

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achinstein, B. 2002. *Community, diversity and conflict among school teachers. The ties that blind*. New York – London: Teachers College Press.

Ancess, J. 2000. June. The reciprocal influence of teacher learning, teaching practice, school restructuring and student learning outcomes. *Teachers College Record*, 102(3), 590-620.

Applefield, J.M., Huber, R. & Moallem, M. 2001, January. Constructivism in theory and practice: Toward a better understanding. *The High School Journal*, 84(2), 35-53.

Archived Information, 1994, September. Systematic Reform: Perspective on Personalized Education.

Ball, D.L.1996, March. Teacher learning and the mathematics reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(7), 500-509.

Ball, D. & Cohen, D. 1996. Reform by the book: What is – or might be – the role of curriculum materials in teacher learning and instructional reform. *Educational Researcher*, 25, 6-14.

Bartlett, S. 2000, March. The development of teacher appraisal: A recent history. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48(1), 24-38.

Beattie, M. 2000. Narratives of professional learning: Becoming a teacher and learning to teach. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 1(2), 1-23.

Bell, B & Gilbert, J. 1996. *Teacher development: A model for science education*. London: Falmer Press.

Biddle, B.J., Good, T.L. & Goodson, I.F. (Eds) 1998. *International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L. & Cocking, R.R. 1999. *Teacher Learning. How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experiences & School*. Washington, DC: Committee on Development in the Science of Learning.

Bredeson, P.V. 2001, July, 26. Negotiated learning: Union contracts and teacher professional development. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(26), 1-23.

Briscoe, C. 1996. The teacher as learner: Interpretations from a case study of teacher change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 28(3), 315-329.

Brown, A. & Campione, J. 1990. Communities of learning and thinking or a context by any other name. *Contributions to Human Development*, 21, 105-126.

Buchanan, J. & Khamis, M. 1999. Teacher renewal, peer observations and the pursuit of best practice. *Issues in Educational Research*, 9(1), 1-14.

Butler, J. 1998. Teacher professional development. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18(2), 221-239.

Calderon, M. 1999, Spring. Teachers learning communities for cooperation in diverse settings. *Theory into practice*, 38(2), 94-100.

Caldwell, B.J. & Spinks, J.M. 1998. *Beyond the self-managing school*. London: Falmer Press.

Carter, K. 1995, July/August. Teaching stories and local understandings. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88(6), 326-334.

Carter, K. & Doyle, W. 1996. Personal narrative and life history in learning to teach. In J. Bittery & E. Guyton (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. 2nd Edition, 120-142. New York: MacMillan.

Chisholm, L. 1999. The democratisation of schools and the politics of teachers' work in South Africa. *Compare*, 29(2), 111-126.

Chisholm, L. 2000, May. A South African Curriculum for the 21st Century. Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005. Pretoria.

Clandinin, D., Kennedy, M & LA Rocque, L. 1996. Living the tension: A case study of teacher stories of teacher evaluation. *Journal of Education Policy*, 11, 169-183.

Clarke, D. & Hollingsworth, H. 2002. Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 947-967.

Clement, M. & Vandenberghe, R. 2000. Teachers' professional development: A solitary or collegial (ad)venture? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 81-101.

Cobb, P. 1994. Where is the mind? Constructivism and socio-cultural perspectives on mathematical development. *Educational Researcher*, 23(7), 13-20.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. 1990. Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher*, 19(2), 2-11.

Cohen, D. 1990. A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs Oublier. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3), 327-345.

Cole, A. 1992, Winter. Teacher development in the work place: Rethinking the appropriation of professional relationships. *Teachers College Record*, 94(2), 365-382.

Confrey, J. 1990. A review of research on student conceptions in mathematics, science and programming. In Cazden, C. (Ed). *Review of Research in Education*. Volume 16, Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Connelly, F. & Clandinin, D. 1990. Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.

Convery, A. 1999, March/April. Listening to teachers; stories: Are we sitting too comfortably? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)*, 12(2), 131-147.

- Cuban, L. 1990. Reforming again, again. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 3-13.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1990. Instructional policy into practice: The power of the bottom over the top. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3), 339-347.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1992. *Standards of practice for learner centered schools*. New York: National Center for Restructuring Schools and Learning.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1997. School reform at the crossroads: Confronting the central issues of teaching. *Educational Policy*, 11(2), 151-166.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1998, February. Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 6-12.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1998. Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a National Commission Report. *Educational Researcher*, 27, 5-15.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1999. Reshaping teaching policy, preparation and practice: Influences of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & McLaughlin, M. 1995. Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597-604.
- Darling-Hammond, L & McLaughlin, M. 1999. Investing in teaching as a learning profession: Policy problems and prospects. In Darling-Hammond, L. & Sykes, G. Teaching as the learning profession: *Handbook of Policy and Practice*, 376-411, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass..
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Sykes, G. 1999. *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dass, P. M. 1998, April. Professional development of science teachers' results of using Iowa Chautauqua model in Collier County, Florida. Paper presented at the

National Association for Research in Science Teaching Annual Conference: San Diego, California.

Dean, J. 1991. *Professional development in school: Developing teachers and teaching*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

deClerq, F. 1997. Policy invention and power shifts: An evaluation of South Africa's education restructuring policies. *Journal of Education Policy*, 12(3), 127-146.

Department of Education, 1995. *White Paper on Education and Training*, Government Gazette vol.357, no. 16312, 15 March 1996, Notice 196 of 1995. Pretoria.

Department of Education. 1996. *National Education Policy Act No 27*. Pretoria.

Department of Education. 1997. *Norms and Standards for Educators*. Pretoria.

Department of Education, 1998. *Developmental Appraisal for Educators*. Pretoria.

Department of Education. 1998. *Norms and Standards for School Funding*. Pretoria.

Department of Education, 2003, April 10. *Protocol and instrument for use for Whole-School Evaluation and Developmental Appraisal System*. Collective Agreement Number 3. Education Labour Relations Council. Pretoria.

Department of Education, 2003. *Strategic Plan: 2003-2005. Statement of policy and commitment by The Ministry of Education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Doug, G. 1997, Spring. Bifocals for teacher development and appraisal. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12, 269-281.

Down, B., Chadbourne, R. & Hogan, C. 2000, November. How are teachers managing performance management? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(3), 213-223.

Drake, C., Spillane, J.P. & Hufferd-Ackles, K. 2001. Storied identities: Teacher learning and subject matter context. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 33(1), 1-23.

Duke, D.L. & Stiggins, R.J. 1991. Beyond minimum competence: Evaluation for professional development. In Millman, J & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds). *Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers*, 116-132. California: Corwin Press Inc.

Dunkin, M.J. & Biddle, B.J. 1974. *The study of teaching*. Holt Rhinehart: New York.

Elmore, R.F. 1995, December. Structural reform and educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, 24(9), 23-26.

Elmore, R. 1996. Getting to scale with good education practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 1-26.

Elmore, R.F. & Burney, D. 1997, August. Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement in community school district # 2, New York City. Consortium for Policy Research in Education and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. New York: Teachers College.

Epstein, J.L., Lockard, B.L & Dauber, S.L. 1998. Staff development policies needed in the middle grades. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Eraut, M. 1994. *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Falmer Press.

Evans, A. & Tomlinson, J. 1989. *Teacher appraisal: A nationwide approach*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Evans, L. 2002. What is teacher development? *Oxford Review of Education*, 28(1), 123-137.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Fishman, B., Best, S., Marx, R. & Tal. R.T. 2001. Fostering teacher learning in systemic reform: Linking professional development to teacher and student learning. Paper presented at NARST. St Louis, MO.

Firestone, W.A. & Pennell, J.R. 1995. State-Run Teacher networks: Capacity building and policy supporting approaches. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2001. *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Foulds, S. 2002, November. Teacher development challenges in the context of curricular reform: The case of South Africa. *Cyber Text*. 1-9.

Fullan, M.G. 1991. *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M.G. 1995. The limits and potential of professional development. In Guskey, T.R. & Huberman, M. (Eds.). *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*, 1-6. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M.G. 1997. *The culture of school change*. Cheltenham: Hawker Brownlow.

Fullan, M.G. & Miles, M.B. 1992. Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73, 377-405.

Fuller, B. & Snyder, C.W. 1991. Vocal teachers, silent pupils? Life in Botswana classrooms. *Comparative Education Review*, 35(2), 274-294.

Garet, M.S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L., Birman, B.F. & Suk Yoon, K. 2001. What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., van den Berg, R. & Kelchtermans, G. 2001, February. Conditions fostering implementation of large-scale innovation programs in schools: Teacher perspectives. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 37(1), 130-166.

Gitlin, A. & Margonis, F. 1995. The political aspect of reform: Teacher resistance as good sense. *American Journal of Education*, 103, 377-405.

Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J. 1989. *Teacher evaluation: Educative alternatives*. London: The Falmer Press.

Goodson, I (Ed). 1992. *Studying teachers' lives*. London: Routledge.

Gray, B. 1999. Towards sustainable support for professional development of rural teachers. Proceedings of the 7th Annual SAARMSE Conference, 174-179, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Greeno, J., Collins, A. & Resnick, L. 1996. Cognition and learning. In Berliner, D. & Calfee, R. (Eds.). *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, 15-46. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gunter, H.M. 2002, February, 01. Teacher appraisal 1988-1998: A case study. *School Leadership & Management*. 22(1), 61-72.

Guskey, T.R. 1995. *Results – oriented professional development: In search of an optimal mix of effective practices. Research on professional development*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Guskey, T.R. & Huberman, M. (Eds) 1995. *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. 1994. *Changing teachers, changing times*. London: Cassell.

Hargreaves, A. 1995. Development and desire: A postmodern perspective. In Guskey, T.R. & Huberman, M. (Eds) *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Perspectives*, 9-34. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. 1998. The emotions of teaching and educational change. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, E., Fullan, M & Hopkins, D. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Educational Change*, 558-575. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hargreaves, A & Goodson, I.F. 1996. *Teachers' professional lives*. London: Falmer Press.

Heck, R.H, Brandon, P.R. & Wang, J. 2001, May. Implementing site-managed educational changes: Examining levels of implementation and effect. *Educational Policy*, 15(2), 302-322.

Hopkins, D. & Howard, J. 1991. Teacher appraisal, professional development and school improvement: A case study. *School Organization*, 11(1), 1-14.

Houghton, M. & Goren, P. 1995. *Professional development for educators: New state priorities and models*. Washington, D.C: National Governors' Association.

Huberman, M., Grounauer, M. & Marti, J. 1993. *The lives of teachers*. London: Cassell.

Humphreys, K. 1992. "I must be crackers". Teacher self-appraisal for professional development: Reflections based on a case study of a group of teachers. *School Organization*, 12(2), 115-126.

Ingvarson, L. & Chadbourne, R. 1997. Will appraisal cycles and performance management lead to improvement in teaching? *Unicorn*, 23, 44-64.

Iwanicki, E.F. 1991. Teacher Evaluation for School Improvement. In Millman, J. & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.). *Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers*, 158-175. California: Corwin Press Inc.

Jansen, J.D. 1999. Lessons learned (And not learned) from the OBE experience. University of Durban Westville, South Africa.

Jansen, J.D. 2001. Explaining non-change in education reform after apartheid: Political symbolism and the problem of policy implementation. In Sayed, Y. & Jansen, J.D. (Eds.). *Implementing Educational Policies: The South African Experience*, 271-293. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Jansen, J.D. 2001. The race for education policy after apartheid. In Sayed, Y. & Jansen, J.D. (Eds.). *Implementing Educational Policies: A South African Experience*, 12-24. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Jansen, J.D. 2001. Image-ining teachers: Policy images and teacher identity in South African classrooms. *South African Journal of Education*, 28(3), 321-331.

Jantjies, E.M. 1996. Performance based teacher appraisal: From judgement to development. *South African Journal of Education*, 16(1), 50-57.

Jessop, T.S. and Penny, A.J. 1999. A story behind a story: developing strategies for making sense of teacher narratives. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2 (3), 213-230.

Johnson, S.M. 1990. *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools*. New York: Basic Books.

Johnson, S., Monk, M. & Hodges, M. 2000, June. Teacher development and change in South Africa: A critique of the appropriateness of transfer of northern/western practice. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 30(2), 179-193.

Kagan, D. 1991. Narrative semiotics and teachers' beliefs regarding the relevance of formal learning theory to classroom practice: A United States study. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 17(3), 245-266.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Kelchtermans, G. & Vandenberghe, R. 1994. Teachers' professional development: A biographical perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 26(1), 45-62.

Kelchtermans, G. 2000. Reflective learning from biography and content. Teachers Develop Teachers Research, Conference Report. Whitstable, Kent: IATEFL.

Kelchtermans, G. 2004. Moving beyond knowledge for practice: Research on continuing professional development. In Day, C. & Sachs, J. *International Handbook on Continuing Professional Development of Teachers*, 1-20. London: Open University Press.

Kirtman, L. 2002, May, 8. Policy and practice: Restructuring teachers' work. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(25), 1-24.

Knapp, M., Bambury, J., Ferguson, M. & Hill, P. 1998. Converging reforms and the working lives of frontline professional schools. *Educational Policy*, 12(4), 397-418.

Lamon, M. 1999, April. Finding theory in practice: Collaborative networks for professional learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association on Knowledge Building in Diverse Contexts: Challenges for Teaching, Design and Teacher Education. Montreal, Canada.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, T. & Peasah, K. 2002, January. An investigation of the instructional thoughts, beliefs, and preferences of selected HRD practitioners. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 35(2), 6-29.

Lieberman, A 1995, April. Practices that support teacher development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 591-601.

Lieberman, A. 1998. The growth of educational change as a field of study: Understanding its roots and branches. In Hargreaves, A; Lieberman, A; Fullan, M &

Hopkins, D. *International Handbook of Educational Change*, 13-20. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Little, J.W. 1990. The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record*, 9(4), 509-536.

Little, J.W. 1990. The mentor phenomenon and social organization of teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 16, 297-351.

Livingstone, D.W. 1999. Reproducing educational inequalities in a learning society: Conceptual gaps and recent Canadian research on barriers to adult education. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Learning*, 13(2).

Lohman, M.C. & Woolf, N.H. 1998, Spring/Summer. Toward a culture of teacher learning in the public schools: A human resource perspective. *Teaching and Change*, 5(3/4), 276-293.

Lunenburg, F.C. 2000, September. Revolution in the teaching profession. *College Student Journal*, 32(3), 400-405.

Lynn, S., Walsdorf, K. & Woods, A. 2003, April. Teacher change and stages of development: One teacher's journey from preservice education to mid-career. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual meeting. Chicago, Illinois.

Martin, D.R. 1996. Preparation and evaluation of three video cases in science teacher education. AETS Conference Proceedings.

Martin, D.S., Craft, A.R. & Tillema, H.H. 2002. Developing critical and creative thinking strategies in primary school pupils: An inter-cultural study of teachers' learning. *Journal of In-service Education*, 28(1), 115-134.

Matson, E. & Harley, K. 2000. *Teacher identities and strategic mimicry in the policy/practice gap*. Unpublished.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

McInnis, C. 2000. Changing academic work roles: The everyday realities challenging quality in teaching. *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), 143-152.

McLaughlin, M.W. 1990. Rand change agent study revisited. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9), 11-15.

McLaughlin, M.W. 1998. Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementation and situated practice. In Hargreaves, A; Lieberman, A; Fullan, M & Hopkins, D (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*, 70-84. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McLaughlin, M. & Oberman, J. 1996. *Teacher learning: New policies, new practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M.W. & Talbert, J.E. 1993. Contexts that matter for teaching and learning: Strategic opportunities for meeting the nation's educational goals. Stanford University, Centre for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. 1993. *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. 3rd Edition. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Merchant, B. 1995, Spring. Current Educational Reform: "Shape-Shifting" or genuine improvement in the quality of teaching and learning. *Educational Theory*, 45(2), 1-17.

Merseth, K.K. 2001. Cases, case methods and the professional development of educators. *Eric Digest Number*, 95(5), 1-4. Eric Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, Washington DC.

Miles, B.M. 1998. Finding Keys to School Change: A 40-Year Odyssey. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., Hopkins, D (Eds.). *International Handbook of Educational Change*, 37-69. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Moir, E. & Gless, J. 2001, Winter. Quality induction: An investment in teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 109-114.

Mortimore, P. & Mortimore, J. 1991. Teacher appraisal: Back to the future. *School Organization*, 11(2), 125-143.

Mulford, B. 1998. Organizational learning and educational change. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., Hopkins, D. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Educational Change*, 616-641. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Newmann, F.M. & Associates. 1996. *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nias, J. 1998. Why teachers need their colleagues: A developmental perspective. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds). 1998. *International Handbook of Educational Change*, 1257-1271. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Nicholls, G. 1998. Professional development, teaching and lifelong learning: Is there a connection? Paper presented at the 28th Annual SCUTREA Conference on Research, Teaching and Learning: Making Connections in the Education of Adults. Guildford, U.K. 3rd July, 1998.

Niikko, A. 2000. How do different theories and theoretical models describe teacher's development? Paper in towards new approaches in international learning conference. 31 July-2 August, Savonlinna, Finland.

Norris, K. 1998. Professional growth: New approaches indicating change in the culture of schools. Paper presented at the Joseph Klingenstein Foundation.

North West Department of Education, 2003. Annual Report of 2002/2003. Mafikeng.

North West Department of Education, 2003. Developmental Appraisal System. Report presented at the Quality Assurance Colloquium, held on 25-26 September, 2003.

Olivero, J.L. 1993. Linking school improvement, teacher performance, assessment and development. *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education*, 7, 203-265.

Orlich, D.C. 1989. *Enhancing human potential*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Pea, R. 1993. Practices of distributed intelligence and designs for education. In Solomon, G. (Ed.). *Distributed Cognition: Psychological and Educational Considerations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, P., McCarthy, S. & Elmore, R. 1996, Spring. Learning from school restructuring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(1), 119-153.

Pintrich, P.R., Marx, R.W. & Boyle, R.A. 1993. Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 167-200.

Poster, C. & Poster, D. 1997. The nature of appraisal. In Kydd, L., Crawford, M. & Riches, C. *Professional development for educational management*, 148-156. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Putnam, R. & Borko, H. 1998. Teacher Learning: Implications for new ideas of cognition. In Biddle, B.J., Good, T.L. & Goodson, I.F. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching*, 1223-1296. Dordrecht: Kluwe Academic Publishers.

Redmann, D.H., Lambrecht, T.J. & Stitt-Gohdes, W.L. 2000, Summer. The critical incident technique: A tool for qualitative research. *Delta P; Epsilon Journal*, 42(3), 132-145.

Richardson, V. 1996. The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In Sakula, J., Buttery, T. & Guyton, E. (Eds). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, 102-119. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Richardson, V. 1999. Teacher education and the construction of meaning. In Griffin, G. (Ed.). *Teacher Education for a New Century: Emerging Perspectives, Promising Practices and Future Possibilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Richardson, V. & Placier, P. 2001. Teacher change. In Richardson, V. (Ed), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. 4th Edition, 905-947. Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Renyi, J. 1996. Teachers take charge of their learning: Transforming professional development for student success. Washington, DC: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 251.

Resnick, L. 1991. Shared cognition: Thinking as social practice. In Resnick, L., Levine, J. & Teasley, S. (Eds). *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, 1-20. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rogan, M.J. & Grayson, D.J. 2001, July. Towards a theory of curriculum implementation with particular reference to science education in developing countries. Article submitted for publication to the *International Journal of Science Education*.

Russell, T. & Bullock, S. 1999. Discovering our professional knowledge as teachers: Critical dialogues about learning from experience. Prepared for J. Longhran (Ed). *Researching Teaching*, 132-151. London: Falmer Press.

SADTU, 2001. Memorandum of grievance on school funding policy. Submitted on 21 June 2001 to the North West Department of Education.

Salisbury, D.F. Conner, D.R. 1994. How to succeed as a manager of an educational change project. *Educational Technology*, 34(6), 12-19.

Sayed, Y. & Jansen, J.D. 2001. *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Schon, D.A. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: How professional think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D.A. 1987. *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scribner, J.P. 1999. Professional development: Untangling the influence of work context on teacher learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(2), 238-266.

Scribner, J.P. 2003, March, 27. Teacher learning in context: The special case of rural high school teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(12), <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n12>.

Shavelson, R.J. & Stern, P. 1981. Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgements, decisions and behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(4), 455-498.

Shaw, K.L., Davis, N.T., Sadani-Tabbaa, A. & McCarthy, B.J. 1990. *A Model of Teacher Change*. Paper presented at the Fourteenth International Psychology of Mathematics Education Conference, Mexico City, Mexico.

Shrinfield, A. & Stufflebean, D. 1995. *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Shulman, L.S. 1986. Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

Shulman, J.H. 1992. (Ed). *Case methods in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shulman, L.S. 1996. Just in case: Reflections on learning from experience. In Colbert, J.A; Desberg, P & Trimble, K (Eds.) *The case for education: Contemporary approaches for using case methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Siegel, M. 2002. Models of teacher learning: A study of case analyses by pre-service teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1-5.

Smylie, M. 1995. Teacher learning in the workplace: Implications for school reform. In Guskey, G. & Huberman, M. (Eds.). *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices*, 92-113. London: Teachers College Press.

Smyth, J. 1996. Evaluation of teacher performance: move over hierarchy, here comes collegiality. *Journal of Education Policy*, 11, 185-196.

Smyth, J. & Shacklock, G. 1998. *Remaking teaching ideology, policy and practice*. London: Routledge.

Somers, M. 1994. The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23, 605-649.

Sparks, D. & Loucks-Horsley, S. 1990. Models of staff development. In Houston, W.R., Haberman, M. & Sikula, J. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, 234-250. New York: MacMillan.

Spillane, J.P. 1994. How districts mediate between state policy and teachers' practice. In Elmore, R.F. & Fuhrman, S.H. (Eds.). *The governance of curriculum*, 107-185. Washington, D.C: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Spillane, J.P. 2002, April. Local theories of teacher change: The Pedagogy of district policies and programs. *Teachers College Record*, 104(3), 377-420.

Stout, R.T. 1996, February. Staff development policy: Fuzz choices in an imperfect market. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 4(2), 1-16.

Sudzina, M.R. 1999. *Case study applications for teacher education: Cases of teaching and learning in the context areas*. 1st Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Swartz, R. 1994. School Management Teacher Development and Support. Proceedings of a conference held at Eskom Centre, Midrand, South Africa.18-19 August.

Sykes, G. 1996. Reform of and as professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(7), 464-468.

Sykes, G. 1999. Teacher and student learning: strengthening their connection. In Sykes, G. (Ed). *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*, 151- 179. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Talbert, J. & McLaughlin, M. 1994. Teacher professionalism in local school contexts. *American Journal of Education*,102, 123-153.

Thompson, C.L. & Zeuli, J.S. 1999. The frame and tapestry: Standards-based reform and professional development. In Sykes, G (Ed). *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*, 341-375. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W.G. 2000. Beyond translation: Truth and Rigoberta Menchu. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(2), 103-113.

Tillemma, H.H. & Knol, W.E. 1997. Promoting student teacher learning through conceptual change or direct instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 579-595.

Tobin, K. & Jakubowski, E. 1990. Cognitive process and teacher change. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Valentine, J.W. 1992. *Principles and practices for effective teacher evaluation*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Valentine, J.W. 1994. Performance based developmental evaluation for teachers. Columbia. Missouri: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education: Leadership Academy.

Valentine, J.W. & Harting, R.D. 1994. Performance based teacher evaluation in Missouri: A three-year report. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, Department of Educational Administration.

Valero, P. & Vithal, R. 1999, December. Research methods of the “North” revisited from the “South”. *Perspectives in Education*, 18(2), 1-12.

Van den Berg, R. & Ros, A. 1999. The permanent importance of the subjective reality of teachers during educational innovation: A concerns-based approach. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36(4), 879-906.

Van den Berg, R. & Slegers, P. 1996. Building innovative capacity and leadership. In Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P.H & Hart, A (Eds). *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, 653-699. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vithal, R. 1998. Disruptions and data: The politics of doing mathematics research in South Africa. Proceedings of the 6th Annual Meeting of the Southern African Association for Research in Mathematics and Science Education. Pretoria: Unisa.

Vithal, R. 2002. Crucial descriptions: Talking back to theory and practice in mathematics education through research. University of Durban-Westville, South Africa. 1-12.

Walsh, K. 1991. Rethinking appraisal and assessment. *Educational Review*, 3(1), 1-12.

Webb, K. 1996. I have left my classroom. Why? Systematic denial of teachers' knowledge. *Teachers and Teaching*, 2, 299-313.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

WestEd, 1997, September. Teaching cases: New approaches to teacher education and staff development. A Program that Supports the Development and Use of Cases in Education. <http://www.wested.org>

Wedekind, V., Lubisi, C., Harley, K. & Gultig, J. 1996. Political change, social integration and curriculum: A South African case study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 28(4), 419-436.

Wills, C. 1995. Voice of Inquiry: Possibilities and perspectives. *Childhood education Annual Theme*, 261-265.

Wilson, A.L. 1993, Spring. The promise of situated cognition. *New directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 57, 71-79.

Wilson, T.D. 2003. Review of Gubrium, J.F. & Holsten, J.A. (Eds.). Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. Thousand OAKS, CA: Sage, 2002. *Information Research*, 8(3), Review no. R088, 1-7.

Windschitl, M. 1999, April. A vision educators can put into practice: Portraying the constructivist classroom as a cultural system. *School Science and Mathematics*, 99(4), 189-196.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W. & Bernstein, H. 1984. *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices*. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation.

Wolf, J., Lung, G., Monit, L.L. & VanBelle-Prouty, D. 1999. Where policy hits the ground. Policy implementation processes in Malawi and Namibia. US-AID.

Wolf, R.M. 1999. *The validity of reliability of outcomes: Measures*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wood, F.H. & Thompson, S.R. 1993. Assumptions about staff development based on research and best practice. *Journal of Staff Development*, 14(4), 52-57.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Yin, R.K. 1994. *Case study research: Design and methods*. 2nd Edition. California: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A

Enquiries: MA Mokoena
Telephone: 018 – 3892080
Fax No: 018 389 2415
E-Mail: mokoenam@uniwest.ac.za

8 Rugby Street
Mafikeng
2745

16th May 2002

Quality Assurance Directorate
Department of Education
North West Province

ATTENTION: Mr. I.S. Molale

**REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AROUND SCHOOLS IN THE
NORTH WEST PROVINCE FOR DOCTORAL STUDIES**

With reference to the above-mentioned issue, I hereby request your office to grant me permission to conduct research in the North West Province. The topic of the study is **“THE EFFECTS OF DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL POLICY ON TEACHER LEARNING”**.

I do commit myself to be ethical and professional during the period of my interaction with the schools for obtaining information.

Yours sincerely

.....
MA Mokoena

APPENDIX B

A CONSENT FORM

Data collection for the study

Kindly be informed that I obtained written permission from the Chief Directorate Quality Assurance to conduct research for my studies i.e. Doctoral Degree. The study is on the Implementation of DAS Policy in Schools. You are therefore requested to participate in this study of policy implementation. The following details are provided for you to make a decision to participate:

- Should you willingly decide to take part, your involvement will be in the semi-structured interview, maintaining a diary, writing a critical incident report and a free writing schedule. With your agreement, I will use a recording device for the interaction together with a notepad for the purpose of getting accurate information. Furthermore, I will ensure that your name and that of your school are not disclosed.
- Your participation in this research will be highly appreciated. Please note that I conduct the research as a doctoral student in the University of Pretoria.
- Having read the contents of this communication, you are requested to attach your signature as proof of consent. If you have any other problems or information pertaining to any studies, feel free to contact me at the address or telephone number given below as follows:

Ms MA Mokoena
University of North West
Faculty of Education
P/Bag X2046
Mmabatho
2735

8 Rugby Street
Riviera Park
Mafikeng
2745

Tel: 018 – 3892080
Cell 0726341056

APPENDIX C1

TEACHER FREE WRITING SCHEDULE

Dear Teacher: Please write down your responses to each of the following questions. Please write down whatever you think or feel is an appropriate answer to each question.

1. What is your understanding of the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS)?

2. In your view, what was the Developmental Appraisal System as a policy responding to (or, Why was DAS necessary)?

3. What in your opinion are the main goals of the DAS policy?

4. What do you regard as the main challenges facing the implementation of DAS?

5. What opportunities (if any), do you think DAS provides for teacher learning and development?

APPENDIX C2

TEACHER BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

The purpose is to explore teachers' professional biography. The information teachers provide will be treated with absolute confidentiality and will be used for research purposes only.

PART A

FILL IN OR CROSS THE APPROPRIATE OPTION

1. Designation of teacher

Teacher level	Principal	Deputy - Principal	Head of Department	Other (Specify)
1	2	3	4	5

2. Main teaching subject area

Commerce	Humanities	Maths/Science	Technical/Skills	Languages	Other (Specify)
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Age

Under 25	25 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 59
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Teaching experience in years

0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
1	2	3	4

5. Gender

Male	Female
1	2

6. Formal qualifications (completed)

2 year Diploma Only	3 year Diploma only	Degree only	Degree and Diploma	More than one degree	Other (Specify)
1	2	3	4	5	6

7. Type of school

Primary	Middle	Secondary/High
1	2	3

8. Description of school

Urban	Rural	Farm
1	2	3

APPENDIX C3

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The purpose of this schedule is to elicit teachers' understanding on Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) policy and to establish how these understandings influenced their learning, which may contribute to changes in classroom practice during the implementation of the policy in the school context.

Before the appraisal process

1. What experiences did you have of teacher appraisal or teacher evaluation before DAS?

- What did those earlier experiences of appraisal mean to you?
- How did they affect your work?
- In what way did they contribute / not to your development as a teacher?

2. What is your understanding of DAS?

- What does it mean to you?
- Did it broaden your understanding of appraisal?
- In what way did it change you?

3. The DAS policy states that DAS is to bring about teacher effectiveness and professional development. What do you understand by teacher effectiveness and professional development?

4. What do you regard as the major problems facing the implementation of DAS?

Self – Appraisal

5. What does self – appraisal mean to you?

6. Did you receive any training for the process of self – appraisal?

- If yes, by whom and for how long?
- When and where was the training?
- Describe the nature of the training received
- How useful was the training in preparing you for the process of self – appraisal?

7. Did the process of self – appraisal affect your work?

- Did it change your teaching?

- Did it assist in your development?
- What difficulties did you experience?
- What specifically did you learn as a result of the self-appraisal?

After the Self – Appraisal

9. What actually happened during the process of self – appraisal?
 - Principal conducted classroom observations
 - Specially prepared lessons were presented
10. What are the effects of what happened during the self – appraisal phase?
 - Teachers began to prepare more seriously for panel appraisal
 - Some teachers became motivated/ de-motivated

Peer Appraisal

10. What did peer appraisal mean to you?
11. What kind of preparation did you receive for the process of peer appraisal?
12. Did the process of peer appraisal affect your work?
 - Did it change your teaching?
 - Did it assist in your development?
 - What difficulties did you experience?

After Peer Appraisal

13. What happened during the process of peer appraisal?
14. What specifically did you learn as a result of peer appraisal?

Appraisal by Panel Members

15. What did appraisal by panel members mean to you?
16. Did you receive any training in preparation for appraisal by panel members?
 - If yes, by whom and for how long?
 - When and where was the training?
 - Describe the nature of the training received
 - How useful was the training in preparing you for the appraisal by the panel?
17. Did you receive sufficient support from your colleagues/principal/governing body/ in preparation for the process?
18. Did the appraisal by the panel affect your work?
 - Did it change your teaching?
 - Did it assist in your development?
 - What difficulties did you experience?

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

- What specifically did you learn as a result of the panel appraisal?

After the appraisal by panel members

19. What happened during the appraisal by panel members?
20. How did you feel about the review that you had to complete in preparation for the post appraisal meeting?
21. What was said with regard to the focus areas during the oral report stage?
22. How did you feel during the period following the appraisal, waiting to receive the formal report?
23. How useful were the comments received from the formal report?
 - What are your views with regard to the issues raised by the panel members?
 - Lack of comfort or knowledge of DAS, how did it constrain your ability to use it as a site for teaching and learning (too abstract/too confusing)?
24. How did the comments from the panel impact on your learning as a teacher?

APPENDIX C4

TEACHER DIARIES

The purpose of the diary is to capture teachers' understanding of the Developmental Appraisal System as a policy and how the policy might have influenced their learning. Teachers are requested to maintain a (weekly) diary where they note the successes, failures, concerns, thoughts etc experienced as they are exposed to the implementation of DAS.

TEACHER DAIRY COMPOSITION AND CONSTRUCTION

The process of Developmental Appraisal System has the following phases: preparation phase for appraisal; self-appraisal, peer appraisal, appraisal by panel members and post appraisal by panel members

GUIDELINES

- You are requested to keep a diary for each of the 5 phases of the Developmental Appraisal System
- You are expected to make entries for each phase: one before, one during, one after each phase event (see diagram)
- Each diary entry must be 3-5 pages long

		before	during	after
Entries	Phase	1	2	3
ONE	Preparation for Appraisal	1	2	3
TWO	Self-Appraisal	1	2	3
THREE	Peer Appraisal	1	2	3
FOUR	Appraisal by Panel Members	1	2	3
FIVE	Post Appraisal by Panel Members	1	2	3

- Guiding questions for the “entries” per phase are provided below
- It is expected that your diary entries will focus on these questions

- It is important that you report on your conversations with others, your observations, and personal reflections of the processes as they unfolded. Emphasis should be on how these might have influenced your learning, and development as a teacher and led to changes in classroom practice.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR ENTRIES PER PHASE

Phase One: Preparation for appraisal

- What training has been received for doing/participating in the preparation for appraisal? (When; duration; nature of training)?
- How did participation in formal professional development workshops on DAS assist in acquiring knowledge useful to both classroom practice and professional development?
- How did collaboration or interaction with other teachers during the preparatory workshops reinforce your learning and allowed you to reflect on own practice?
- How did the workshop sessions reflect the ways you learn and improve practice?
- How does your own learning compare with the official rhetoric of DAS?
- When were you informed about the appraisal (who informed you (staff), by what means?
- What were your expectations about DAS?
- Is there an implementation plan to inform teachers who will be appraised?
- How did you prepare for it?
- What staff room discussions surfaced during that time? What were the effects on you?
- What did you as a teacher learn during the preparatory phase for appraisal?

Phase Two: Self-Appraisal

- How did you prepare for self-appraisal?
- What discussions surfaced during that time?

- How often are you expected to engage in the process?
- What did you learn during and after the processes?

Phase Three: Peer Appraisal

- How did you prepare for peer appraisal?
- What discussions surfaced during that time?
- How often are you expected to engage in the process?
- What did you as a teacher learn during the process of peer appraisal?

Phase Four: Appraisal by Panel Members

- Describe the panel members (size, areas of expertise etc)
- What was the duration of the appraisal?
- What staff room discussions surfaced during that time and how did they affect you?
- What were the challenges that were experienced during and after the process?
- How did they contribute to your development as a teacher?
- How did you feel about DAS as a policy considering or not considering context or implications for teaching and learning?
- What specifically did you learn during the appraisal by panel members?

Phase Five: Post Appraisal by Panel Members

- In what way did the appraisal by panel enable you to think about different teaching strategies/change in approach to communicate with learners/assist you in strengthening relationship with learners and colleagues?
- To what extent have you managed to improve your skills?
- How did the school environment/work context and DAS influence your development and professional self?

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

- How did the appraisal assist you to relate your learning to your work?
- In what way did they make it possible for you to access resources, which could improve or strengthen your learning?
- What have been the most difficult problems you have had to cope with during that period?
- Is there anything you need that could help you develop and become more effective?
- How do you feel about DAS policy considering context and or implications for teaching and learning?
- What did you as a teacher learn during the post appraisal by panel members?

NB: *A template will be used for each phase of DAS*

TEACHER DIARY FOR DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

PHASE ONE: PREPARATION FOR APPRAISAL
Entry number:.....
Date:.....
Day:.....
Time:.....

TEACHER REFLECTIONS

APPENDIX C5

CRITICAL INCIDENT REPORT

The purpose of the Critical Incident Report (CIR) is to determine how the Developmental Appraisal System as a policy influenced teachers' development and the way they learn and its effect on classroom practice. Teachers are requested to write critical incident reports of the process of DAS as it unfolded. These will be in-depth descriptions of specific events or experiences in order to gain an understanding of their thoughts, feelings and behaviours.

GUIDELINES FOR TEACHERS

- You are requested to write a 2-3 page “report” on a **critical incident** in DAS
- Please write a full description on **one significant or important experience or event (positive or negative)** that influenced your **learning** and **development** as a teacher during the implementation of DAS
- Describe the experience or event in terms of circumstances before the experience or event, what exactly happened and how it affected you and what was the outcome or result, especially in terms of **your** learning as a teacher
- Provide instances of learning for you as a teacher that had really made a difference.

NB: Different numbers will be used for different teachers

TEACHER ‘CRITICAL INCIDENT REPORT’ FOR DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Entry number: 1A

Date:.....

Day:.....

APPENDIX C5

CRITICAL INCIDENT REPORT (ADDENDUM)

This is a story of your experiences with Developmental Appraisal System.

CRITICAL EVENTS

- Concentrate on a few key events that may stand out in your story. This may be an important episode in your experiences with DAS. Please write about **three** specific events *(see 1, 2, and 3).
- Describe each event/experience in detail, e.g. what happened, where were you, who were involved, what you did, and what were you thinking and feeling during the event. How did the event affect you as a person and as a teacher?

EVENT 1: PEAK EXPERIENCE

- **A peak experience would be a high point in your story about DAS. It may be positive emotions, or something uplifting.**
- **Describe the event**
- **What did you learn from the experience?**
- **How did it affect your classroom practice?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX D

FORMS

NAME	PURPOSE	COMPLETED BY
Personal Details Form	Record of personal particulars, qualifications, teaching/management/other experience.	Appraisee
Needs Identification and Prioritisation Form	Self-appraisal Other Panel Members Appraisal Panel Appraisal	Appraisee Other Panel Members Panel
Professional Growth Plan (PGP) Form	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.	Finalised in Panel
Discussion Paper	To review successes/difficulties of PGP in this cycle.	Panel
Appraisal Report	A signed record of the entire appraisal process for the cycle, including identified needs, strengths and development plan	Appraisee and appraisal panel members

PERSONAL DETAILS

Surname	
First Name	
Employing Department	
Persal Number	
Name of Institution	
Rank/Post Level	
Nominal Date of Appointment	
Type of Appraisal:	
Probation	
In-service Development	

Qualifications				
Qualification(s) Certificates	Where obtained (Institution)	When obtained (Year)	Major learning area(s) Direction(s)	Secondary learning area(s) (at least second year courses)

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

Learning area	Grade

Other relevant certificates / diplomas / credits			
Certificates / Credits	Where obtained	When obtained	Content and nature of qualification

Teaching experience			
Period (Dates)	Department / Institution / School / Other	Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)	

Management and administration experience			
Period (Dates)	Department / Institution / School / Other	Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)	

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

Non-teaching experience			
Period (Dates)		Department / Institution / School / Other	Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)

NEEDS IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITISATION FORM FOR PL1 EDUCATORS

CRITERIA	SYMBOLS A or B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rating by appraisee, 2 identified appraisers and members of the panel - Needs identification - Prioritize the identified needs in the order of importance for the PGP 		
1. CORE	APPRAISE	PEER/HOD/ DP/PRIN	PANEL
1.1 Curriculum development			
1.2 Creation of a learning environment			
1.3 Lesson presentation and methodology			
1.4 Classroom management			
1.5 Learner assessment			
1.6 Recording and analyzing data			
1.7 Development of learning field competency			
1.8 Professional development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies			
1.9 Human Relations			
1.10 Leadership			
1.11 Community			
1.12 Extra-curricular work			
1.13 Contribution to school development			
2. OPTIONAL			

3. ADDITIONAL			
MOTIVATION FOR CHANGING CORE CRITERIA TO OPTIONAL CRITERIA			

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN (PGP)

This section is to be completed by the appraisee and finalized 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

	PERIOD
OBJECTIVES	
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITES	
RESOURCES NEEDED	
KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	

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 backlog 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 / departmental officials?

8. Are there any other general matters you would like to discuss? E.g. factors affecting your work? Refer to Contextual Factors

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: _____

APPENDIX E

PROTOCOL AND INSTRUMENT FOR USE WHEN OBSERVING EDUCATORS IN PRACTICE FOR THE PURPOSE OF WHOLE SCHOOL EVALUATION (WSE) AND DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM (DAS)

PROTOCOL

The Protocol is a set of step-by-step processes and procedures to be followed in order to harmonize both the internal and external evaluation for the purpose of DAS and WSE. This protocol should be read and applied in conjunction with WSE and DAS policies.

PLANNING AND TIMING

It is advisable that departments and schools establish a procedure that allows schools to prepare their programmes during external evaluation. There should be adequate time given to schools, through giving them notices of external evaluations as early as possible. This will assist schools to make sure the two processes coincide.

Process A: Internal Appraisal and Evaluations

Step 1

The District and principal of a school should facilitate the establishment of DAS structures in the school and its implementation.

Step 2

Self-appraisal of individual educators should take place before any lesson observation of educators in practice.

Step 3

Lesson observation of educators in practice for purposes of both DAS and WSE must coincide to utilize human resources and time efficiently. The Principal, the School Management Team (SMT) and the Staff Development Team (SDT), in consultation with staff members, develop an implementation plan for lesson observation of educators in practice as required by these two processes. This implementation plan must indicate clearly who should be evaluated/appraisal, by whom and when. This

information must be reflected in the school composite timetable well in advance of implementation.

Step 4

The DAS panelist observes the lesson using the prescribed instrument and discuss the outcomes of the lesson observation with the educator observed/appraisee. The appraisee may request copies of the lesson observation records and should not be denied access to this information.

Step 5

The DAS panelist will make the information on lesson observation available for WSE internal processes.

Process B: External Appraisal and Evaluations

Step 1

The WSE team leader to determine a suitable date for the external evaluation, after consultation with the Principal and SMT of the school. Schools to be informed timeously (at least 4 weeks in advance – excluding recess) of the dates of a forthcoming visit for the purpose of conducting WSE. When necessary, the Department and the principal of a school will facilitate the establishment of DAS structures in the school and its implementation.

Step 2

If not already done, the WSE team leader to request the District to provide advocacy and training around WSE and DAS. The District to make the necessary arrangements with the school principal to do so, and to inform the principal of documentation required before the visit, including assessment reports, learner profiles, learning programmes, timetables, school policies and DAS documentation. The school management should also inform parents, educators and learners of the forthcoming evaluation, and its purpose.

Step 3

Pre-evaluation visit by team leader to the school, to meet with SMT and SDT and:

- Collect documentation – self-evaluation forms, professional growth plans, DAS reports etc.
- Finalise dates of the school evaluation.
- Confirm the appointment of a school-based WSE coordinator (does not need to be the principal) in accordance with WSE Policy.
- Discuss the process to be followed, and impress the need to maintain the normal routine of the school.

Step 4

On the basis of documentation received, and their own priorities, the team leaders and supervisors to identify a representative cross-section of educators for observation in practice, and communicate this to the school as soon as possible, preferably during the week prior to the external evaluation. The WSE team should consist of supervisors with appropriate knowledge of learning areas to be evaluated.

Step 5

The external evaluation

- School management to introduce the WSE team to the staff, and remind them of the purpose of the visit;
- The supervisors to confirm which educators to be observed and finalise a timetable for the week with the SMT and SDT.
- Evaluation of the other 8 areas goes on simultaneously with the lesson observations;
- Supervisors involved in observations to meet with DAS panels and appraisees to consider/complete the pre-evaluation educator profile checklist and collect other significant information on the individual educator, including the professional growth plans;
- A member of the DAS panel with appropriate learning area knowledge to accompany the supervisor in relevant lesson observations;
- DAS panelist and WSE supervisor to observe the lesson using the same instrument (each completing a separate form); compare findings and discuss

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

these with the appraisee. The appraisee may request copies of evaluation forms.

- Confidentiality regarding the identity of the appraisee is assured in any documentation leaving the school as part of the WSE (the name of the appraisee is written in the form for DAS purposes only).

Step 6a

The DAS processes must inform the professional development of individual educators.

- The Professional Development Plan (PDP) is prepared after the observation.

Step 6b

The supervisor prepares a written report after the observation to include:

- WSE evaluation of the quality of learning and teaching
- WSE evaluation of the quality of DAS processes

A consolidated report on the quality of teaching and learning is to be incorporated into the final WSE report for the school.

THE PRE-LESSON OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

PRE-EVALUATION EDUCATOR PROFILE CHECKLIST

To be used for establishing the profile of each educator selected for classroom observation. The questions could be used as a framework for a professional discussion between the WSE supervisor, the DAS panelist and the educator.

No written responses required.

Wherever appropriate documentary evidence should be provided.

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

- Have you been appraised through the Developmental Appraisal System?
- What is your projected Professional Growth Plan?
- To what extent have you managed to acquire new knowledge and additional skills to address your professional needs?
- Do you stay informed regarding policies and regulations applicable to your position?
- Do you receive support from your colleagues, school managers, governing body and departmental officials?
- Do you share information with colleagues?
- Is there anything you need that could help you develop and become more effective?
- How do you contribute to extra-curricular activities at the school?
- Do you participate in professional activities?
- What type of community activities are you involved in?
- What role do you play in formulating and implementing the school's policies?
- Are there any other matters you would like to bring to the attention of the supervisor before you are observed in practice?

LESSON OBSERVATION OF EDUCATORS IN PRACTICE

Name (NB: only for DAS purposes)

School:
.....

Address:.....
.....

E-mail:

Date of Observation:

Names of Observer/s:
.....

Signature of Observer/s:.....
.....

The Lesson Observation Instrument

The instrument is designed for lesson observation of educators in practice for both Whole School-Evaluation and Development Appraisal System.

The instrument has four focus areas, which should be assessed:

- The creation of a positive learning environment
- Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes
- Lesson planning, preparation and presentation
- Learner assessment

Each focus area asks a question:

- Does the educator create a suitable environment for teaching and learning?
- Does the educator demonstrate adequate knowledge of the learning area and does s/he use this knowledge effectively to create meaningful experiences for learners?
- Is lesson planning clear, logical and sequential, and is there evidence that individual lessons fit into a broader learning programme?
- Is assessment used to promote teaching/learning?

Each of these questions is assessed in terms of four levels of performance. They are:

- Rating 1: Unacceptable. This level of performance does not meet minimum expectations and requires urgent intervention and support.
- Rating 2: Satisfies minimum expectations. This level of performance is acceptable and is in line with minimum expectations, but development and support are still required.
- Rating 3: Good. Performance is good and meets expectations, but some areas are still in need of development and support.

- Rating 4: Outstanding. Performance is outstanding and exceeds expectations. Although performance is excellent, continuous self-development and improvement are advised.

A GUIDE ON HOW TO USE THE LESSON OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

1. The focus area appears at the top of the instrument and is followed by a broad statement of what the expectation is.
2. The question to be answered from the observation is given.
3. The supervisor/appraiser is required to record observations as clearly as possible in the appropriate columns as follows:

3.1 In the column “Strengths”, record the strengths that have been taken into account in the assessment rating.

3.2 In the column “Notes on contextual factors”, record the contextual factors that have influenced the assessment rating. These can consist of personal, social, economic and political factors. The assessment of contextual factors is intended to assess not only their effect on performance, but also the manner in which the educator addresses these issues. The comments should, therefore, reflect the following:

3.2.1 To what extent do contextual factors influence performance?

3.2.2 To what extent does the educator attempt to overcome negative influences in their teaching?

3.3 Rate the performance of the educator in each of the four focus areas by placing a cross in ONE of the blocks marked “Rating”.

Example:

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

3.4 Make recommendations in the column “Recommendations for Development”. These are based on the overall rating in the light of

University of Pretoria etd – Mokoena, M A (2005)

what the educator did in practice and the contextual observations as well as post-observation interview with the educator.

Focus Area: Creation of a learning environment			
Expectation: The educator creates a positive learning environment that enables the learners to actively participate and achieve success in the learning process			
DOES THE EDUCATOR CREATE A SUITABLE CLIMATE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING			
Level of Performance	Strengths	Notes on contextual factors	Recommendations for development
<p>1. Unacceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No effort to create a learning space conducive to teaching and learning. ○ Organization of learning space hampers teaching and learning. ○ Educators and learners appear disinterested. ○ No discipline, much time is wasted. ○ Educator insensitive to racial, cultural and gender diversity. <p>2. Satisfies minimum expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is evidence of some attempt at creating a suitable environment. ○ Environment supports group and/or individual learning. ○ Learners are engaged in activities for most of the lesson. ○ Environment is disciplined. ○ Environment is free of obvious discrimination. <p>3. Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organisational learning space makes use of relevant resources to aid teaching and learning. ○ Organisational learning space encourages group and individual activity. ○ There is a lively and stimulating environment with purposeful activity. ○ There is positive reinforcement encouragement and appropriate admonition of. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educator uses inclusive strategies, acknowledges and promotes respect for individuality and diversity. <p>4. Outstanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organisation of learning space encourages questions, exchange of ideas and experiences, cooperative learning and productive activity on the part of all learners. ○ Relevant resources are continuously updated as a resource in teaching and learning. ○ As above learners are motivated and self-disciplined. 			
---	--	--	--

Rating

Unacceptable = 1	Satisfies Minimum Expectation = 2	Good = 3	Outstanding = 4
------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-----------------

Focus Area: Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes			
Expectation: The educator possesses appropriate content knowledge which is demonstrated in the creation of meaningful learning experiences			
DOES THE EDUCATOR DEMONSTRATE ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LEARNING AREA AND DOES HE/SHE USE THIS KNOWLEDGE EFFECTIVELY TO CREATE MEANINGFUL EXPERIENCES FOR LEARNING			
Level of Performance	Strengths	Notes on contextual factors	Recommendations for development
<p>1. Unacceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educator conveys inaccurate and limited knowledge of learning area. ○ No skill in creating enjoyable learning experiences for learners. ○ Little or no evidence of goal-setting to achieve curriculum outcomes. ○ Makes no attempt to interpret the learning programmes for the benefit of learners. <p>2. Satisfies minimum expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educators knowledge is adequate but not comprehensive. ○ Has some skill in engaging learners and relating the learning programme to learners' needs and 			

<p>background.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of some goal setting to achieve curriculum outcomes. Makes some attempt to interpret the learning programmes for the benefit of learners. <p>3. Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educator is able to use knowledge and information to extend the knowledge of learners. ○ Educator skillfully involves learners in learning area. ○ Good balance between clarity of goals of learning programme and expression of learner needs interests and background. <p>4. Outstanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inspires learners through our engagement with learning area to further reading, activity and involvement outside school hours. ○ Excellent balance between clarity of goals of learning programme and expression of learner needs, interests and background. 			
---	--	--	--

Rating

Unacceptable = 1	Satisfies Minimum Expectation = 2	Good = 3	Outstanding = 4
------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-----------------

Focus Area: Lesson Planning, Preparation and Presentation			
Expectation: The educator demonstrates competence in planning, preparation, presentation and management of learning programmes			
SOME PLANNING CLEAR, LOGICAL AND SEQUENTIAL, AND IS THERE EVIDENCE THAT INDIVIDUAL LESSONS FIT INTO A BROADER LEARNING PROGRAMME			
Level of Performance	Strengths	Notes on contextual factors	Recommendations for development
<p>1. Unacceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Little or no evidence of planning ○ Lesson not presented clearly ○ No records are kept <p>2. Satisfies minimum expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lessons have structure and are relatively clearly 			

<p>presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Essential records of planning and learner progress are maintained <p>3. Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lesson planning is generally clear, logical and sequential ○ Lesson planning clearly fits into a broader learning programme by building on previous lessons and anticipates future learning activities ○ Essential records of planning and learner progress are maintained <p>4. Outstanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lesson planning abundantly clear, logical, sequential and developmental ○ Essential records of planning and learner progress are maintained ○ There is a clear sense of purpose in achieving the goals of the overall learning programme 			
---	--	--	--

Rating

Unacceptable = 1	Satisfies Minimum Expectation = 2	Good = 3	Outstanding = 4
------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-----------------