school and the Department of Education?	6	9	9	2	25	25%	38%	38%	
p	9.9 Are members of the DoE playing a significant part in school management?	0	14	9	3	0	0%	61%	39%	
n	9.10 Is the school very dependent on the support of the DoE?	4	10	9	3	43	17%	43%	39%	
<b>J. Managing Change</b>										
<b>Responses</b>										
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Diff.</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	
	<b>Questions</b>									
p	10.1 Is the school receptive to innovation and change?	13	6	5	2	54	54%	25%	21%	
n	10.2. Is there a degree of professional scepticism about the current changes?	18	4	2	2	17	75%	17%	8%	
p	10.3 Does the principal, where doubts are expressed, use it effectively to the advantage of education?	8	7	9	2	33	33%	29%	38%	
n	10.4 Is there a perceived 'innovation overload' among staff?	12	5	7	2	21	50%	21%	29%	
n	10.5 Are some of the innovations or developments left 'up-in-the-air' and not fully implemented or discussed?	17	1	5	3	4	74%	4%	22%	
p	10.6 Is the school re-aligning the existing structures in line with the innovations?	5	11	8	2	21	21%	46%	33%	
p	10.7 Does the principal allocate resources to support innovations?	3	11	10	2	13	13%	46%	42%	
p	10.8 Is change being successfully managed?	3	13	6	4	14	14%	59%	27%	
p	10.9 Have current transformations led to an increase in collaborative decision-making?	5	10	9	2	21	21%	42%	38%	
p	10.10 Despite the fact that collaborative decision-making is taking more time, is management perceiving it to lead to better results?	4	7	13	2	17	17%	29%	54%	



## Appendix E

### Comparing the 22 steps of SADTU with the 11 steps of the facilitator's manual

11 steps of Facilitator's manual			22 steps of SADTU		
Step	Meeting	Action		Level	Step
			School need to establish a <b>Professional Development Committee</b> , as prescribed by the South African Schools Act of 1986 (people interested in staff development).	5	1
			From this committee, the staff will elect a <b>Staff Development Team</b> (SDT) whose responsibility is to train teachers, oversee, monitor, organise and manage the DAS. Members of the team will be elected based on their ability or potential to perform the task within the SDT. By virtue of his/her position the principal will be part of the SDT, but not necessarily the chairperson or co-ordinator.	5	2
1	Staff meeting	SDT explains developmental appraisal purpose, philosophy, process, forms, management plan, appraisees and appraisal panels.	After electing the <b>SDT</b> , the two staff members who were trained by the Provincial Appraisal or District Appraisal Team, will then <b>train the entire staff</b> at the school.	5	3
2	Staff meeting	The persons to be appraised will be decided.	The staff will, based on sound democratic principles, <b>identify halve of the staff complement to be appraised</b> during the first phase of the appraisal cycle. The other halve will be appraised during the second phase of the cycle.	3	4
3	Panel meeting	The appraisal panel will be formed and their roles within it resolved.	The appraisees will, in consultation with the SDT, <b>establish the rest of the Appraisal Panel</b> . It is advisable to spread the appraisers as widely as possible to avoid the over-burdening of one or a small group of people. It will also assist schools it appraisal panels could be identified for a group of	5	5

			<p>appraisees, if this could be agreed on. The <b>appraisees</b> must be given the opportunity to propose the <b>peer and union representative</b>, while collectively the <b>panel</b> will identify the most <b>appropriate senior and outside person</b>. It must be emphasised that this process is not a 'power play', but a process of consensus.</p>		
			<p>The SDT will complete the list of all the appraisal panels at that school. Collectively, the participants will <b>identify dates for the initial meeting</b> of the panel. It is crucial that appropriate venues be identified for all the appraisal activities.</p>	3	6
			<p>The <b>appraisers</b> will now <b>familiarise themselves</b> with the institution, appraisee and the broader community.</p>	3	7
			<p>The <b>appraisee</b> will do <b>self-assessment</b> in order to facilitate the discussion during the initial meeting. Self-assessment ensures that the appraisee becomes part of the process of appraisal, and not just an 'object' which is under 'investigation'.</p>	5	8
5	Panel meeting 2	<p>The forms filled in by the appraisee are discussed and finalised within an appraisal panel meeting. Also at this meeting the appraisal panel will finalise arrangements for how the appraisal will be conducted, by whom and how the criteria are being understood.</p>	<p>The initial meeting for the appraisal panel will focus on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ a) to elect the chairperson of the panel;</li> <li>■ b) clarify the aims and purposes of appraisal to the entire panel;</li> <li>■ c) to set the tone and direction for the appraisal process by clarifying the roles and responsibilities of both the appraisers and appraisee;</li> <li>■ d) for members to share possible misgivings and problems which might be part of individuals on the panel;</li> <li>■ e) identify who, when and how the data that will be collected for the appraisal interview (at this point, any optional or/and additional criteria</li> </ul>	5	9

			<p>which the appraisee wants to include must be identified in order to facilitate the verification of this data);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ f) identify the information that will be needed from the appraisee, how the information will be used as well as what will be expected from the appraisee during the appraisal interview;</li> <li>■ g) discuss the date for the appraisal interview meeting;</li> <li>■ h) the procedure to be followed;</li> <li>■ i) whether classroom observation will be appropriate in the case of the specific candidate, and if yes, who, when, the nature and how often it will be performed;</li> <li>■ j) the criteria that will be used, taken from the appraisal instrument;</li> <li>■ k) the time-frame of the appraisal process, and;</li> <li>■ l) the repetition of the process if 'agreed statement' cannot be reached.</li> </ul>		
4	On your own	The appraisee fills in the form for Personal Details and the Professional Growth Plan.	The <b>appraisee</b> will complete his/her <b>personal details form</b> . This form will be filed at the institution within the educator's personal folder, which will contain all the relevant teacher development reports. The inclusion of these reports must be discussed with the teacher involved.	1	10
			Copies of the <b>Prioritisation form</b> will be handed to the <b>entire appraisal panel by the SDT</b> . The <b>appraisee</b> alone will complete the <b>first column</b> , and the <b>peer and/or senior</b> will complete the <b>second column</b> . The <b>last column</b> will be completed by the <b>entire appraisal panel</b> , of which the appraisee is part of.	2	11
6		The appraisal is conducted by members of the appraisal team using the criteria decided upon.	Between the initial meeting and the appraisal interview meeting, the <b>SDT will act as the support structure</b> to the appraisal panel, especially with the collection of data by the appraisers and the conduction of the self-appraisal by	3	12

			the appraisee.		
			The <b>appraisee</b> will submit his/her <b>self-appraisal</b> to the appraisal panel (this will be translated onto the first column on the prioritisation form).	5	13
			The <b>appraisers</b> who were identified to do <b>class observation</b> as well as completing the <b>Learners Feedback Questionnaire</b> where agreed (this will be translated onto the second column of the prioritisation form), and <b>data collection</b> will submit the information to the appraisal panel.	5	14
7	Panel meeting 3	The findings of the appraisal are tabled at an appraisal panel meeting.	A <b>professional development conversation</b> will now take place, based on the necessary information at hand (any data under dispute which cannot be verified, must be ignored).	5	15
			It is at this point that an <b>agreed statement</b> (Appraisal Report) will be drafted based on the assessment of the previous year's PGP ( <b>but not during the first cycle of appraisal</b> ).	5	16
			After the panel has agreed on the necessary growth need, the <b>Professional Growth Plan</b> (PGP) will be completed, with the endorsement of the appraisers and appraisee. <b>Time-frames</b> will be built around the implementation of the PGP. In consultation with the SDT, the appraisal panel must ensure that <b>the agreed growth needs should be implementable</b> (whether such developmental agencies are available to develop teacher and whether monies are available where necessary). The <b>appraisee</b> will now <b>implement the PGP</b> , with the support of the SDT.	5	17
8		Other follow-up appraisal may be necessary.	The intention of this follow-up meeting is to <b>assess</b> whether the appraisee has <b>implemented the PGP</b> , or if not, what are the problems surrounding the development.	5	18
9	Panel	If follow-up appraisal were done, then these would be	This <b>meeting must take place during the middle of the second phase</b> in	5	19

	meeting 4	reported back to an appraisal panel meeting.	order to be meaningful to the appraisee.		
			It could also be that the PGP has under-stated the potential development, by which the panel can agree on enriching the PGP by recommending <b>further development</b> .	5	20
10	On your own	The appraisee fills in the Discussion Paper.	It is during this meeting that the <b>discussion paper</b> will be submitted by the appraisee to the appraisal panel.	5	21
11	Panel meeting 5	The Discussion Paper filled in by the appraisee is discussed at an appraisal panel meeting and the appraisal report is finalised and signed. This may happen over two appraisal panel meeting, rather than just one.	The panel will draft the <b>Appraisal Report</b> with the adjusted PGP, where applicable. The appraisee, after implementing the adjustments, will be ready for the <b>next cycle</b> of appraisal.	5	22

## Appendix F

University of Pretoria etd – Gallie, M (2007)

### Average Functionality of CFSS in different sections of the questionnaires

A. School Ethos	32.8
B. Vision, Aims and Strategic Planning	27.5
C. The Principal	38.4
D. The Principal and the Senior Management Team	37.7
E. Structures, Roles and Responsibilities	33.6
F. Decision Making and Communication	64.5
G. Professional Working Relationships	44.0
H. Links with Parents and the Community	36.6
I. The Governing Body and Department of Education	20.5
J. Managing Change	21.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>35.7</b>