

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS – TWO SCHOOLS IN KUALA LUMPUR

Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis of the data in two schools in Kuala Lumpur. These schools are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur Education Department and they adhere to similar policies established by the authorities. The discussion in this chapter is based on a within case analysis of the data in Case One: Aman Ria Primary School and Case Two: Impiana Primary School. A comprehensive cross case analysis between the four cases in this study will be presented in Chapter Six. The analyses of data encompass a synthesis of both the administrators' and teachers' perspective to provide a holistic account of how the school-based teacher evaluation practices were implemented in this school.

In each case report the main sections include the description of the setting and the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices. The discussion of the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices will be based on the salient themes which emerged from the main categories in the study. The main categories include the purposes of evaluation, methods used to evaluate, instruments used to evaluate teacher performance and the utilization of the evaluation findings. Subsequently the contextual factors affecting the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in each school will be discussed in detail.

Case One: Aman Ria Primary School

The Setting

Aman Ria Primary School is situated in an affluent neighbourhood in the city of Kuala Lumpur. It is a single session school with 1,077 students and 54 teachers. There

are 30 classes ranging from Year One to Year Six. Aman Ria is one of the excellent schools in the country and has managed to retain its position in the top 10 in the state for the Primary School Assessment Examination (*Ujian Penilaian Sekolah Rendah*), which is held at the end of Year Six every year. This school had always produced students with excellent academic achievement and this made it popular with parents.

The school's popularity is not only due to the high student achievement over the years but also due to its competitive culture in academic and non-academic fields. Students have excelled in public speaking, reading competition, swimming, chess, equestrian sports, golf, sailing, baseball and many other competitions. The school has won awards such as the Education Minister's Quality Award in 2000; champion for the Most Promising Schools in 2001; champion in the 3K competition and the second best Excellent Resource Centre in 2006. A couple of teachers have also won awards for Creative Teacher Award in 2001 and Quality Teacher in 2002. All these achievements have attracted frequent visitors including the Minister of Education and also foreigners who come to grace special occasions or just to observe the special features that make Aman Ria so special.

The school's administrative structure encompasses the headmistress and three senior assistants, followed by the clerical staff. The headmistress and the senior assistant in charge of curriculum were chosen for this study because they made all the management decisions as well as played key roles in the school-based evaluation process. Besides that, the senior assistant was the first evaluator and the headmistress the second evaluator in the summative evaluation process. So it was deemed most appropriate to talk to them about the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria.

Implementation of School-Based Teacher Evaluation Practices

The background of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria remained vague. No one knew who had designed the teacher evaluation system in this school. All the administrators who came to Aman Ria just followed the practices of their predecessors with minor changes when necessary. There were no policy documents indicating why and how the school-based teacher evaluation practices were carried out in this school. The administrators believed that the teacher evaluation practices were carried out by every school in the country and since it had been carried out by the previous administrators, so they too had to continue the tradition of evaluating teachers in this school.

When Sofia, the headmistress, came to Aman Ria four months ago, she realized that instructional practice in the classroom was not evaluated frequently in this school. She made a few changes and insisted that all teachers should be observed in the classroom so that she could evaluate their performance and provide feedback for further improvement. According to Sofia, supervision and evaluation were part of her duties as a head teacher. The concept of supervision had not been clearly understood by the administrators and teachers in Aman Ria. The administrators assumed that supervision is done when you monitor teachers to ensure that they are performing their duties well. They also had failed to demonstrate explicitly how they supervised their teachers. Therefore this had resulted in a situation where the administrators assumed that they were carrying out supervision, whereas the teachers thought otherwise. These divergent views on supervision was further complicated when at times the administrators believed that by carrying out classroom observations they would be meeting the requirements of both the supervision and formative teacher evaluation process in school. They could not differentiate whether they were supervising or evaluating their teachers.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

In Aman Ria both the administrators and teachers agreed that teachers should be evaluated regularly. They gave several reasons to explain why teacher evaluation within the school system was a prerequisite for improved teacher practice. The different opinions espoused by the administrators and teachers indicated that there was a lack of communication between the evaluators and the beneficiaries of the evaluation process on why teacher evaluation was conducted in Aman Ria. The following discussion will look at some of the purposes of teacher evaluation.

Improving instructional practice. According to the administrators the main purpose of formative teacher evaluation was to improve instructional practice. The administrators felt that teachers needed to be evaluated to improve the quality of teaching. The headmistress, explained "... we have to evaluate the teachers because first to improve, to improve the quality of teaching ...". She believed this can only be achieved by having formative evaluation throughout the year. In order to improve the quality of teaching the headmistress said "sometimes we will call them, we will discuss. Sometimes if I'm not satisfied with their work, then I call them and I discuss. I think that's the best way because after that I can see they improve their work." Sofia wanted to be honest with the teachers and have an open discussion with them to help improve their performance in school. But her desire to help improve instructional practice was not evident during the actual implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria. The teachers could not perceive any direct connection between evaluation and improved instructional practice because of the infrequent classroom observations and the insignificant assistance rendered by the administrators.

Ensuring compliance to school policies. The formative teacher evaluation was also seen as a mechanism to ensure that teachers follow stated policy while teaching. Amin, the senior assistant, strongly believed that policies on teaching and matters pertaining to curriculum should be adhered to in order to create an effective learning environment. But the need to ensure adherence to policy was not evident in the evaluation process in Aman Ria. Prior to the arrival of the new headmistress, Amin had a very loosely designed teacher evaluation system in the school and he had conducted minimal classroom observations. His style was to follow the policies of the head teachers without imposing his own ideas on how to evaluate teachers. So, if the head teacher did not suggest formative evaluation, he saw no reason to do so either because that's what the boss wanted. Therefore, the practice of evaluating teachers in the classroom had not been carried out regularly in Aman Ria.

Evaluating underperformers. Another purpose of teacher evaluation was to ensure that teachers performed their duties efficiently. The administrators were of the opinion that teachers who were not monitored regularly would avoid doing the duties assigned to them and slacken in their performance. Sofia said "some teachers I think don't do their work. As I said earlier, we don't come or come some teachers do their duties. But others, when they see you are not around they don't do their work. They just relax somewhere." Sofia noticed that she had to deal with different types of teachers in this school. She further explained, "Some teachers, I just say a bit and they do a lot, some teachers I say a lot and yet they do very little. Some if you don't say, they don't do; when you say only then they do."

Sofia's perception that teachers must be evaluated to ensure that they perform their duties was indicative of an authoritarian style to inspect rather than improve performance. It was apparent that the administrators perceived teacher evaluation as a

mechanism to detect ineffective teachers in school. This was especially evident when previously the administrators only evaluated teachers who received negative feedback from parents. Those who had no problem were not observed. Due to this some novice teachers had been teaching in the school for four years without being observed by the administrators. They were not given any feedback about their teaching practice in the classroom because the administrators assumed since there were no complaints against them, they must be doing a good job.

Meeting administrative requirements. According to the teachers the purpose of the school-based teacher evaluation system was to meet organizational obligations. The administrators carried out teacher evaluation practices because they had to follow government regulations and it was a mere mechanical ritual in school. The teachers explained that the classroom observation was a perfunctory routine where all teachers were observed twice a year to meet administrative requirements. The administrators were just meeting their quota of carrying out two observations in a year. One of the teachers explained the routine evaluation process as follows:

First it is to check whether the syllabus is completed. Normally, beginning of the year to see if we have taught according to the syllabus within a certain time. Then whether the teachers are doing their duties or not and whether students get enough exercise on all these topics. That's about it all.

The teachers in Aman Ria were convinced that the underlying purpose of formative evaluation was to check if they were performing their obligatory duties in school. As far as they were concerned it was more of an inspection process which did not contribute directly towards improving teaching practice in school.

Teachers need reassurance. Further investigation into the purpose of formative evaluation illustrated that the teachers wanted the evaluation process to provide reassurance that they are performing their duties well in school. They wanted to know if they were doing the right thing in the classroom. This need for reassurance was more evident among the novice teachers in Aman Ria. Nicole said "... only when we are evaluated we know whether we are on the right track or whether we are teaching the correct things to the students or we are teaching the wrong things to students." The teachers were aware that they were accountable for what students learnt in school. They had to ensure that they taught the correct content and used the right teaching technique in the classrooms because this affected their students' future learning experiences. Another teacher, Roslina, believed that evaluation would make teachers aware of their level of performance. She said "... at least we know our level. We think we are doing the best but we don't know whether it is correct or it is good enough."

The need for feedback about their performance was a common concern among teachers who had not been observed by the administrators in Aman Ria. Even though classroom observation was an intrusion for the teachers, they felt that occasional visits by the administrators would prevent a laidback attitude and inefficiency. The teachers believed that if they were not observed for a long time, then they could deviate from the expected methods of teaching because they had not been informed about the latest changes in pedagogy or content knowledge. This was experienced by Nicole who had been using the wrong marking scheme for the Science examination paper until she realized her mistake when she attended a course conducted by the state education authorities. The reality of what was happening in Aman Ria indicated that the teacher evaluation practices provided insufficient feedback to reassure teachers or promote teacher development.

Recognition of good performance. Both the administrators and teachers in Aman Ria agreed that the purpose of summative evaluation was to select teachers who would be given the Excellence Service Award in school. This award was given as recognition of the teacher's overall excellent performance throughout the year. The summative evaluation results also affected decisions on special remunerations and opportunities for promotion. The teachers were aware that the summative evaluation was not confined to their instructional practice in the classroom. Their overall performance in school determined the ratings they received in the summative evaluation.

The teachers stressed that there was a need for more recognition from within the school system and the giving of awards should not be confined to the six teachers who received the Excellence Service Award from the government every year. They believed that all teachers needed motivation and probably the school itself could confer some special awards to teachers every year. This, they believed, was one way of making teachers feel appreciated and it would encourage them to work harder. When teachers are given a lot of work but not appreciated by the administrators, then they would eventually feel dissatisfied with their job. This lack of appreciation and its resultant low level of motivation could affect teacher performance in the long term and this would eventually have negative effects on student learning in the school.

Analytic Summary

In Aman Ria the administrators and teachers viewed teacher evaluation as a necessary mechanism to judge teacher performance. Whilst the administrators considered the purpose of evaluation was to improve instructional practice, the teachers on the other hand saw it more as a checking and monitoring mechanism in school. The teachers regarded the evaluation process more of an administrative procedure that was carried out to meet institutional obligations stated by the state education authorities. This difference

in opinion on the purpose of formative teacher evaluation was due to the absence of a cohesive school-based teacher evaluation system in Aman Ria.

Methods of Evaluation

The administrators in Aman Ria used three main methods of teacher evaluation, that is, classroom observation, evaluation of student work and principal rating. In addition to this, there were several informal methods of evaluation which were carried out discretely to provide extra information on how teachers performed their duties in school. The discrete manner of conducting formative evaluation in this school had resulted in the unconscious assumption that it was non-existent. As for the summative evaluation, it was a government mandated practice and therefore the method of evaluation had been predetermined. The administrators used principal rating to appraise teacher performance based on guidelines provided by the government. There were several concerns pertaining to methods used to evaluate teacher performance in Aman Ria. The main themes are presented in the following paragraphs while common concerns pertaining to evaluation methods in all four cases will be discussed in the cross case analysis.

Inadequacies of classroom observation. The administrators used classroom observation to evaluate instructional practice in school. The teachers received approximately seventy percent of their marks for their performance based on the teaching and learning process in the classroom. The balance thirty percent was based on other aspects, which included duties outside the classroom and personal characteristics of the teachers. But what was evident in Aman Ria was that the use of classroom observations as a method of formative evaluation had its limitations. The administrators could barely conduct two classroom observations per year and some novice teachers had not been

observed even once since they started teaching in Aman Ria. The teachers were convinced that the administrators could not evaluate their performance adequately just based on two classroom visits a year.

The teachers were of the opinion that the duration of the classroom observation was too short to effectively evaluate teaching practice in the classroom. Nicole stressed “they can’t see, they really can’t see when they observe. It is too short a time.” She also said that the record book could not indicate the planning of the lesson because the description given in the planning section was too brief. Furthermore, some teachers were good at writing their lesson plan in their record books, but that did not mean they were good teachers. So the administrators were only observing the delivery part of the whole teaching process. They could not possibly observe the planning component based on what was written in the teacher’s record book prior to the lesson.

Another point of contention about the classroom observation was that informed classroom observations would not denote the actual teaching practice in the classroom. The administrators were aware that there was a possibility that teachers only taught very well when they were observed and at other moments they were not performing their best. Due to this, the administrators were not very sure whether they should inform the teachers about the date and time of the observations. They compromised by informing the teachers about the week when the observations would be carried out but the exact date and time were not revealed to the teachers.

The teachers agreed that sometimes informing teachers about the dates of observation could give them significant lead time to prepare the lesson and therefore their performance in the classroom could be an “act”. It would not project a true picture of what actually happens in the classroom daily. They admitted that the process of teaching was not perfect, especially when the teachers were busy and they did not have time to prepare their lesson daily. But whenever teachers were aware that the

administrators were coming to observe them, then they would prepare the teaching aids and the outcome of the lesson would be different. The teachers preferred not to be informed beforehand even though they might be very uncomfortable with the presence of the administrators in the classroom. One of the teachers said "... for me it is better like that, instead of informing us that they are coming in. Then they can see how the teacher prepares for the lesson. But I don't feel comfortable".

The headmistress sometimes preferred to walk into a classroom unannounced to see if the teachers were teaching properly at all times. This was indicative of a more checking and monitoring process rather than an organized formative evaluation process where both the evaluator and the teacher were aware of the reasons for evaluation, mode of evaluation and criteria used for evaluating the teacher's performance.

The administrators in Aman Ria encouraged peer observation by getting the subject panel heads to observe their colleagues in school. But this practice did not result in better performance in the classroom because the panel heads could only provide minimal feedback on instructional practice. In addition to carrying out evaluation, the panel heads had their own teaching periods as well. This was too much of a burden for them and eventually they either carried out superficial classroom observations or totally neglected it. Due to time constraints the subject panel heads entered the classroom for ten minutes and then filled up the observation instrument. The teachers were not satisfied with this practice because they felt that it was not fair to carry out observations for ten minutes to judge their instructional practice in the classroom.

Furthermore, novice teachers who were selected to be panel heads did not have the confidence to enter their senior colleagues' classroom to evaluate them. Roslina, who was a panel head, said "...young teachers, maybe, work they can do. But in terms of evaluation, that one is a bit difficult for me." To solve her dilemma she finally decided to observe only friends who would not object to her presence in their classrooms. The

teachers in Aman Ria accepted the shortfalls of the peer observation because they were aware that the subject panel heads faced time constraints due to heavy workload in school. One of the teachers said, "... they have other work and then also they are forced to do, so they do it." Peer evaluation was not working well in Aman Ria due to problems faced by the subject panel heads.

My personal role as a non-participant observer in Aman Ria Primary School gave me a glimpse of how the administrators evaluated teachers in the classroom. I was invited to observe two teachers and I followed the senior assistant closely to understand how he carried out classroom observations in the school. The following excerpt is a portion of my field notes during the classroom observation:

The teacher was an experienced teacher and she was teaching Malay Language. He observed the teacher and filled up the instrument. He had very little contact with the teacher and did not even take a look at her record book to see her lesson plan. Neither did he walk around to look at the students' work. He only observed her for 20 minutes and decided that he had observed enough to evaluate her performance. He left the classroom abruptly and said that he will give the teacher the feedback later. He wanted to give a copy of the instrument to the teacher so that she could see how she was rated in the different aspects.

I realized that the classroom observations were short and nothing much could be evaluated during the short span of time spent in the classrooms. There was no pre-observation conference with the teacher prior to the classroom observation. The administrator did not sit in for the whole lesson and had based his judgment on his prior knowledge of the teacher's abilities. The administrator had preconceived notions about the teachers and the classes he was going to observe. He knew that the first class was a weak class and that he could not expect much from the students. He was not satisfied with the way the teacher taught the lesson, which was partly a revision lesson. As for the

second teacher, he thought that she was a good teacher and the students in that class were of a higher proficiency level and therefore it was not necessary to observe them for the whole period.

Even though the classroom observation was considered the main method of formative evaluation, both the administrators and teachers agreed that it was not sufficient to provide data on teacher effectiveness in the classroom. This method provided the administrators very little insight into what teachers did daily in their classrooms. This insight was also tempered by the administrators' preconceived notions about teachers, especially when they went in to observe teachers who had received negative comments from other sources.

The teachers felt that what the administrators observed in the classroom was only part of their duties in school. The other duties they performed outside the classroom took up equal amount of time and needed to be taken into consideration as well. The teachers and the administrators agreed that the classroom observation had to be supplemented with other sources of data on teacher performance to make a fair judgment of teachers' performance in school.

Apprehension about observation. The teachers expressed their trepidation on teacher evaluation, especially the classroom observation practice which was carried out in this school. Nazlee, a novice teacher explained his experience thus, "...the evaluator just sat at the back and observed. He did not comment anything. He just looked at everything. Later when he met me then he told me what was lacking in my class." During the post-observation meeting the administrator indicated the scores given to the teacher and discussed his inadequacies, for example whether it was his class control, his presentation or the exercises he had given the students. He would then be given a copy of the evaluation report in a week's time.

Generally the teachers were uncomfortable during classroom observations. They explained that they could not be their usual self when they were being observed by the administrators. One of the teachers' feelings about being observed was explained thus:

I want to say frankly, I find it difficult to teach when there is someone at the back even though it is a friend; automatically we stop, become nervous. But they want to observe, how not to, we have to still show. We just assume that they are not there. They are there, they want to walk and they want to see, let it be. Just consider that they are not there, like normal days.

The feeling of uneasiness was not just among the novice teachers; even the experienced teachers were ill at ease with classroom observation. The experienced teachers had become so off-guard over the years and suddenly when the administrators came to observe them, they felt everything they did in the classroom was being scrutinized. Their apprehension was due to the fact that after so many years, teaching had become an involuntary, automatic and repetitive process. Some of them hardly followed the usual procedure of starting the lesson with the set induction, delivering the planned lesson and finally assessing the students at the end of the lesson.

When the new headmistress came to Aman Ria, she insisted that all teachers should be observed at least once in the classroom as part of the formative evaluation process. This new practice created a sense of uneasiness among the experienced teachers because they had not been observed for a while by the previous administrator. Some teachers felt nervous and worried especially if they did not have any teaching aids. The teachers had to prepare teaching aids according to their lessons and present them effectively in the classroom. This was not the norm in their daily practice in the classroom and this made them more self-conscious of the way they taught their students. The human defense mechanism of not wanting to be judged by others was a common

underlying psychological reason for the aversion towards classroom observation in this school.

Lack of feedback. The findings in Aman Ria constantly denoted that there was a lack of communication between the administrators and the teachers. The administrators rarely discussed the implementation of the teacher evaluation process with the teachers. There was no pre-observation conference with the teachers and the post-observation conference was only carried out on the day of the observation if both the teacher and the administrator were free to discuss the feedback. Otherwise it was conducted at a later date convenient to both parties. If the teachers taught well, then the administrators did not have a post observation discussion with them. They just gave the teachers a copy of the classroom observation instrument so that they could read the evaluator's comments. As for those who had some weaknesses, the administrators would have a discussion with them.

The teachers revealed that sometimes they were not even given feedback individually. The feedback was generally given during staff meetings and not personally to the teacher. The feedback provided during post-observation conference is an essential feature of the evaluation process. It is through this feedback that teachers are supposed to gain knowledge about their strengths and weaknesses and take appropriate steps to improve their overall instructional practice and ultimately improve student learning within their classrooms. The inconsistency in providing feedback after the classroom observation resulted in this method being less effective in improving instructional practice in this school.

In Aman Ria the teachers felt the feedback from the administrators was mainly about the deficiencies in their teaching and very little was said about the positive aspect of the lesson. The teachers expressed their dissatisfaction with the feedback when they

said, “normally it should be all the positive, right? We are human beings; I think she should give all the positives. But their positive is hardly being mentioned”. One of the teachers said this in exasperation, “... that’s the problem. Sometimes they always want to talk about the bad ones, the weaknesses”.

The practice of pointing out the negative aspects of a teachers’ instructional practice indirectly instilled the fear of being observed. The teachers were very worried about making mistakes in the classroom when the administrators were observing them. The anxiety had resulted in more slip-ups in the classroom compared to a normal situation. All the teachers agreed that if the classroom observations were carried out effectively and proper feedback was given to the teachers then it could help them improve instructional practice.

Evaluating student’s work. The findings in Aman Ria indicated that there was a contrast in opinion between the administrators and teachers on the use of students’ work as an indicator of effective teaching in the classroom. The administrators considered the evaluation of students’ work as another method of obtaining data on the teacher’s ability to teach in the classroom. Student learning was judged based on the quality and quantity of work given in the exercise books. This practice was carried out twice a year to determine how much work had been given; whether the exercises had been marked; the type of work given; whether the students’ work was tidy and the handwriting was neat and to check how students did their corrections. The administrators stressed that if there was a complaint about a teacher, the first thing they did was to check his or her students’ exercise books. This was to ensure that the teacher had given adequate work to his or her students.

The administrators were of the opinion if there were too few exercises then the teacher was not teaching well in the classroom. The headmistress believed that there was

a correlation between the number of exercises given and the student's achievement in school examinations. She explained that if teachers gave fewer exercises, then the students' achievement at the end of the year would be affected. She also pointed out that one of the criteria in the classroom observation instrument included checking the exercise books to inspect whether corrections had been done by the students and if teachers had marked them. This indicated that the evaluation of the student work was connected to the classroom observation process in school.

On the other hand, the teachers strongly felt that the evaluation of students' work did not directly indicate how well they taught in the classroom. It just indicated to the parents that the teachers and school authorities had checked the books. The teachers considered the whole process as an exercise in futility because on occasions when the students did not pass up their exercise books, no action was taken against them by the school administrators. One of the teachers said "so what is the point of checking the exercise book? Okay, maybe they want to make sure the teachers do their work. I don't know, what is the point of doing it?"

The inspection of the books seemed to be another evaluation practice carried out more to examine whether the teachers were doing their duties in the classroom rather than to help teachers improve their practice. It overlooked the fact that an abundance of exercises with little guidance did not improve student learning. The teachers could have made the students copy work from the whiteboard and this would not have enhanced understanding among the students and there was a possibility that no real learning had taken place. But the administrators had overlooked this and carried on with the process of evaluating students' work twice a year. This indicated lack of ideas on how to evaluate teacher practice in school.

Student achievement as an indicator of teacher performance. It was not surprising to note that in an examination-based school system like the one in Aman Ria, student achievement was given lots of prominence. The headmistress believed that student achievement could be regarded as an indicator of teacher performance in school. Although it was an indirect manner of evaluating the teachers, the administrators believed that it could be used to assess the effectiveness of the teacher's instructional practice in the classroom. The common belief was that the results reflected the effort the teacher had put into the instruction.

The teachers had mixed views about using student achievement to evaluate their performance in school. Though some agreed that the examination results were important indicators of how well they had taught in the classroom, others felt that looking at the students' results in examinations and tests was not fair, especially if the teacher was given a weak set of students. The students might not have obtained an 'A', but he or she might have improved from a 'C' to a 'B'. This indicated an improvement in the student's performance. The change that had taken place in the individual student's capacity to learn was far more important than the overall results in national examinations.

The administrators looked at the results, whereas the teachers wanted them to see the change in the student's overall behaviour and attitude towards learning, not just grades. Moreover in Aman Ria there were several factors that contributed towards student achievement in school. These included teachers, parent involvement, socio economic background, peer competition, private tuition and the prior learning experiences of the students. Therefore, the notion of making teachers accountable for student achievement in school was not well received by all teachers.

Limitations of informal evaluations. There were on-going indirect teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria. This was an informal process to make informed

judgment of how teachers performed their various duties in school. The administrators would walk around the school at different times to observe how teachers performed the tasks given to them. This undocumented, indirect evaluation was based on the administrators' perception of how teachers performed their duties outside the classroom. The information and perception accrued from this form of evaluation formed the basis for the summative evaluation at the end of the year.

The teachers were aware that the administrators were walking around the school to observe them and they knew if there was any problem they would be called up by the administrators. But informal observations could only provide very limited information about how teachers handled classroom management issues and therefore it was not sufficient for an accurate evaluation of teacher performance in the classroom.

The evaluation of co-curricular activities was also based on walking around to see if the activities were carried out regularly and if the teachers managed to carry out the activities successfully. The administrators expected the teachers to train their teams for competitions and achievements in these competitions indicated the effort and commitment put in by the teacher. When the students won competitions, the teachers were given due recognition for their effort. But the teachers pointed out that not all students were able to participate in competitions and win awards. Therefore, only teachers who trained the winning teams would be recognized and this would be unfair to the other teachers.

The teachers in Aman Ria were also given some special tasks to be performed throughout the year. The administrators gauged teacher commitment and efficiency based on the performance of these tasks. This attribute was not seen directly, so it was based on the administrator's perception of how a teacher demonstrated the sense of commitment in performing his or her duties in school. The administrators were constantly monitoring teacher performance in all aspects of duties assigned to them. But the

teachers, especially the beginners, were not fully aware of the impact of informal evaluation carried out by the administrators.

Lack of transparency in summative evaluation. A constantly repeated concern among the teachers was the lack of transparency in summative evaluation process. The main method of evaluation for summative teacher evaluation was principal rating. The senior assistant was the first evaluator and the headmistress was the second evaluator in this school. The first evaluator gave the ratings and then the second evaluator would agree or change the scores accordingly. The second evaluator had more authority to make a decision on the final score. The final ratings in the summative instruments were based on on-going informal evaluation throughout the year. Once the decision had been made the final scores were given and forms were sent to the State Education Department. The administrators recommended the names of five or six teachers whom they considered to be in the excellent category. These teachers would then be given the Excellence Service Award, which came with a cash reward of 1000 *ringgit*.

The teachers said that they did not know what happened to the summative evaluation forms once they had handed it to the administrators. They were not aware of their final scores and they did not know how the administrators determined their final ratings in the instrument. The headmistress explained that “the summative evaluation score is confidential to other people but not to you. You can get it from me. I’ll give you before I send it to the department. If you want to know, come and see me.” The teachers were given a week to request for their summative evaluation ratings and to discuss matters pertaining to their scores. They could voice out their opinions about the marks given to them. But according to the headmistress less than one per cent of teachers actually came to see their final scores because they did not dare approach the administrators. In her opinion the teachers did not actually care about their summative

ratings. But some teachers in Aman Ria were not even aware that they could ask to see the final score and that if they were not satisfied, they could ask for an explanation about their low scores.

Generally the teachers were worried about the repercussions of voicing their disagreement about the summative evaluation ratings given by the administrators. Due to this they rarely discussed the results with the administrators. They accepted the ratings given by the administrators because they believed their opinions and suggestions would not be taken seriously by the administrators. The teachers did not have any value for the ratings in the summative evaluation because it was mainly based on the administrator's perception of teacher effectiveness. The difference of opinion among teachers and administrators about the credibility of the final score was linked to the lack of transparency in how the administrators derived the final score.

The teachers could not understand why there was so much secrecy over the summative evaluation process. Furthermore, the lack of feedback from summative evaluation had caused some teachers to become indifferent towards the whole process. The teachers felt that if the feedback from the summative evaluation was discussed openly then there would be more avenues for the teachers to improve their performance in school.

Rewards based on seniority and not merit. Teachers were rewarded annually based on the ratings they received in the summative evaluation in school. But a feeling of dissatisfaction with the procedure for awarding the Excellence Service Award was quite apparent in Aman Ria. This was because the Excellence Service Award was given based on seniority and not how well a teacher had performed his or her duties. Those who had been teaching for many years were given preference over novice teachers. Since the award was given based on seniority rather than merit, the teachers knew that even if in

the successive years they performed excellently, they would not be rewarded for their performance. Shireen explained, "... some feel okay I've already got the excellent award, I don't want to do it anymore, you know because we know that we only get it once. I'm being very frank. I won't get it again." This affected the teacher's morale and future performance in school. Surprisingly, most of the novice teachers in Aman Ria were not aware of the implications of the ratings given during the summative teacher evaluation process. They did not realize that if they were given the Excellence Service Award, then they would stand a better chance of being promoted or given other benefits such as opportunities to further their studies.

Use of personal judgment in evaluation. The teachers were convinced that the summative evaluation was solely based on the administrators' personal judgment. They said that the administrators had a perception of who could perform their work well and that person would be considered as good teacher. Those who were perceived to be good were loaded with work while others did less. This eventually helped them to outperform those who had fewer duties during summative evaluation at the end of the year. A feeling of dissatisfaction arose from the assumption that some teachers were consciously given more duties than others in this school. Shireen pointed out why an imbalance in the distribution of duties would result in dissatisfaction among the teachers. She explained:

I think duties should be given equally. If they don't divide then this teacher has a lot of duties, this teacher has less, you know. So when at the end of the year you have to fill up this evaluation forms, so of course those with a lot of responsibilities will get more marks, right?

The teachers were of the opinion that sometimes their colleagues who were very vocal about their accomplishments in school were perceived to be doing more work, whereas others who were quiet and low profile completed their tasks unnoticed by the

administrators. So the teachers concluded that if they wanted their performance to be noticed then they too had to publicize their accomplishments unabashedly.

The administrators concurred that summative evaluation was partly based on their personal judgment. The ratings they gave teachers were based on what they had observed throughout the year. They explained that as human beings it was virtually impossible not to be swayed by perception. But they were quick to add that the evaluation of a teacher's performance was not just based on perception but also on evidence they had gathered through informal evaluations throughout the year.

The issue of evaluator objectivity in summative evaluation was exacerbated by accusations of favouritism by administrators in school. Some teachers who were always seen to be doing work for the administrators were branded administrators' favourites. The headmistress said she tried to minimize favouritism, but explained "sometimes you know as human beings, we favour this person because they always help us and it is easy to ask them to come and help." Sometimes the administrators found it hard to draw a line between impartiality and preferential treatment for teachers who assisted them in school.

The question of integrity in rating teacher performance in school was dependent on how the administrators as professionals performed their duties based on credible data obtained throughout the year. They had to ensure that there was no discrimination or bias in the evaluation process in school. The administrators insisted that they acted professionally when they rated teacher performance in school and that the ratings given were dependent on the actual situation. Their decisions were based on the policy and existing benchmark in the school. But the absence of performance standards in Aman Ria was noted during document analysis. Teacher performance was measured using the criteria in the teacher evaluation instruments in school and not based on any standards developed by the school or state education authorities.

Analytic Summary

The limited methods used to derive data about teacher performance affected the credibility of the teacher evaluation system in Aman Ria. The general assumption in this school was that only those who were seen to have problems with their instructional practice had to be observed. This negative connotation of evaluation further contributed towards the notion that evaluation was a mechanism to find fault with teacher performance and not to help teachers improve instructional practice in school. The various inadequacies in the classroom observation practice further emphasized the need for multiple data source to obtain valid data on how teachers performed their duties in school. As for summative evaluation, it created more dissatisfaction and bred ill feelings amongst teachers rather than improved their performance. The ratings given for the summative evaluation was solely based on the administrators' perception and teachers were mindful of the repercussions of disobeying administrative directives. They felt that how they responded to directives from the top management would eventually be connected to the ratings they received in their summative evaluation at the end of the year. This contributed towards teacher indifference and apathy towards the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation system in Aman Ria.

Instruments Used for Teacher Evaluation

There were only two instruments used for evaluating teacher performance in Aman Ria. One was the classroom observation instrument used for formative evaluation and the other was Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002 which was used for summative evaluation. Previously the administrators in Aman Ria used their own classroom observation forms to evaluate instructional practice in the classroom. But in 2007 they had decided to switch to the new classroom observation instrument created by the Head Teachers Council because it was similar to the instrument used by the Federal

Inspectorate of Schools. The administrators and teachers were not involved in developing the evaluation instruments because the instruments were provided by external agencies. The criteria for performance evaluation were determined by these agencies.

Lack of time to evaluate all the criteria. Most of the criteria in the classroom observation form created by the school authorities and the instrument developed by the Head Teachers Council were quite similar. The instrument prepared by the school authorities was detailed out clearly and a likert scale was used to rate the teacher's performance in the classroom. As for the new instrument, the criteria were described briefly and the administrators had to refer to a guideline for the explanation of the various aspects and the method of scoring.

The main focus of the criteria in the instruments was on teaching practice in the classroom. The administrators could not observe every aspect stated in the instrument in 40 or 60 minutes of classroom observation. The headmistress said "... sometimes we cannot fulfill all. But I think we manage about 80 percent. Some teachers will get 80 percent or 85 percent. That one I would consider good". The teachers said that the criteria in the instrument encompassed various aspects of teaching and therefore the administrators should look at all the aspects during the classroom observation. Only then will they be able to evaluate properly how teachers taught in the classroom.

A comparison of the criteria in the classroom observation instrument created by the administrators in Aman Ria and the classroom observation instrument provided by the Head Teachers Council is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Comparison of Criteria in the Classroom Observation Instruments

Classroom Observation Instrument by Aman Ria Primary School	Classroom Observation Instrument by the Head Teachers Council
Details About the Teacher	A. Details About the Institution B. Details About the Teacher C. Teaching and Learning (T&L)
Planning - Planning for the Semester - Weekly Lesson Plan - Daily Lesson Plan	Aspects/ Critical Items - Planning for the Year - Daily Lesson Plan - Set Induction
Preparation - Preparation of Teaching Aids - Identification the needs of the students - Informing students to prepare for the lesson	- Presentation and Development of T&L - Teacher's Questioning Technique - Student Involvement - Support given - Exercises and Assignments - Checking Students Exercise/ Assignments
Delivery - To what extend the teacher was able to achieve the objectives of the lesson and create an interesting learning environment	- Closing - Student Outcome - Classroom Management - Teacher Character and Personality
Teaching Techniques - To what extend the teacher is able to present the content of the lesson clearly and effectively	Remarks/Comments
Student Involvement - To what extend the teaching process involved student participation	

Source: Aman Ria Primary School and Head Teachers Council

Sometimes the criteria in the instrument were too detailed and did not fit their purpose. So in such cases the administrators changed some criteria to suit their school. If there were any aspects that were not included in the instrument they would write it down separately in a different section. The administrators had their own ways of interpreting the criteria in the instrument and this affected the validity of the instrument used for classroom observation. However, the administrators considered the instrument reliable and thought that it was complete and had covered all areas of teaching. Although they

agreed that it was not the best instrument, they believed it covered every aspect that they wanted to see in the classroom.

Inadequacy of evaluation criteria. The main instrument used for summative evaluation was called the Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002. The administrators and teachers had conflicting opinions about the suitability of the evaluation criteria in the summative evaluation instrument. While the administrators considered the instrument to be sufficient, the teachers on the other hand were not happy with the criteria and wanted to see a change in the criteria used to evaluate their performance. The administrators were quite satisfied with the validity of the instrument. They believed that it was adequate to evaluate overall teacher performance because it included various aspects pertaining to the teachers' duties in school. As far as they were concerned the criteria in the instrument covered almost all the duties teachers performed in school, as well as the teachers' personal characteristics.

The teachers felt that some parts of the instrument were not appropriate and that changes should be made to increase its validity and reliability. The teachers complained that the criteria had not changed over the years and they could not see the relevance of some questions in the instruments. Shireen said:

It's been the same thing, you know; the same questions over the years. I think they should change. They keep on asking about the courses. For me I don't see the connection between what the courses we attended with the evaluation. Don't tell me the more courses we attend the more marks we will get. If they come back and do the in-house training then everybody will be able to share.

The various criteria in the summative evaluation instrument have been summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Summary of Criteria in Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002

SECTION	CRITERIA
I	Information About the Officer
II	List of Activities and Contribution Outside Official Duty/Training
III	Work Output <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantity of Output - Quality of Work - Meeting Deadlines - Effectiveness of Outcomes
IV	Knowledge and Competency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Content Knowledge - Performance of Policy, Regulations and Instructions - Effective Communication
V	Personal Qualities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ability to Organize (Organizational Skills) - Discipline - Proactive and Innovative - Cooperation and Ability to Socialize
VI	Scores for Activities and Contribution Outside Official Duty
VII	Overall Score
VIII	Overall Comments and Confirmation By First Evaluator
IX	Overall Comments By Second Evaluator

Source: Public Service Department

As far as the teachers were concerned, completing the performance summative evaluation forms had become a mundane, tedious practice every year because the findings of the evaluation did not change their instructional practice in school. The teachers preferred the use a school-based instrument rather than an instrument prepared by external agencies. A common belief among the teachers was that multiple instruments to gauge how teachers performed their various duties in and out of school would yield more accurate assessment of teacher performance in Aman Ria. It would then provide insights on their overall contributions towards school and their students.

Analytic Summary

The issue of suitability of the evaluation instruments was never discussed by the administrators and they unquestionably used what was given to them by the external authorities. The administrators were not aware of how the validity and reliability of the evaluation instruments were established by the external authorities. The teachers too were not consulted in the preparation of the instruments and had no inkling about the suitability of the criteria used to evaluate their performance in school. They did not question the validity of the instruments and criteria used by the administrators mainly due to their lack of knowledge about the teacher evaluation process and also their general disinterest in the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria.

Utilization of Evaluation Findings

The findings obtained from the evaluation process were usually kept in the office. This was especially true for the formative evaluation process. It was rarely utilized to promote teacher development in school. The administrators were not required to send the findings of the classroom observation to the Kuala Lumpur State Education Department. It was not compulsory to provide evidence of having carried out classroom observation in school. But the results of the summative evaluation were sent to the State Education Department together with the recommendations to give the Excellence Service Award to six teachers. The school could only select six teachers based on the quota given to it and the quota was dependent on the overall number of teachers in the school.

Minimal use of evaluation findings. The evaluation findings were hardly used for teacher development in school. Most of the teachers were ignorant about the use of the evaluation findings in Aman Ria. They were not aware of how the findings, especially the summative evaluation findings, affected their career. The lack of interest

on the teachers' part had far-reaching consequences on opportunities for promotion in the school. The teachers had to demonstrate excellent performance in order to be considered for application to further their studies or for promotion. The results of their summative evaluation for three consecutive years would be taken into consideration to make decisions on giving benefits to the teachers. But most of the teachers in this school were not aware of this.

Though the initial purpose of the formative evaluation practice was to improve instructional practice, there was no evidence to indicate that the results of the evaluation were the basis of any remediation plan to improve the quality of teaching in the classroom. There was no connection between the purpose of conducting teacher evaluation and the utilization of the findings in Aman Ria Primary School. It was also quite apparent that the findings of the teacher evaluation process were not used for planning any special professional development programmes in this school.

The teachers remained the main contributors towards enhancement of student learning in school. Unfortunately, minimal effort has been put to improve their performance through well-organized professional development courses. The professional development practices consisted of sporadic courses planned by the state or school authorities. Sometimes these courses did not meet the teachers' professional needs. In the past the school administrators only planned occasional motivation courses for the teachers in this school. It was apparent that teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria had not contributed towards the teacher professional development.

Analytic Summary

The school-based teacher evaluation practices in Aman Ria did not reflect a developmental approach and failed to provide sufficient feedback to help teachers to grow professionally. Findings of the evaluation were not used to ensure that teachers

attained the necessary competency to teach in the classroom. This was contrary to the original aim of the formative teacher evaluation process, that is, to improve the quality of teaching in school. The administrators were more concerned with maintaining high student achievement in national examinations and competing to remain amongst the top ten schools in the state. This had caused the administrators to lose focus on the fundamental issue of developing human resource capital within the school system.

Contextual Factors Affecting the School-based Teacher Evaluation System

The findings in Aman Ria indicated that there were more factors that hindered the effective implementation of the teacher evaluation system compared to those that promoted it.

The administrators in this school considered their experience and guidance from friends as a supporting factor. Since they had been working as administrators for some time, they felt that they had enough knowledge and experience about how to evaluate teacher performance in school. Whenever they were in doubt they asked their friends and therefore they believed that they were able to function effectively as evaluators in this school. Most of the teachers felt that the administrators had the necessary knowledge and experience to be evaluators since they had been administrators for quite some time. Only Nicole mentioned that they were not hundred percent qualified and that they mostly sat in their office and did not know what was really happening in the school. She believed that they based their summative evaluation on the information given in the instrument.

The cooperation given by the teachers in this school was another factor that facilitated the implementation of the teacher evaluation process in this school. The teachers hardly opposed or questioned the administrators when they wanted to carry out evaluation. The only request they made was to have the classroom observation at a more suitable time. They just considered the school-based teacher evaluation as an

administrative process that needed to be implemented. The unquestionable acceptance increased the administrators' control over the school-based teacher evaluation practices in this school.

Insufficient time was a major constraint in carrying out teacher evaluation practices in school. The administrators had too many administrative duties to perform and very little time to perform all duties efficiently in school. Sometimes their administrative duties had prevented them from carrying out classroom observations as scheduled. Other pressing duties such as attending to parents who had come unexpectedly or important matters that required their urgent attention took them away from performing their duties as evaluators in school. Usually they had to cancel their scheduled visit to the classroom and do it another day. But the new schedule might not be suitable for the teacher whom they wanted to observe and therefore eventually the observation was not carried out at all. This indicated that classroom observation was not given priority over other administrative duties.

The seasonal assessment periods in school also prevented the classroom observation from being carried out. Whenever the administrators wanted to enter the class the teachers were doing revision and not teaching a new topic. The administrators were not interested in observing revisions of previous lessons. They wanted to observe a complete lesson with planning, delivery and assessment. So the frequent tests and revision period had upset the classroom observation schedules. The administrators and teachers could not find the suitable time to evaluate the teachers and eventually it was totally neglected.

The lack of knowledge among administrators on how to carry out effective teacher evaluation seemed to be the underlying problem in implementing the school-based teacher evaluation practice effectively in this school. Though most of the teachers thought that the evaluators were adequately qualified, and the administrators prided

themselves on their vast experience and knowledge in teacher evaluation, implicit evidence proved otherwise. The administrators also had very little exposure to courses related to evaluating teacher performance, except for occasional briefings on how to rate teachers for summative evaluation. They had very little knowledge about how to be effective evaluators in school.

The administrators were only using instruments provided by other people and they did not know about the reliability or validity of the instruments they used to measure teacher performance. It was apparent that they had given very little thought to the competencies they were evaluating. They used the same criteria to evaluate all teachers, irrespective of their experience and knowledge in performing their job. They had certain indicators of effective teaching in mind and thought those were sufficient to evaluate the teachers. They spent very little time in the classrooms and based most of their judgments on perceptions of teacher effectiveness.

Conclusion

The administrators in Aman Ria Primary School had not implemented the school-based teacher evaluation practices effectively to improve teacher performance in school. Initially when asked about the evaluation practices in this school the teachers said that there was no visible evaluation system in the school. The only evaluation which was obvious to them was the summative evaluation which was carried out at the end of every year. Upon further probing, the presence of a loosely designed formative evaluation system was evident in this school. The teachers could not see the effectiveness of the school-based teacher evaluation system in Aman Ria because it was not carried out systematically. To most of them the teacher evaluation practices in this school were mere bureaucratic practices performed to meet government requirements. It was obvious that the teacher evaluation practices were not directly linked to improving teacher

performance this school. Albeit all these inadequacies, Aman Ria Primary School had high student achievement rate in national examinations. It had remained one of the top ten high performing schools in the state. The teachers unanimously agreed that this was due to the student factor and parental influence. Most of the students in this school were intelligent and knowledgeable. They had other forms of support from outside school and their parents took a great deal of interest in their progress. The parents gave feedback regularly to the school authorities and played an important role through the Parent Teacher Association.

Case Two: Impiana Primary School

The Setting

Impiana Primary School is a public school established in 1986 in an urban area in Kuala Lumpur. The building is situated on five acres in a residential area. In the beginning there were only two blocks of classrooms but in 1988 an additional two blocks were built to accommodate the increasing student population. Now it has five main blocks and a pre-school for special kids in the same area. It opened with six teachers and 65 students but now it has 75 teachers and caters to the needs of 1,282 students.

The student population consists of boys and girls from a multi-racial background. Eighty percent of the students come from the surrounding wealthy neighbourhood, whereas the remaining twenty percent come from lower income families who live on the outskirts of the neighborhood. Most of the students in the school are intelligent and active in sports and co-curricular activities. The school also has high student achievement rate in the Primary School Assessment Examination (*UPSR*) and is considered one of the top performing schools in the state.

The management structure of this school was similar to Aman Ria, where the head teacher was the head of the organization and he was assisted by three senior

assistants. He made the major decisions in the school and in his absence the senior assistant took charge. The headmaster and the senior assistant were the main evaluators in the teacher evaluation system in the school. So they were chosen to give the administrators' perspective of the school-based teacher evaluation practice in this school.

Implementation of School-Based Teacher Evaluation Practices

The findings indicated the absence of a formally structured school-based teacher evaluation system in Impiana. The headmaster explained, "... there is no instruction to say that the headmaster must observe the teacher four times a year. As for the instruments, you have to do on your own." The instructions on how to evaluate teachers were obtained informally or based on discussions with other head teachers in the district. There were no formal written documents or circular stating the rules and regulations of establishing a school-based evaluation system or conducting teacher evaluation practices in this school. Therefore whoever became the head teacher had to perform the task of evaluating the teachers based on his or her own prior knowledge of performance evaluation.

One of the teachers described the school-based teacher evaluation system in Impiana as an indistinct system carried out to meet administrative needs. She said, "... because there is no circular to say what they are supposed to do. Everyone is quite blur. They just want to make sure that they fulfill the requirement, not in the proper way. Whatever it is, just do and finish it." This echoed the opinion of all the teachers who participated in this study in this school.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

There were multiple perspectives on why teachers were evaluated in Impiana. Surprisingly, the two administrators in this school, that is, the headmaster and the senior assistant, differed in their opinions on the reasons for teacher evaluation. This was due to

their diverse background and the various experiences they had gained over the years. The headmaster, who had worked as an officer in the State Education Department followed a top-down approach in implementing the teacher evaluation system and he determined the main purpose of teacher evaluation in Impiana. The teachers wanted the evaluation process to help them improve and maintain good performance in school.

Quality assurance process to monitor teachers. Nizar, the headmaster, considered the teacher evaluation system as a quality assurance process which monitored how teachers performed their diverse roles in school. He preferred to call it monitoring rather than evaluation because the whole process was not just based on judgment of a teacher's performance in the classroom but it encompassed checking every aspect of how a teacher performed his or her duty in school.

According to Nizar, in the local context, the teacher evaluation could not be carried out for personnel decision making because the government's human resource policy did not practice the selection or termination of teachers based on evaluation results. So the school-based teacher evaluation did not have an impact on decisions pertaining to selecting teachers, renewing tenure, licensing or to even removing incompetent teachers. Due to this, Nizar felt that the purpose of evaluating teachers was restrictive and therefore he did not see the need to carry out frequent teacher evaluation practices in his school.

Ensuring effective instruction in the classroom. Ameera, the senior assistant, considered formative and summative evaluation as a holistic process "which makes sure that the whole system is running as it should be" in the school. In essence it was carried out to make sure "that the learning is done, the topic is covered, the concept is delivered and understood by the children because the concept is the building block of the whole

thinking of these children.” The main focus was to ensure that the objectives of teaching and learning were achieved in the school. But the analysis of findings in this school indicated that there was very weak link between the purpose of evaluation and the actual implementation of the teacher evaluation practices.

The senior assistant was of the opinion that by evaluating the teachers they could provide feedback to rectify their weaknesses and improve instructional practice in the classroom. According to her, the purpose of formative evaluation was mainly to ensure that classroom instruction was carried out effectively. She believed that it was necessary to conduct on-going formative teacher evaluation to ensure that teachers taught their students according to the curriculum and syllabus provided by the education authorities. Ameera explained:

The ultimate aim locally in the schools is to make sure there is a transfer of knowledge or transfer of information; what is to be transferred from the teachers to the students. Is it being done? And it is checked by evaluation, which is a validation process.

It was difficult to see if the ‘ultimate aim’ was achieved in Impiana because teacher evaluation was not carried out regularly and the purpose of formative evaluation remained obscure during the period of this study. Although the administrators insisted that the main emphasis of the formative evaluation process was to ensure that teachers delivered knowledge and information to the students properly, it was difficult to comprehend how this goal was going to be achieved in the absence of a well-designed formative teacher evaluation system in this school.

Evaluation to detect teacher effectiveness. As for the teachers, they were aware that the purpose of formative evaluation was closely linked to student performance. Since teaching was their core business, how they performed in the classroom was crucial

for student learning. They believed that evaluation was carried out mainly to detect teacher effectiveness in the classroom. Lina, an experienced teacher in Impiana explained:

Whatever action we did, whatever steps we took were directed towards the students. Actually the appraisal is a form of encouragement for the teachers to teach effectively, right? So the purpose is to improve the effects on students, to increase student achievement.

In order for teachers to be effective there must be regular feedback on their performance in school. The teachers expected the evaluation process to be an avenue for obtaining feedback about their pedagogical skills. They wanted reassurance that their work was acceptable and meeting the expectations of good teaching practice. The teachers believed that feedback based on proper evaluation could help them recognize their weaknesses and improve their teaching methods in the classroom. Shilpa commented:

Like I said just now when the *GPK 1* (Senior Assistant) entered my class, then I know what are the weaknesses I am having in my teaching. If no one evaluates us, or no one come into our class to say something about our teaching we will think that we are doing the perfect job, which is not true sometimes.

It was quite obvious that when teachers were observed, they paid more attention to what they were teaching and tried to improve their techniques in the classroom. However, in Impiana some novice teachers had not been observed in their beginning years. The teachers agreed that novice teachers should be evaluated and given regular feedback so that they could do a better job in the classroom. Lina said, "If they are allowed to go on without being observed, then maybe they will float away aimlessly without any direction."

Ensuring that teachers meet stated targets. According to the teachers, another purpose of evaluation was to determine if the targets were met and to ensure that teachers “don’t teach the wrong things”. The main concern in the school was to ensure high student achievement rate in examinations. The school had its targets and teachers were required to teach accordingly to meet these targets. It was also noted that if teachers were evaluated regularly, then they would not remain in their comfort zone thinking that they were doing a good job. Amir believed it was human nature to slack off when there was no monitoring or evaluation. Those who were underperforming needed regular evaluation to ensure that they were improving their instructional practice to enhance student learning. Lina stressed that frequent evaluation would prevent teachers from deviating from their original goals of teaching. A common belief that resonated throughout the investigation in Impiana was that teacher evaluation was a mechanism to ascertain that teachers perform their jobs effectively in school.

Evaluation is carried out to meet administrative requirement. In Impiana most of the teachers considered the evaluation process as an administrative requirement that had to be fulfilled. They could not see any other purpose for carrying out evaluation because there was no direct link between evaluation and improvement in instructional practice. Shilpa remarked that it was “to make sure their files are complete. They are supposed to do that and then especially when the Inspector of Schools is around, so they can show something.” She questioned the relevance of classroom observation if the outcome of the evaluation did not cause any significant improvement in teacher performance. Anna echoed the same view when she said that the formative evaluation was carried out for documentation purposes only. She personally felt that she did not learn anything from the experience of being observed by the administrators. As far as the

teachers were concerned the formative evaluation process was something the administrators had to carry out and it did not affect their performance in the classroom.

Rewards and recognition to motivate teachers. The administrators and teachers concurred that summative teacher evaluation was carried out to give some form of remuneration to those who performed their job excellently. The school was compared to any other organization where outstanding employees are rewarded for their performance. It was clear that the main purpose of the summative evaluation in Impiana was to identify teachers who would be given the Excellence Service Award in the school. The Excellence Service Award was a form of incentive given at the end of the year to motivate those who had performed their duties exceptionally well. Besides that, the school administrators could identify competent teachers who could be put in-charge of important portfolios in the school. This would ensure the smooth running of the school system.

The administrators believed that there was a correlation between good performance and promotional opportunities in the service. Those who were rated highly in the summative evaluation stood a better chance of getting promoted. The teachers were aware of the importance of good ratings in their summative evaluation for further professional development. One of the teachers explained, "... because the rating from this form will be rated in future in whatever things you apply, for example the application to a scholarship. I understand that whatever we apply for we must have more than 85 percent continuously for three years".

Amir stressed that motivation and remuneration should be the purpose of having teacher evaluation. He insisted on the need for motivating teachers to perform better by giving rewards, which could be in the form of monetary gains or recognition. The Excellence Service Award was considered as recognition for the good effort put in by the

teachers in school. According to the teachers it was natural for people to perform better when they were rewarded for their efforts. However, they reiterated that teachers should be evaluated based on the overall performance of their duties in school and not just based on their teaching in the classroom. The formative and summative evaluation should have incentives for those who performed their duties well. In this sense the teachers viewed evaluation as a positive reinforcement to improve teacher performance in school.

Analytic Summary

In the context of a school, administrators seek to influence performance by assuring teachers that the evaluation is based on a sound system and therefore deserves compliance. But in Impiana this was not possible because there was no consensus on the reasons for evaluating the teachers. The headmaster and the senior assistant had their own views on the purpose and this was not articulated to the teachers. As far as the teachers were concerned the teacher evaluation process was more of a checking mechanism because the administrators were more interested to know if they were performing their duties effectively. There was no instructional improvement and neither was there a change in performance based on feedback given by the administrators.

Methods of Evaluation

The administrators in Impiana had confined themselves to limited methods of teacher evaluation to obtain data on teacher performance. Formative teacher evaluation methods encompassed mainly of classroom observation and the evaluation of student work, whereas summative evaluation comprised informal observations and principal rating. There were informal evaluations which were carried out regularly to accrue evidence on teacher effectiveness in school. This was used as basis for judging overall teacher performance in school. The teachers felt that there must be some formal

guidelines to indicate how administrators ought to conduct teacher evaluation practices in their school. Otherwise, they feared it would be a superficially conducted process which did not benefit the teachers or the school as an educational organization.

Need for multiple methods of evaluation. The administrators in Impiana had not explored the possibilities of using multiple methods of evaluation to obtain more accurate and comprehensive data on teacher performance in school. The teachers felt that the evaluation process should encompass a teacher's overall performance in school. They pointed out that to evaluate teacher performance, the administrators should obtain data from various sources which included feedback from the students, evaluating student work, looking at performance of tasks, parent feedback, peer evaluation and self-evaluation. The administrators did not use the option of gathering data from other sources due to time constraint and the constant focus on achievements in an examination. The teachers were required to complete the syllabus to meet the needs of the examination culture and this gave the administrators and teachers very little opportunity to use various methods to obtain data on teacher effectiveness in school.

Lack of self reflection among teachers. The headmaster had attended a course on self-evaluation and he had given in-house training to the teachers. But discussions with teachers indicated that they rarely used self-evaluation as a means to reflect upon their teaching in the classroom. Shilpa was the only teacher who had tried to carry out self-evaluation in this school. She had conducted self-evaluation by getting student feedback about her teaching in the classroom. It had helped her to identify the weaknesses in her lesson and rectify her teaching methods to provide better learning experiences for her students. Her prior working experience in the private sector before becoming a teacher in Impiana had made her aware of the need for constant feedback for personal growth and

improvement. However, self-evaluation was not a common practice among all the teachers in this school. Generally the practice of reflecting on one's performance in the classroom was not rampant because the teachers were inundated with heavy workload, lots of paperwork and classroom management issues which left them very little time to reflect and rectify weaknesses in their teaching practice.

Looking beyond what happens in the classroom. Amir, an experienced teacher in this school, stressed that the evaluation process should not be confined to observations of just the teaching process in the classroom. He wanted the administrators to look at what happened after the teaching was over, especially when the teacher stayed back in school after school hours to prepare lessons or perform other academic duties. Only then it would be indicative of how teachers performed their duties in school. But it was quite apparent that the administrators in this school had decided to focus on the teachers' instructional practice and use it as a measure of their performance in school.

As far as the teachers were concerned the classroom observation could only be part of the formative evaluation process. They said the administrators must obtain evidence of teacher effectiveness based on how teachers performed in the classroom, as well as the performance of other duties in the school. They believed the teacher's responsibility in educating a child was not confined to the classroom. It encompassed the various roles the teacher played in the school.

Limitations of classroom observation. The administrators explained that ideally a minimum of two classroom observations should be conducted for each teacher. The administrators wanted two observations so that they could observe some improvements in the teacher's instructional practice during their second visit. But in practice, the teachers revealed that only one classroom observation per teacher was carried out in

Impiana. Prior to this, some teachers had not even been observed once. The administrators could not conduct two classroom observations per teacher in a year due to time constraints. Sometimes the administrators could not observe all the teachers in their list because they were burdened with administrative work and classroom observation was not top in their list of priorities

The administrators were aware that short visits to the classroom were not helpful in evaluating teachers because it was only indicative of what a teacher did during a short period in the classroom. Other aspects such as lesson planning and achievement of learning outcomes were not clearly visible during the forty to sixty minutes of observation. The planning aspect was usually evaluated based on what the teachers wrote in their record book and the assessment stage was usually neglected because the evaluators hardly made return visits to the same classroom.

Another issue which reduced the accuracy of the data obtained during classroom observation was the practice of informed observations. The administrators were aware that informing teachers of the impending visits to the classroom did not portray an accurate picture of how teachers taught in their classrooms. Most of the teachers would be prepared with extra teaching aids and present a better lesson when they know that they are going to be observed. However, the teachers commented that it was fine to give prior notice about the observation because they were only human and would naturally panic if someone were to suddenly enter their classrooms. If the main aim of the formative evaluation was to help teachers improve instructional practice, then it would be more appropriate to discuss with the teachers the most suitable time to plan the classroom visits, rather than to drop in unannounced.

When I carried out classroom observation with the senior assistant in this school, I was able to get an insight of the shortcomings of the observation process in this school. During my observation I noted that the administrator was unable to concentrate on her

role as an evaluator because she had to attend to other pressing administrative matters at that moment. She had to do relief for the classes because one of the teachers had been taken ill. In the midst of her observation she had to leave and return after a short while to continue observing the teacher. This affected her performance as an evaluator and how she rated the teacher's instructional practice in the classroom.

Minimal benefit from pre and post observation conference. Pre-observation discussion with teachers would help create a more cordial interaction between the administrators and teachers during classroom observations. The teachers would be aware of the criteria which will be used to evaluate them and the focus of the whole observation process. But during my fieldwork in this school I noted that the administrators did not conduct pre-observation discussion with the teachers. This was confirmed by the teachers during the interviews. Most of the time, the administrators would visit the classroom, conduct the observation and leave without talking to the teacher. The lack of communication between the administrators and teachers, especially during observations was quite apparent in Impiana. The administrators made all the decisions and the teachers were passive recipients in the classroom observation process.

Post-observation conference between the administrators and the teachers were usually held after each session to discuss the feedback based on the evaluation. During this conference the administrators commented on the teachers' weaknesses and how they could improve their teaching. They met teachers immediately after the observation if they had the time but on some occasions it was impossible to do so. So they would meet the teachers a few days later. If the headmaster had observed more than two teachers in a day and if he had similar feedback for them, then he would meet them in a group to give his comments. On some occasions the teachers rarely got any feedback from the

evaluators. This further reinforced the notion that classroom observations could offer very little assistance to improve teacher practice.

Feedback from experts in content knowledge. The feedback obtained during post-observation conference had been useful to some of the teachers. It gave them an insight into their weaknesses and allowed them to rectify their mistakes in future lessons. But the teachers stressed that the feedback given was only useful if the person who had observed them was really skillful. Otherwise they could not see any changes taking place in their classroom even after the observation. The teachers believed that they were knowledgeable in the subjects they taught in the classroom. Therefore, any feedback on the content of their lesson should be from a peer who was equally knowledgeable or an expert in the particular subject area.

Amir explained that he would prefer his evaluators to be from the same subject area so that they could provide better feedback since they had the content knowledge. He felt that sometimes he could not accept the comments given by the administrators because they were not knowledgeable in his subject. They could only comment on teaching methods and not the teacher's content knowledge.

The teachers felt more comfortable being observed by someone from the same subject areas. But this was not always possible since the administrators were from different subject areas. To resolve this issue the administrators tried to get the subject panel heads to observe teachers in their panels. The subject panel heads could provide feedback on the content knowledge and at the same time the administrators could go in to provide feedback about other aspects of teaching and classroom management. But the findings indicate that generally the teachers were not receptive to the idea of peer evaluation in their classroom.

Irregular peer evaluation. In Impiana classroom observation by subject panel heads was a form of peer evaluation to provide feedback and promote collegiality among teachers. But the panel heads had not carried out peer evaluation regularly because they were saddled with heavy workload and hardly had the time to observe their peers. Sometimes the observation was carried out informally because the teachers were not comfortable about being observed by their peers. Shilpa, who was a subject panel head, had problems carrying out peer observations. Being a novice teacher, she encountered difficulty in observing experienced teachers in her panel. These teachers were uncomfortable with peer evaluation because they believed the novice teacher lacked the experience to provide constructive feedback about their performance. The administrators had made the situation worse by selecting novice teachers as subject panel heads in Impiana.

Amir, who was an experienced teacher in Impiana, explained that peer evaluation could become a very sensitive issue and lead to misunderstanding among the teachers. When teachers observed their peers and provided some feedback that touched on some weaknesses they had seen, their peers might get offended and question their judgment. Most teachers did not like the presence of another person in their classroom. They were usually uncomfortable and the situation was described aptly using a cooking analogy by Anna. She explained:

Just like good mothers who can cook very well, so they don't mind to share their experience with others. But a new housewife like me, if a senior citizen was standing beside me to see how I cooked, I won't like it.

Shilpa concluded that reluctance to be observed by peers was due to the fact that most teachers were still very insecure and unhappy when someone entered their classroom for observation. Furthermore, the school administrators had not developed a culture where classroom observation was seen as an opportunity for the observer and observed to learn

from each other. Subsequently, any form of evaluation was seen as an intrusion into one's classroom to detect shortcomings.

Indirect evaluation indicates actual teacher behaviour. There were various informal methods of teacher evaluation in Impiana. These included observations while walking around the school, evaluating co-curricular activities, giving teachers tasks to perform and judging them based on how they performed these tasks. These indirect methods helped administrators to form opinions about the teacher's ability, expertise and attitude in performing their duties.

The administrators believed that walking around to observe indirectly how teachers performed their duties was an acceptable method of determining teacher performance in their school. They sometimes observed the teachers from outside the classroom. By doing this they were able to form impressions of how teachers actually taught when they were not being observed directly in the classroom. The administrators could also assess the teacher's ability in classroom management and how they communicated with their students.

The teachers believed that when the administrators observed indirectly, they could see the real situation in the classrooms and note that the teachers were not putting on an act to impress the administrators. During indirect observations the teachers were unaware that they were being observed from outside the classroom and therefore they were less self-conscious and more natural while teaching. But the teachers agreed that this method of assessing would not be entirely suitable because the administrators could have incorrect perception of a teacher's performance in the classroom.

Another form of indirect evaluation of teacher performance was the evaluation of co-curricular activities carried out by teachers in school. The activities were planned at the beginning of each year and teachers put in-charge of the various on-going activities.

All teachers were given extra-curricular duties, which included coaching students in sports activities, games and guiding students in societies. The teachers were required to develop student potential in other areas besides learning in the classroom. The administrators used student achievement in games or societies as an indicator of teacher commitment in school. If the teachers were selected as trainers for a particular game or even societies and they managed to get their teams to be champions, then the administrators would consider that teacher to be successful in performing his or her duties. Lina said the headmaster always reminded teachers that if they managed to produce champions they would receive higher ratings during summative evaluation.

Besides co-curricular duties teachers were also given other tasks and assignments by the administrators. These tasks were performed when teachers were not teaching in the classroom or during after school hours. The administrators considered having good organizational skills and being able to perform tasks properly as indicators of teacher performance in the school. The headmaster said “we have also given tasks to the teachers, for example, to organize a program. So if the teacher can organize it well and is successful, then we will consider that the teacher has shown good performance.” He further explained, “... all the programs which we do, all the assignments which are given are the instruments which are used to detect teacher performance”.

The teachers were aware that the administrators kept a checklist to monitor their performance during special functions like the Sports Day, Parents-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings or any other events in the school. They felt that the element of time should be taken into consideration in performing a task. Shilpa explained that there were many aspects of a teacher’s job that involved time and whatever tasks given to them should be completed promptly. She implied that some teachers did not complete their duties effectively on time and this had affected other teachers’ performance. The administrators agreed that promptness in performing a task was a performance indicator

in this school. All these indirect indicators were used to evaluate how teachers performed their various duties in school and it helped the administrators appraise overall teacher performance during summative evaluation.

Evaluation based on work targets. During summative evaluation, the teachers were evaluated based on whether they had achieved their work targets for the year. Every year the teachers set targets in their summative evaluation forms. They filled up all the duties they had performed throughout the year and how they had achieved the targets for their main duties. They wrote down to what extent they had achieved their targets. The normal practice was to set the targets at the beginning of the year and to review them after six months, before finally stating the outcomes in the summative evaluation. But according to the teachers, the whole procedure was not faithfully practiced in Impiana.

There was a gap between what the teachers wanted and how the administrators carried out the evaluation process. The administrators did not have any discussions with the teachers about setting work targets. The teachers on the hand expressed the need for more discussion with the administrators about how to set appropriate targets which would improve student learning. Based on this discussion the administrators could gauge how far the teachers had performed their duties and achieved their targets at the end of the year.

Control exerted by administrators. In Impiana the summative evaluation was based mainly on the administrators' perception. The administrators decided on the methods of evaluation and carried out direct and indirect evaluation practices to gauge teacher performance. The administrators agreed that the ideal practice would be to carry out discussions with the teachers through interviews to make final judgments on how teachers performed their duties in school. However, the teachers indicated that there was

no opportunity for them to be part of the evaluation process in school. As far as they were concerned they only had to fill up the form and pass it to the administrators. After that they did not know what happened to the form or how they were rated by the administrators. Anna explained thus, "... I can see it when I fill up the form. After I pass up I won't see it again. We don't even know the ratings that we get in the form. We don't know." The large number of teachers made it difficult for the administrators to carry out appraisal interviews for the summative evaluation process.

In most schools there was consensus among the administrators when deciding on the final scores for the teachers. But in Impiana the final decision was up to the headmaster. Being the first evaluator, the senior assistant gave her ratings and passed the forms to the headmaster. The senior assistant explained that she evaluated the non-graduates and the headmaster evaluated the graduate teachers. She usually consulted the other senior assistants before rating the teachers in her list. Then she passed the forms to the headmaster to give the final ratings. Ameera said "when I pass it to him, it's up to him because after that I don't see the forms anymore." It was quite obvious that the headmaster exerted more control in the overall evaluation process in this school. He was by nature more authoritarian due to his background as an officer in the education department prior to his appointment as a head teacher in Impiana. The teachers were aware that even though there were two evaluators who rated their performance during summative evaluation, the final decision was always up to the headmaster and the senior assistant had very little say in it.

The teachers constantly spoke about the need for more collaboration between the administrators and teachers in the school. They did not have an opportunity to express their opinions about the evaluation process even though they had a lot of reservations about the overall evaluation process in school. They commented that the whole summative evaluation process was highly confidential and they were not informed about

the findings of the evaluation by the administrators. There was also no direct feedback about their performance and only the excellent teachers who scored high ratings would be aware of their scores. Lina explained “They can’t see. They only know that they are excellent. They don’t know where they are excellent, we don’t know. There is a lack of feedback.” All the teachers concurred that the lack of feedback and the administrator’s control over the evaluation process affected the implementation of teacher evaluation practices this school.

Teacher dissatisfaction. The teachers were dissatisfied with principal ratings. The principal rating method used in the summative evaluation was viewed as inadequate to provide a reliable measure of teacher performance. This method was very subjective and it depended highly on the evaluator’s discretion. Shilpa felt that the method was very vague. She explained:

It is like very ambiguous, right. It is not really clear. What can we say when we are asked about the achievement of our targets? For example, 80percent or 90 percent. How we can say that? Because that is not objective, that’s too subjective. And then yet we have to put there our achievement is 70 percent or 80 percent.

The teachers had their reservations about the administrators’ judgment of teacher performance in the school. Shilpa was of the opinion that it would be difficult for the administrators to compare the performance of the different teachers because there were seventy of them in the school. She said “even if we have a file, can we really compare because each of us will have different tasks, different areas and I don’t think it is that comparable.”

Shilpa’s concerns were shared by Amir who concluded that since the administrators could not really observe the teachers’ behavior they must be guessing it.

He believed that the administrators were not aware of what was actually happening and they based their judgment on what they saw. He said that it was difficult to compare a teacher who taught a good class with a teacher who taught a weak class. If the judgment was based on student achievement in examination, then teachers who taught a good class would get a higher rating in the summative evaluation. This would be unfair to teachers who taught weak classes.

Another point of discontent with the principal rating method was that the results of the evaluation usually depended on how close the teachers were with the administrators. The teachers believed that only those who ingratiated themselves with the administrators received higher ratings in their evaluation, Shilpa said “let’s say the teacher is very familiar with the evaluator, then it is easier for him. Sometimes the other teacher who is really working very hard but not really spending time with the head teacher, maybe they won’t know.” The teachers concluded that only those who performed their duties well in front of the administrators were seen to be doing their work and their efforts were acknowledged, whereas those who worked quietly in the background were not noticed.

The headmaster explained that those who were seen to be walking in and out of his room regularly were doing so in order to discuss matters pertaining to tasks given to them. From the administrators’ stance they were merely seeking guidance and not favours. So there was nothing wrong for some people to be seen to be close with the administrators, whilst others chose to perform their duties and remain silent in the background. The administrators’ perspective on the issue of bias in the evaluation practice indicated that they considered teacher rapport with administrators as an essential part of social interaction in school.

The headmaster explained that how teachers performed their duties and projected themselves to the administrators was based on their interpersonal skills. He said it had

nothing to do with favouritism. Nevertheless, he agreed that to a certain extent it was natural for administrators to be influenced by their interactions with the teachers because as human beings, they too liked those who cooperated with them or those who praised them. So if someone was close to them and carried out all their tasks without questioning, they were considered to possess good interpersonal skills. The teachers who lacked this skill had a flaw and they needed to rectify it. He implied that teachers who got better ratings in their evaluation were those performed their tasks willingly and professionally.

The administrators were of the opinion that those teachers who were cooperative and performed their duties ungrudgingly deserved better ratings because it indirectly projected their behaviors and attitudes towards their job and their organization. Their value system was compatible with the expectations of the school authorities. An analysis of the summative evaluation instrument indicated that some aspects such as cooperation, discipline and being proactive were evaluated under the criteria of personal qualities in the instrument. So a teacher's behavior and good qualities were considered contributing factor towards higher ratings in the summative evaluation.

The teachers did not agree with the practice of giving higher ratings to teachers based on their association and good rapport with the administrators. They considered this form of evaluation to be unfair and unethical. Therefore in order to prevent any form of ambiguity in the evaluation process the teachers felt that there should be some standards or benchmark to evaluate teachers during the summative evaluation. This would give more credibility to the process of evaluation and eliminate any suspicion of the practice of evaluation based on favouritism.

Teacher indifference. According to the administrators they based their evaluation on reliable data gathered by observing instructional practice in the classroom and monitoring how teachers performed tasks assigned to them. The suspicion of discrimination in the evaluation practice had led to teacher indifference towards the implementation of the summative evaluation process. The teachers were confident that they were doing their job and therefore how others rated their performance was of no consequence to them. Furthermore, they did not bother about the final outcome of the evaluation process because at the end of the year everyone got the same increment and bonus despite their ratings in the summative evaluation. Anna expressed her feelings thus:

... but for me as long as I did all my things, how many marks they want to give is up to them because I'm not afraid that they are going to give me low marks or whatever; it is just their own opinion of me. I don't care about that.

She was not bothered about the results because she was a novice teacher and did not intend to use the results to further her studies. So eventually her summative evaluation scores did not really matter to her or affect her career.

One of the teachers explained that teachers who performed their duties effectively in school had nothing to worry about because the administrators did not bother them. Only those who slacked in their performance were reprimanded by the headmaster and their final summative evaluation results were affected. The underlying notion that evaluation was basically for identifying incompetent teachers existed in Impiana.

Recognition based on seniority. The Excellence Service Award in this school was given based on the summative evaluation results. But the teachers believed that the recipients of the award were chosen based on seniority rather than on how well they performed their duties throughout the year. Shilpa said "... our headmaster said that even

if you all can perform well, you will have to wait.” Based on Amir’s personal experience, he was very sure that the award was given based on seniority. He explained that in the years that he had worked hard in this school his efforts were not rewarded. When he finally received the award three years ago, he felt he did not deserve it because “I got excellent award when I did not do work hard. That’s why I was surprised. I spoke to my senior assistant personally and asked why did I get excellent when I did not do work hard. It was because of my seniority.” He felt disappointed that he was not given the Excellence Service Award when he had performed his best. He was given the award because he was a senior teacher and it was his turn to receive it.

This internal policy of giving preference to senior teachers demoralized the others and they were not motivated to perform well every year. This had also resulted in the teachers becoming indifferent towards the whole summative evaluation process. They felt even if they performed well in a particular year the award would be given to a senior teacher who had been waiting for his or her turn. The novice teachers could work hard for the whole year and yet be sidelined when it came to recognition of their performance.

Analytic Summary

The myriad issues that plagued the methods of teacher evaluation had affected the school-based evaluation practice in the school. The evaluation process had lost its impact and was considered a mere administrative function to meet stated requirements in the school. It neither motivated the teachers to perform better nor discouraged them from carrying out their regular duties. The findings in Impiana indicated a continuous undertone of dissatisfaction among teachers about the methods used to evaluate teachers in this school. A multiple level evaluation which encompassed administrator evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation and self evaluation was preferred by the teachers, especially those who had previously worked in the private sector prior to entering the

teaching profession. They believed the use of various methods of evaluation will provide more authentic data on teacher performance in school.

Instrument Used for Teacher Evaluation

In Impiana the administrators used a formal instrument to record classroom observation. The instrument was prepared by the previous school administrators and it had been in use for some time. Administrators evaluated the instructional practice in the classroom according to the various criteria stipulated in the instrument. The Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002 was used for the summative evaluation in Impiana. This instrument was similar to the one used in Aman Ria. It was a standard instrument given to all schools to carry out the final appraisal.

Using school-based instrument. The administrators in Impiana were quite satisfied with the classroom observation instrument. This instrument contained six sections, namely, planning, preparation, implementation, teaching techniques, classroom environment and student participation. The sections were split under various criteria with ratings for each criterion. The criteria examined in detail the activities pertaining to teaching and learning within the context of the classroom. The many sections evaluated in this instrument required the evaluators to spend more than one teaching period in the classroom. But sometimes due to time constraints the administrators could not evaluate every criterion in the instrument.

The administrators believed that the criteria in the instruments were relevant as they were key performance indicators that could be gauged through observation. However, they felt that some parts of the instrument could be refined further to make it more relevant to the current context in the classroom. The headmaster planned to combine the six sections because some of the criteria in the sections were repeated and it

would be easier to collapse these sections together to make the evaluation simple and more precise.

There were some specific criteria that were given emphasis by the administrators during observations. When they observed the teachers they looked at the set induction, the lesson plan and the use of different teaching techniques. The headmaster reiterated that he was not expecting spectacular teaching aids in the classroom. But he wanted the teachers to use their creativity in preparing teaching aids for their lesson. Whatever they used had to suit the lesson as well as be effective.

Other criteria considered important were class control, ability to give clear instructions to the students, varied questioning techniques, positive response to student's answers and the teacher's interpersonal skills in the classroom. Students should be encouraged to participate actively in the lesson and due praise and applause must be given to student responses. Ameerah wanted the teachers to be adept in communications skills and possess knowledge of human relations. They needed these skills to deal with students from diverse backgrounds. The main criteria of the school-based classroom observation instrument are presented in Table 4.3

Table 4.3
Main Criteria of Classroom Observation Instrument

SECTION	CRITERIA
1	<p>Planning</p> <p>- To what extent the lesson plan had been prepared and taken into consideration the elements of critical thinking.</p> <p>a) Yearly Planning b) Weekly Planning c) Daily Planning</p>
2	<p>Preparation</p> <p>- To what extent had the teacher prepared the lesson.</p>
3	<p>Implementation</p> <p>- To what extent the delivery had met the objectives and created an interesting learning atmosphere.</p>

Table 4.3 (continued)
Main Criteria of Classroom Observation Instrument

SECTION	CRITERIA
4	<p>Teaching Techniques - To what extent the teachers could deliver the contents of the lesson clearly and effectively.</p>
5	<p>Atmosphere in the Classroom (Teaching and Learning) - To what extent was the learning environment conducive.</p>
6	<p>Student Participation - To what extent had the teaching process involved the students.</p>

Source: Impiana Primary School

The teachers in Impiana were not well versed with the instrument or the criteria used for classroom observation. They had seen the instrument but had not given much thought to the criteria used to evaluate their teaching practice. Both Amir and Shilpa felt the instrument could be improved further. Shilpa said though the instrument covered many different aspects of teaching, she wanted it to include student feedback, comments on work given in the exercise books and the teacher's ability to help academically weak students. The teachers had not scrutinized the instrument properly to understand clearly the aspects that were evaluated and how they could prepare themselves for classroom observations. However, some of the teachers suggested that the authorities should have standardized instruments for evaluation in the classroom.

Limitations of the evaluation instrument. An analysis of the summative evaluation instrument indicated that the criteria did not measure how teachers contributed towards student learning in school. According to the senior assistant this was because the final product of the teaching process was not seen immediately in the present context. It took a few years to really gauge the knowledge the student had gained from

lessons in the classroom. Due to this she believed that student achievement in examination was not an appropriate indicator of teacher performance in school. She pointed out that the change in a child could only be seen in the future. She explained thus:

... in teaching you have your product, of course the product is your child, the children but then the things that are learned or the things that are transferred to the child is processed in his mind and the end result, that is the things in the mind cannot be seen there and then. It cannot be seen. They have a cooling period where the child processes the information and then in the end when he can make a living of the knowledge he has gained and that is not now but ten years or fifteen years later.

The senior assistant believed that the practice of evaluating teachers based on immediate student outcome was inappropriate and would result in unfair judgment of the teachers' contribution towards student learning. Ameera said that when evaluating teachers the focus should be on the teachers' contribution towards the development of the whole child and not just academic achievement. On the contrary, the headmaster believed that student achievement could be used as a criterion to evaluate teacher performance. As far as he was concerned teacher evaluation can be based on student achievement in examinations. But the evaluation instruments used did not indicate how teacher performance was measured based on student achievement. The teacher's contribution towards student learning could not be deduced using the present instruments. The evaluation instrument had its limitations and the administrators were not duly concerned by this.

The teachers believed that the evaluation instrument should take into consideration the various contributions teachers made towards the holistic development of a student in school. This was because the teacher was not just teaching the students in the classroom, but developing their whole personality as individuals who will be part of a

larger society. The teachers were of the opinion that the present instruments used in this school were inadequate and could not measure all aspects of teaching during the evaluation process.

Analytic Summary

The administrators were clear about the criteria they were using to evaluate teachers in the classroom because the instrument was developed by the school authorities. The instruments had been in use for many years and they continued using it thinking that it was valid and reliable to evaluate teacher performance in the classroom. But there was a need to make changes to ensure that the instrument measured teacher effectiveness in the classroom. The administrators and teachers were mindful that the evaluation instrument could not measure the actual contribution made by teachers towards student learning in the long run. The instrument focused on the short term outcome and the teachers were disappointed that it did not have the capacity to evaluate the changes that they had made to the student's life in the future.

Utilization of Evaluation Findings

The administrators said that the formative evaluation results were compiled and kept in files. Ameera said that she made a copy of the instrument and gave it to the teachers to provide feedback based on the classroom observations. She did not send the results to the State Education Department because they were not required to do so. The state education authorities in Kuala Lumpur had no specific regulations about the use of the formative evaluation results for teacher development. Once the summative evaluation process was completed the results were sent to the State Education Department. The teachers who had scored high marks in the evaluation were selected to receive the Excellence Service Award.

No remediation plans. The administrators said that they organized courses for the teachers based on the findings of classroom observation. If the teachers lacked knowledge in the methods of teaching they would sometimes invite lecturers from teacher training colleges to give professional development courses in the respective area. Others who needed training in other areas would be sent for special courses.

However, the four teachers who were part of this study revealed that they had not received any direct assistance based on the findings of classroom observations. As far as they were concerned there was no remediation plan to rectify teacher weaknesses in the classroom. They had also not attended any professional development courses to improve their instructional practice in the classroom. The sparsely conducted professional development courses in this school were seldom connected to improving teacher effectiveness in school.

Using formative evaluation findings for summative evaluation. Sometimes school administrators used the results of the classroom observations for the final appraisal. The headmaster explained that if the teacher was chosen as a recipient of the Excellence Service Award then he would refer to the formative evaluation results to gather more evidence on the teacher's performance in the classroom. The teachers believed that the combination of formative and summative evaluation findings would provide an overall view of the teacher's performance in school and it would help the administrators determine who were worthy of being recognized for excellent performance.

Anna felt that if some teachers performed their duties competently at the beginning of the year and due to some unforeseen circumstances they could not perform well at the end of the year, and then the formative evaluation results would be helpful. In such cases it would be unfair just to depend on summative evaluation findings to

determine the teacher's performance. The formative evaluation results could be used as an additional evidence of the teacher's consistent effort throughout the year.

Analytic Summary

The utilization of the evaluation results was entirely up to the administrators and the teachers had shown very little interest on how the findings were used or its effects on their profession. As far as they were concerned the whole evaluation practice did not significantly affect the performance of their core business in school. Whatever the findings of the evaluation, they were committed to carry out their duties as a teacher in the school. Previously, the findings of the summative evaluation had an impact on teacher promotion and salary increment. But now, the teachers only received a remuneration of a thousand *ringgit* and therefore it did not affect their performance greatly.

Contextual Factors Affecting the School-based Teacher Evaluation System

The findings indicated that there were several positive factors that facilitated the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practice in Impiana. This included teacher cooperation and congeniality of the senior assistant in school. The school administrators rarely encountered any problems with the teachers when they conducted teacher evaluation. They were able to plan and carry out classroom observations according to schedule. The teachers had not reacted in a negative manner or retaliated when evaluated. The administrators were pleased with the cooperation and support given by the teachers. The teachers gave their cooperation in the evaluation process despite the fact that they were not very comfortable being evaluated by the administrators. They were aware that the summative evaluation was a mandatory process that had to be carried out by all school authorities in the country.

The senior assistant's personality had helped the teachers to be at ease with the evaluation process. Ameera had a positive view of her role as an evaluator. She said "... it is my practice to somehow like bring the best of a person, bring out the best of anyone." She said that she understood and believed that it was only normal that there were times the teachers were not at their best. So she took all those things into account before evaluating the teachers. Ameera paid careful attention to how she approached the teachers. She said "... the thing is that whenever we interact with anyone do not let there be a barrier. You learn to understand first."

The teachers confirmed that they felt at ease with Ameera when she came into their classrooms. Shilpa said she felt comfortable and could respond to her feedback without any problem. Anna was able to negotiate with the senior assistant about the day and time of the classroom observation. This was to ensure that Anna was teaching a complete lesson on the day of the observation and not just doing revision with the students. The good relationship between the evaluator and teacher reduced the tension and facilitated the evaluation process.

Another supporting factor was the administrator's knowledge of evaluation. The headmaster had vast experience as a teacher, an officer in the education department and as an administrator in school. He had attended courses on administration where he was exposed to aspects of teacher evaluation in school. The senior assistant had taken up courses on human resource development and this had helped her carry out her duty as an evaluator. Though she had only been an evaluator in this school for a year, her experience as a trainer and the knowledge she had gathered from courses she attended previously had given her a broader perspective of the whole evaluation process. It had also taught her how to ensure that her emotions did not interfere with her judgment. She was not emotionally influenced when she evaluated the teachers and this helped her to make fair judgment about their performance in school.

The most common hindering factor which prevented the administrators from carrying out teacher evaluation was the lack of time. The headmaster said that if he had the time he would observe at least two teachers a day. But at the moment it was not possible due to time constraints. His administrative duties were a distraction when he was carrying out his classroom observations. Sometimes just as he had entered the classroom to observe a teacher, he would be called back to the office to meet parents pertaining to important matters. Due to heavy workload as an administrator he could only observe his teachers once a year. His other duties were considered urgent and given immediate attention at the expense of the formative evaluation practice in this school.

Ameera also bemoaned the lack of time as her biggest challenge. She said that there were just too many things to do and she could not find the time to carry out the classroom observation as scheduled. The effect of a rushed classroom observation was seen during my field work in this school. I observed the constraints faced by the senior assistant in performing her duties as an evaluator. She was scheduled to observe one of the teachers in the classroom but in the midst of carrying out the observation she had to attend to her administrative duties. Ameera had to prepare a relief time-table when suddenly one of the teachers became ill and had to go home. She had to find replacement teachers to take over the teacher's classes. The field notes below indicate what happened during the classroom observation:

The evaluator gets a call on her mobile. She had to do relief because a teacher is not well and has to go home urgently. The senior assistant seems distracted and decides to leave the classroom to sort out the problem. The teacher passes the record book to the senior assistant. But the senior assistant leaves the classroom for a few minutes. She misses some parts of the lesson. The teacher continues her lesson and is not perturbed by the distraction in the observation process.

The distraction made Ameera lose focus on her observation for a while. She later came back and continued the observation. Though this form of distraction did not occur regularly, it had an influence on the effectiveness of the evaluation process. Sometimes the administrators could not observe the teachers for more than one period due to time constraints. They also had too many teachers to evaluate and it was not possible to evaluate every one more than once. It was also difficult to evaluate every aspect of the teacher's performance in one visit to the classroom.

Conclusion

The school-based teacher evaluation was carried out for various reasons in Impiana. The administrators considered it a mechanism for ensuring quality assurance in the school, whereas the teachers looked at it as an administrative function that had to be performed. The administrators felt that some part of the evaluation process in the school needed to be rectified to make it a more effective system. For example, the administrators could not terminate the services of a teacher based on the evaluation results even if the teacher was incompetent. They were bound by personnel regulations to keep these teachers in the school even when they did not perform their jobs well. They could only send the names of these teachers to the State Education Department and recommend further courses.

In Impiana the headmaster exerted greater control over the whole evaluation process in school. There was a lack of communication between the teachers and the administrators and it was quite apparent that the administrators had very little understanding of the teachers' expectation of the evaluation system in school. The teachers felt that there was still room for improvement in the school-based teacher evaluation system. The sporadic classroom visits by the administrators and the lack of direct evaluation convinced the teachers that the school-based teacher evaluation

practices in their school did not have a significant effect on improving their performance in school.

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the findings in two schools in the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur. Both Aman Ria Primary School and Impiana Primary School had similar framework for the school-based teacher evaluation practices in their respective schools. The system consisted of on-going formative evaluation and a mandatory summative evaluation, which was carried out at the end of the year. The State Education Department had given the school autonomy on carrying out teacher evaluation practices in the respective schools. But there was a lack of monitoring to ensure that school administrators had performed teacher evaluation practices to help improve teacher quality in school. The individual case report described in depth how the teacher evaluation practices were implemented in each school and the issues that plagued the implementation process. Both the school faced a number of common challenges in the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation system in their schools. This was due to the common practices in school management in both the schools in the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur.