

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS – TWO SCHOOLS IN SELANGOR

Introduction

This chapter examines the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in two schools in the state of Selangor. The framework for analysis in Case Three: Sri Damai Primary School and Case: Kiarra Primary School is similar to the framework used to discuss the findings in the two schools in Kuala Lumpur. The main aspects in the framework include the purposes of evaluation, methods used to evaluate, instruments used to evaluate teacher performance and the utilization of the evaluation findings. An analysis of the contextual factors affecting the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in each school is also presented to give a detailed account of the overall teacher evaluation system in the two schools.

Case Three: Sri Damai Primary School

The Setting

Sri Damai Primary School started as a special project school initiated by the Faculty of Education of a local university more than thirty years ago. It was established in 1969 with 648 students and 26 teachers. Over the years the student population has increased to 1164 students. It is one of the good schools in the state with excellent student achievement in the national level examination. Students are very active in co-curricular activities and have received awards at the national level. Its popularity has led many parents to send their children to Sri Damai. The school has a student population of 373 boys and 339 girls who come from a multi-cultural background. Most of the students live in the vicinity of the school and majority of the students come from families with higher and middle socio-economic status. Besides that, there are students from lower

socio-economic background who come from other parts of the district. Parents have shown keen interest in working together with the school authorities to improve the overall performance of the school.

The school's administrative structure consists of the headmistress, three senior assistants, one afternoon supervisor and 59 teachers. The office is manned by five staff who deal with daily administrative matters. The management of the school was very efficient due to the excellent leadership skills of the headmistress. The teachers had high regard for her and generously endorsed her ability to lead. The senior assistant and the headmistress were the main evaluators in the school-based teacher evaluation system in Sri Damai. So they were able to give an in-depth account of how the teacher evaluation system functioned in this school.

Implementation of School-Based Teacher Evaluation Practices

The school-based teacher evaluation system in Sri Damai Primary School has been in existence for a long time. The present administrators were not sure how the evaluation system originated in this school, but they assumed the directives and regulations to conduct school-based teacher evaluation practices were from the Ministry of Education. According to Rehan, the headmistress, the instructions on teacher evaluation were passed on from the Federal Inspectorate of Schools to the District Education Office and finally to the schools. Besides this, she was also convinced that teacher evaluation was part of her job description as a head teacher in school. Rehan explained:

Actually part of our job, headmistress's job is to evaluate our teachers. It is in my job scope. So how we evaluate, I think I have to get materials, or instruments for observation. I get it from the District Education Office. Like other areas we do the instruments, like for co-curriculum, for Student Affairs. I do all the books like

I do the management book. That is a method of my evaluation. From there I think my teachers have learnt a lot on how to handle their jobs.

Rehan pointed out that previously the evaluation process examined how teachers imparted knowledge to students and how learning took place in the classroom. But nowadays, various other aspects in school were also given due consideration. This included how teachers performed their co-curricular duties and matters pertaining to student affairs in school. All these duties were also important because teachers had the responsibility of educating the students in all aspects. Besides being a teacher in the classroom, they had to play various roles in school. The headmistress was confident that the present school-based teacher evaluation practices were far better than the practices that had existed previously in Sri Damai.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

In Sri Damai the participants agreed that evaluation was an essential organizational practice that could assess teacher performance and provide feedback to enhance the quality of teaching in school. There were several reasons why teachers were evaluated, but the constant theme that emerged was the need to provide accurate feedback which could improve teacher performance in school. The administrators and teachers had similar views on the reasons for evaluating teacher performance in school.

Provide feedback to improve performance. The administrators were aware that teachers needed guidance and supervision in performing their duties effectively. The administrators carried out formal and informal evaluation to provide feedback to the teachers. The notion that constant monitoring and evaluation could help teachers perform their duties better prevailed among the administrators in this school. They were of the opinion that most teachers did not know how to perform their duties and there was a

need to establish a system where constant feedback was provided to help teachers perform their duties effectively in school. The administrators carried out classroom observation to ensure that feedback was provided to help teachers improve their instructional practice and enhance student learning.

All the teachers conceded that evaluation would be a means of detecting how teachers performed their job and to identify strengths that could be shared and weaknesses that had to be rectified. They agreed that it was not possible for them to identify their own mistakes. So they needed feedback about their performance from the school administrators. The teachers were receptive to idea of evaluation because they were aware of the need for teacher reflection to improve teaching practice in the classroom. Esther said "... I see it as a way to improve myself, to know my weaknesses, in what aspect I need to improve myself and that will make me a better teacher." She felt that it was only fair to have continuous evaluation throughout the year so that the teachers got feedback about their performance.

Shreya believed that feedback from regular evaluation could also enhance student learning. She said by providing teachers feedback on their teaching methods and content the administrators would be able to help teachers improve their instructional practice and become better teachers in the future. However, she insisted that the administrators must go back and evaluate the teachers a second time to note the changes that take place in the classroom after the first observation. Only then would they be able to detect changes in teaching practice in the classroom. When there was no feedback based on proper evaluation then the teachers would think that what they were doing in the classroom was correct. Shreya stressed that this would then lead to the following scenario:

... She might be going on and then if there is no feedback, I'm sure there is no improvement in her teaching and she will be doing the same things all the time.

Maybe she will be using the same methods, the same techniques, you know things like that which is not so good for the children's performance.

In Sri Damai, most of the teachers were anxious to know how they performed their duties in school. The common questions of 'how am I doing'? and 'how can I improve myself'? had often emerged in their minds when they reflected on their teaching. They believed that formative evaluation was carried out to improve the quality of teaching in the classroom. The teachers realized that they needed to upgrade and equip themselves with the latest information about teaching. They believed that if the evaluation process was carried out meticulously and professionally, then the feedback from the evaluators could be used to upgrade their performance. But most teachers agreed that the feedback provided by the administrators was not sufficient to help them make a significant change in their performance in school.

Keep teachers on their toes. The administrators in Sri Damai Primary School admitted that the underlying reason for on-going formative teacher evaluation was "... to keep the teachers on their toes." According to senior assistant the school-based teacher evaluation practice was a "... check and balance sort of thing." The administrators had to check if the teachers were performing their duties as required and also to evaluate the teacher's level of pedagogical content knowledge. Personally, she believed a standardized teacher test would be a good means of evaluating teacher performance.

The headmistress preferred formative evaluation because she felt that the teachers would be constantly alert in performing their duties. The formative evaluation practices gave the administrators an opportunity to assess teacher effectiveness throughout the year. This gave them more data on how individual teachers performed their respective duties in school. The teachers too had a chance to improve their performance throughout

the year and those who did not perform well at the beginning of the year had a chance to improve their performance and obtain better evaluation scores at the end of the year.

Surprisingly, the teachers admitted that without formative evaluation some of their colleagues would slack off in their performance. One of the teachers explained that there were several categories of teachers in this school. There were some who did their job with very little supervision, while there were others who did not do their duties even after being instructed. Due to this, formative evaluation was carried to ensure that all teachers were doing their job well. Those who performed their duties excellently with very little directive and guidance got good reviews in their evaluation. On the other hand, some teachers needed the occasional push through monitoring and evaluation to ensure that they performed the duties assigned to them.

Most of the teachers in this school were experienced teachers and they were very honest about the reality of what was happening in school in the present context. One of them said, “I think because nowadays in many cases the teachers are not performing well in their teaching. There is no progress on their teaching level, they don’t upgrade themselves. They do not know what’s happening out there.” There was a common belief among administrators and teachers that evaluation was necessary to check teachers who were under-performing in school. It was also quite apparent that there was a need for a mechanism to indicate how teacher’s progressed in their work throughout the year. This would eventually help the administrators assess teacher performance and reward those who performed their duties excellently in school.

Assist beginning teachers. Teacher evaluation was also carried out to ensure that beginning teachers adapted to the complex educational environment in school. The headmistress lamented that there was not enough practical training in the teacher education programmes in the local context. Furthermore, these programmes did not deal

with the intricacies of being a teacher in a school. They concentrated on the basics of teaching and the theoretical aspects of teaching and learning. Hence, most beginners experienced ‘culture shock’ and were unable to adapt to the situation in schools. They had not anticipated the multiple roles they had to play in school. They just wanted to focus on teaching and learning in the classroom. The administrators believed that the beginning teachers had to be supervised and their performance must be evaluated to help them become better teachers in school. The headmistress said:

They only expected to come as a teacher to class, teach, mark books, you know and that’s it. They thought that is their job, even until today. So when they come to school they have got so many aspects to look into, they have this culture shock where I think we need the evaluation to help them to become better teachers, whether it is in academic or in other fields because I feel that even worst now they are really, you know, not aware of such things like how to handle their job.

Many aspects of the teachers’ roles and responsibilities were only revealed to the beginning teachers when they were in school. They had no prior knowledge of how to perform these duties in school. Teachers were expected to discover for themselves their various duties in school and how to perform them efficiently to improve student learning. Rehan believed that the feedback from evaluation, especially formative evaluation, could help teachers improve. She reiterated that not only beginners, but also senior teachers needed feedback to improve their performance.

Encourage teachers to perform better. In Sri Damai the purpose of the summative evaluation was to encourage teachers to perform better every year. Those who performed their duties exceptionally well were singled out for the Excellence Service Award. The teachers were certain that whatever they did throughout the year was taken into consideration during the summative evaluation. The evaluation was based on

how the teachers contributed towards the development of the school as a whole. Munir said "... if this year I did not achieve much success for things which uplifted the school, next year I have to do more." Esther explained further about the purpose of summative evaluation. She said, "... it is to see how much a teacher has achieved in the given responsibility, in their role as a teacher, how much they have achieved. I think that's the purpose." The teachers were given certain responsibilities or special projects throughout the year and they were evaluated based on how they performed these tasks. These tasks included the curriculum, co-curricular and student affairs aspects of the teachers' duties. Those who performed their duties efficiently were given recognition and awards to motivate them to perform their best at all times.

Analytic Summary

In Sri Damai, administrators were convinced that teachers, especially beginners, needed supervision and evaluation to help them perform their duties effectively in school. The teacher evaluation process was seen as a check and balance mechanism to monitor teacher performance in school. The teachers agreed that lack of regular evaluation could cause negative repercussions in the school. It was also quite obvious that teacher evaluation could either be a form of motivation or the cause of stress to the teachers. If regular positive feedback is given to teachers, then it would be a form of motivation to perform better and subsequently improve instructional practice in the classroom. On the other hand, constant evaluation created a feeling of uneasiness among the teachers, especially the experienced teachers who were convinced that they were doing a good job in their classrooms.

Methods of Evaluation

Sri Damai had an effective system of ongoing teacher evaluation which was carried out throughout the year consistently to gather information about how teachers performed the duties assigned to them. The two administrators had different opinions about the most effective way of evaluating teachers. Rehan believed in formative evaluation such as classroom observations, checking of exercise books and monitoring through management books, whereas Joyce on the other hand, preferred special tests for teachers to assess their knowledge and skills in their respective areas of specialization.

Infrequent classroom observation. The administrators tried their best to observe all the teachers at least twice a year, though ideally they would like to do more observations. Joyce said “according to rules and regulations each teacher is to be observed twice. We try our best; even if we cannot do twice every year, we make sure that each teacher is observed at least once.” The headmistress was of the opinion “... twice a year is not sufficient for per teacher, I think at least maybe four times.” The administrators did carry out more observations because it was not a policy requirement. Rehan explained further:

Well, you see it can be done by me, another time is by another senior assistant, you know. We all do on different weeks. But the District Education Office only wants twice; the report to be sent twice. But I mean internally for us to guide the teacher I think it is good to go and see them at least four times then we can see the changes, the progress, whether up or down.

Since the classroom observation reports were sent to the District Education Office half yearly, the administrators only carried out a minimum of two observations a year to meet the mandatory requirement. Surprisingly, the same teachers were not observed twice in this school. Joyce explained, “... we observe a teacher in the first part

of the year and we may not observe the same teacher the second part of the year.” By conducting one observation per teacher in a year the administrators could not determine whether a teacher’s instructional practice had improved based on the feedback they had provided after the first observation.

The teachers were aware that the administrators could not observe them more than once because there were too many teachers in this school. Some senior assistants followed the schedule and observed each teacher twice, whilst some did only one classroom observation per teacher in a year. There were others who did not observe some of the teachers in their list. Esther, an experienced teacher said:

But sad to say of course, a few senior assistants wouldn’t go round, you see. So teachers involved under their care, I think will be affected. I don’t know how the teachers are evaluated. We can see who are the senior assistants going around doing the observation, the rest are not doing their job.

Esther felt that if all the senior assistants were not consistent in the manner they conducted the classroom observation, then the whole formative evaluation practice was not reliable and it was unfair to those teachers who were observed more than once in a year.

Preference for unannounced visit. In Sri Damai the administrators, especially the headmistress, preferred to visit the classroom unannounced because they believed the teachers should be prepared at all times. This was more in line with the practice of checking if teachers were performing their respective duties in school. During the unannounced classroom visits the headmistress discovered that some teachers did not prepare their lesson plans. The senior assistants usually informed the teachers about the details of their visits to the classroom. Some teachers were informed a day before the observation, whereas others were informed on the day of the observation.

The schedule for conducting classroom observations was prepared in the beginning of the year and each senior assistant had about 13 to 14 teachers to observe in their list. As for the headmistress, "... whenever, wherever she can, she will just zoom in on anybody." She picked the teachers at random and observed all the different categories of teachers. She said "... I go and observe the very, very weak ones and I also observe the excellent ones. So I do that kind of classroom observation. But once in a while I will go at any time, any one." Though generally she just walked into a classroom and observed the teacher, sometimes she told them one day ahead of her impending visit.

As far as the headmistress was concerned it did not matter if the teachers knew about her impending visit. She was not worried that the teachers who had prior knowledge of her visit would prepare a good lesson just to impress her. She confidently said "whatever it is whether prepared or not you will know the teacher's level. You will know. You can evaluate, yes." This indicated that the administrators had preconceived notion of the teachers' competencies even before they observed them in the classroom. The observation was just an obligatory visit to confirm their opinions about the teacher's ability and behaviour in the classroom.

Sometimes when the administrators paid unexpected visits to the classroom some teachers lost their nerve and performed badly. But on other occasions the same teacher would have performed reasonably well. The administrators were aware that going into a classroom unannounced caused some form of distress to the teachers. The teachers had mentioned to the headmistress that sometimes when she walked into their classroom, they panicked at first. So whenever she was in the classroom she observed the teachers discreetly. This was to make sure that the teachers were not uncomfortable with her presence. She tried to focus her attention on the students and watched the teachers indirectly.

The teachers had mixed reactions to uninformed classroom visits. Based on Munir's experience there was not much of a difference even if he was given prior notice of the impending classroom observation. He prepared his music lessons according to what he would normally teach. Since he was teaching music he had to use certain musical instruments on certain days. So whether he was informed earlier or on the day of the observation made little difference to him.

Shreya felt that informing the teachers earlier was not a good way to evaluate a teacher because "... when you tell a teacher that you are coming, all the while they don't have all the teaching aids and all that, but on that particular day everything is extra, which is out of the way I would say." Personally she felt that she would teach as usual even when she was aware that the administrator was coming to evaluate her because she believed using more teaching aids did not make one a better teacher. What was important was the students understood what the teacher was teaching. Shreya wanted to depict her true self during the classroom observations because she was confident that she was a good teacher and she was not worried about the administrators observing her instructional practice in the classroom. She expressed her strong convictions thus, "I don't want to be a hypocrite, when the person is coming all the good teaching aids and all that, no. I teach as usual, from there you evaluate. I don't want to be a hypocrite, I want to be myself."

Shreya knew that her teaching methods had produced results and students who were very weak had managed to score better grades in her classroom. Her achievements were attested by the administrators and other teachers who sang praises of her ability to improve student learning in the school. Shreya considered the evaluation process as a mere administrative function and she did not feel that she had to impress the administrators. She explained the whole process thus, "... they come to class, sit at the back and they will observe. They will sign certain children's book. They will check and

sign. That's all." It was quite apparent that the formative evaluation process did not significantly affect Shreya's teaching in the classroom.

The teachers felt that the administrators came into their classroom when they were unwary and this reinforced their notion that evaluation was carried out to detect their flaws and not to help them improve. If the proper procedure for classroom observation was followed strictly, then the pre-observation conference with the teacher would give them an idea of what the evaluators would be looking for when they evaluated them. But unfortunately there was no pre-observation conference with the teachers in this school.

Feedback for improvement. The administrators provided feedback during post observation conference to help teachers improve their instructional practice in the classroom. Once the headmistress had carried out her observation she passed the instrument to the senior assistant so that she could take a look at the comments and get a general idea of what the headmistress had observed. Rehan explained the post observation process as follows:

Okay, well as I told you know when we observe we meet and at that moment tell them whether their level is good, satisfactory or excellent. We inform them and then if they have other ways to improve we discuss with them directly and for the overall evaluation we give them awards.

In some instances when Rehan had observed five teachers, then she would have a meeting with all the five teachers to discuss their strengths and weaknesses and to show them her comments in the instrument. The senior assistant showed the teachers their scores and gave her feedback immediately after the observation. She said "I try to give them on that day itself, but if time does not permit then I usually do at the earliest possible opportunity." Her feedback was basically on the teaching and learning aspect in

the classroom. She said "... we tell them exactly how they can improve on their teaching and learning." Generally she felt that the teachers were receptive to her comments and sometimes they admitted that they could have done better.

The teachers concurred that they received feedback from the administrators during post observation discussion. But they were of the opinion that they would get better feedback if the person who was observing them in the classroom was well-versed in the subject they were teaching. Sometimes she could not accept the comments given by some of the evaluators because they were not specialist in her area. Similarly, Munir too preferred administrators who were well-versed with the subject he was teaching. He confessed that being a music teacher he would not be able to evaluate someone else who taught Mathematics. He would not be able to do justice to the person he was observing.

Munir revealed that during his meeting with the administrator, he usually just wanted to know if he had made a lot of mistakes. If they gave more comments, then it meant he had weaknesses that needed to be rectified. The foremost question in his mind was the mistakes he had made during teaching in the classroom. The prevalent assumption among teachers was that classroom observation was conducted to detect the weaknesses in their teaching. The notion that they had not taught well was foremost in the teachers' mind because most of the time the administrators had highlighted the teachers' weaknesses and spoken very little about the teachers' strengths in the classroom. The common assumption in Sri Damai was that only those who had problems in the classroom got feedback from the administrators so that they could improve their performance.

Unhappy with classroom observation. The teachers were indifferent towards the classroom observation process because the administrators just came in once in a while and judged their performance based on what they perceived at that moment. They did not

investigate the truth behind the teacher's actions in the classroom. There was very little discussion with the teachers about the various aspects of the classroom observation. The administrator's final decision on the evaluation score was given even before the post-observation discussion. The teachers did not have an opportunity to explain their actions which resulted in unsatisfactory performance during the observation. Most of the time the teachers accepted the comments and ratings given by the administrators in the classroom observation instrument and they rarely argued with the administrators. The teachers rarely bothered to justify their actions even though they were unhappy with the evaluation.

Esther felt that her classroom observations did not result in a satisfactory outcome because the administrators had not given due consideration to the fact that she was busy the whole week accomplishing another task assigned to her by the administrators and therefore she was unable to enter her classroom. She was not given prior notice about the administrator's visit to her classroom and the administrator had chosen to observe her when she least expected it. Esther felt the timing was just not right because she was busy with her duties for the Resource Centre Week in school and had not entered her classes. So she was behind on the marking of the students' exercise books. When suddenly the senior assistant came in to observe her lesson, she was totally unprepared and she felt the administrator was being unreasonable.

Esther was further dissatisfied with her experience because the administrators had decided to use a new instrument to evaluate her performance in the classroom without informing her. She had not seen the instrument beforehand and was unhappy with the administrator's action. She said, "... why should I be a victim of this. I didn't know about the new instrument. She called me and she showed me the new book. She showed me the marks. Then she said are you happy, I said no."

Shreya agreed that the administrator's timing was not always right. She recounted how once when she was coughing badly the administrator had decided to observe her. She felt that it was not a suitable moment because she could not perform her best due to her illness. She was not satisfied with the comments written by the administrator because the administrator had failed to consider that fact that even though she was not well during the observation, she had tried her best. Due to this she had very little faith in the classroom observation process in school.

Need for knowledgeable evaluators. In Sri Damai the teachers expressed the need to have qualified evaluators who could provide constructive comments to help teachers improve their performance. Shreya said "You must know what the person is doing. You must know your stuff very well before you go and evaluate. But I think most of the evaluators, I think 99 percent, I can say that they don't know their stuff." According to Shreya the prerequisite of a good evaluator was someone with a good knowledge of the syllabus and the content of the subject. Only then would the evaluation process be valid. She insisted that the evaluation should be on the teacher's content knowledge and the methods used to get students to understand the subject they were learning. Other petty matters such cleanliness of the classroom should not be given prominence in the classroom observation.

On the contrary, the administrators felt that they could evaluate the teachers even if the subject they were observing was not their area of specialization. They were more concerned with how the teachers executed the lesson in the classroom. They wanted to look at the overall teaching and learning process. The administrators said they tried their best to put the most appropriate evaluator to observe the teachers according to the subjects they taught, but it was not always possible to do so. To overcome this problem the subject panel heads were asked to observe the teachers in their panel so that they

could provide more accurate feedback about the subject and the teaching methods. The headmistress pointed out that initially some of the panel heads were reluctant to conduct classroom observations. But she insisted they do it because it was part of their job scope. The subject panel heads were given the freedom to choose the teachers in their panel and observe the teachers. They were able to provide better feedback because they were well-versed in the subject area.

Peer evaluation is not effective. The administrators felt that peer evaluation was not feasible in the local context. Joyce said "... I don't think people are open enough. This is acceptance of ideas. We are not open enough, we are, how would you say? We are not ready for such a system. I don't think we are looking at it positively." Teachers had to be impartial and honest when they evaluated their peers. Only then the data from peer observation could be used to evaluate overall teacher performance in school. It was still questionable whether teachers were going to be objective when they evaluated their peers in the classroom. Joyce explained that the teachers might not want to give their peers low scores because it affected their performance in school and eventually it might even indirectly affect their summative evaluation ratings.

Generally the teachers were not ready to be evaluated by their panel heads because they did not want their peers to point out their mistakes in the classrooms. Most of them were worried about the negative consequences and could not really see peer observation as a means of sharing knowledge on teaching and learning in the classroom. Another reason why peer observation rarely occurred in this school was because panel heads were too busy with their duties and did not have the time to observe the teachers in their subject panel. The panel heads had their own teaching periods and could hardly find the time to observe other teachers.

Most panel heads did not observe the teachers directly because they were uncomfortable doing it, especially if they had to observe teachers who were more senior to them. Esther said “as panel heads we are supposed to observe but I don’t really sit in the class.” She felt that the classroom observation could be carried out in a discreet manner. Esther explained how she would observe the teachers in her panel: “I do in the sense that I may be outside, not directly, indirectly. I have not started, but I think I would on one or two because I foresee some problems.” Ironically, when the teachers spoke about evaluating their peers, they too emphasized the need to observe those with some problems in their instructional practice.

In Sri Damai the classroom observation was mainly conducted by the administrators and the teachers were not ready to go into their colleague’s classroom to provide constructive feedback on their teaching. The culture of being open to comments from observers in the classroom was not prevalent in this school. The concept of exchanging ideas among peers for further improvement was also not entrenched within the school system.

Frequent use of informal evaluation. The administrators believed that they could obtain more accurate data on teacher performance by carrying out informal evaluation. The administrators practiced walk around management in school to observe teachers indirectly. They did this daily at least twice a day to get an overall picture of what was happening in the school. The headmistress and the senior assistants walked around separately at different times during the day and they wrote reports about their observations in a special book. Rehan said:

... That’s why even when I walk around the school we have a book on patrol by all my senior assistants. That is part of evaluation in an informal way. Sometimes I just, you know from the back of the class, I can know what the teacher is

teaching. I can know how the teacher is handling the class and on all the other parts of the school too. So if I don't do that I don't feel complete, that is my feeling.

Joyce explained that their observations "could be on anything at all; the physical aspect of the school, teaching, learning, discipline and cleanliness." The administrators were convinced that by using informal evaluation they could see how teachers actually performed their duties in school.

The teachers conceded that the administrators observed from outside the classroom and this was done frequently. Iman noticed that even when the headmistress did not enter the classroom, she was aware of what was taking place in the classroom. Esther said that the best form of evaluation would be through informal observations. As the administrators went around the school each day, they could observe if the teachers were doing their routine work. She stressed that the administrators had to go down to the ground and observe personally what was happening daily and to interact with the teachers to understand how they coped with their duties in school. Informal evaluation made the teachers more comfortable because it was discrete and did not make them conscious of being evaluated. They were aware of it and yet not be overly concerned about being observed. They could remain their true self and go about performing their routine duties. This provided credibility to the evaluation process.

In addition to walking around the administrators also assigned certain tasks to the teachers throughout the year and their ability to perform these tasks were taken into consideration during summative evaluation. The tasks assigned to the teachers included co-curricular activities. The performance of the co-curricular activities was closely monitored by the senior assistant for co-curriculum and the co-curriculum coordinator. The headmistress said "...When you talk about co-curriculum I have got the log books; monitoring and evaluation of the books. Actually it is the evaluation of the teacher, the

implementation by the teacher through records in the books.” So based on the reports given in the log book the administrators could monitor the co-curricular activities of teachers in Sri Damai. This helped them to determine how teachers were performing their duties outside the classroom.

Using management books. The headmistress was very happy with the school-based teacher evaluation practices in her school. She took pride in the fact that she had established a good system with the use of management books to monitor the day-to-day performance of duties assigned to teachers. She wanted the teachers to write a report of how they performed their special tasks in the management book. This book was used to record all matters pertaining to the administrative function of the school. The headmistress explained about her system thus:

But other than those main important thing, to ensure that my teachers are doing their respective duties, I have management books like canteen management book, classroom cleanliness management book, toilet management book, and then what you call, duty teacher’s report book, library report book, report book for special rooms, everything, every section have their respective management book. And in those books they report daily. In their committee they have decided who will do the report. So those books are all in the office. So every morning my duty when I arrive in the school, I normally reach at 6.50, all the books I read and I will endorse. I know what happened and then I write the headmistress’s comments or criticism, any praises. It is all in that book.

Only in Sri Damai there was a system where everything was written down and documented to provide evidence on the performance of duties in school. The headmistress communicated her ideas and expectations to the teachers through the management books and there was no necessity to meet the teachers regularly. She felt

that they did not have the time to meet daily and discuss about what had to be done. The administrators felt that this was a very effective system and it had been implemented ever since the headmistress came to Sri Damai. The teachers were aware that the reports they wrote in the management books were important indicators of how they performed their duties. They made sure that they were up to date with their reports since the book was checked daily. The teachers knew that the headmistress used the book to evaluate their performance indirectly.

Grooming excellent teachers. The administrators in Sri Damai consciously groomed those who had the potential to perform well so that they could be selected to receive the Excellence Service Award. The administrators usually predetermined the teachers who they thought had the potential to perform their duties well and monitored their performance throughout the year. They gave these teachers extra duties and special projects and assessed how they executed the various duties assigned to them. The headmistress said, “Sometimes I give them projects. I give them extra responsibilities compared to others because I know that they have the potential ...” Those who had the potential to perform better were given encouragement to do their best and finally they were given high ratings in their summative evaluation.

According to the teachers, some of their colleagues were assigned big projects in school and they had to constantly have discussion with the administrators to ensure that these projects were completed successfully. In this way the administrators could monitor the progress of the duties or projects given to the teachers. This gave them a chance to project themselves in school. But the teachers who were not given special projects did not get the opportunity to prove their capabilities and thus missed the chance of getting the Excellence Service Award in school. According to Munir, “Like me, I have never got excellent before, not that I’m hoping for it. I don’t care because I never got any big

projects. So I admit that those who got the awards are those who have lately done big projects.”

Even though the practice of grooming teachers to become excellent teachers was carried out discretely, most of the teachers were aware of it. Some of them were dissatisfied and not motivated to perform better because they were not the chosen ones. It also exacerbated the suspicion among teachers that the administrators practiced favouritism during the summative evaluation process. Evaluating teacher performance during summative evaluation was a difficult task for the administrators. They had to judge overall teacher performance and rate teachers based on evidence obtained from reliable sources.

The administrators first discussed among themselves the rational for awarding the ratings for the teachers before they finalized the overall score for the respective teachers. They wanted to make sure that the teachers had contributed in the three main sectors in the school organization, namely, curriculum, co-curriculum and student affairs. The administrators also indicated that they used the findings of the formative evaluation throughout the year to evaluate the teachers for the summative evaluation. Rehan explained how she rated her teachers:

So we all sit down to give the marks for each one of the teachers. Then from there we have got the categories of teachers where we get the final percentage from the marks that we have given to them. So we divide them into excellent and then average. I have only two categories. So the excellent teachers we have a quota, okay so maybe I have ten excellent teachers but my quota is only six.

The headmistress believed that she was quite lenient with the ratings. According to her some teachers got average scores even though they did not deserve it. But due to department policy she had to give the teachers a higher rating. She expressed her frustration thus, “To me I’m very honest person, sometimes I would like even to give 50

marks overall to a teacher but I'm not allowed to because I'm supposed to give at least 80. But some teachers don't deserve it." The administrators felt they did not have much choice because if they gave low ratings to the teachers they would be questioned by the authorities at the State Education Department. Therefore they gave teachers higher ratings even though they did not deserve it. This practice actually reduced the validity of the whole summative evaluation process in the school.

Discontent with summative evaluation. Generally the teachers were not aware of what happened during the summative evaluation and they were indifferent towards the whole summative evaluation process. They hardly questioned the administrators about the ratings given to them. They just accepted their results and griped amongst themselves privately. Most of the time the teachers did not get any direct feedback based on the summative evaluation process. Esther said, "so far I didn't get any feedback from them. As I told you, I was many times encouraged by them, words of encouragement from them. They compliment me. They have a very high expectation of me." The results of the summative evaluation surprised many teachers because they did not know how the administrators derived the final scores.

Most of the time the teachers in this school did not see their final scores for the summative evaluation, but they were aware that the administrators were willing to reveal the results if they requested for it. According to Iman the teachers usually did not know their results because they were not bothered about it. Iman expressed her indifference when she said, "... maybe we have our right to question them but as I told you I couldn't be bothered. They want to give, they give, you know. Not to say I don't have the guts to ask them." She said that previously one of the teachers who confronted the administrators about her ratings got feedback on her performance and was able to perform better the following year.

The teachers believed that the summative evaluation method could be improved further. The administrators had to include the motivation aspect to the evaluation process for it to be more meaningful for the teachers. Esther said, "... this system cannot work. They must come up with strict rules that will help teachers, motivate them to be somebody, you know, they have to think." The teachers were unhappy that the whole process was controlled by the administrators. Iman said "...actually they couldn't be bothered because you know, at the end of the day the power is still in their hand. They are the administrators." The feeling of resignation that nothing could be done because the administrators had the power to make decisions about the ratings in the summative evaluation instrument prevailed among the teachers. This feeling partly contributed to the indifferent attitude shown towards the summative evaluation practice in this school. Esther added "But for me I think something must be done because as long as it's in the hands of the administrators, they are human, it's not going to be fair.

Teacher dissatisfaction with the summative evaluation process was noted throughout the interviews. They were disappointed with the methods used to select teachers who received the Excellence Service Award. The teachers believed that the administrators gave the ratings based on their perception of how teachers performed their duties and not based on solid evidence of teacher performance in school.

The headmistress denied that the summative teacher evaluation was based on the administrators' perception. She was convinced that her constant monitoring and documented evidence of teacher performance were the basis of her decision in rating the teachers during summative evaluation. She believed that by giving the teachers the opportunity to perform certain tasks in school she was giving them a chance to prove their capabilities. Then she makes a decision about their capacity to perform tasks assigned to them and finally gives her ratings. She also gets regular feedback about the teachers' performance from the senior assistants during weekly meetings. All this

information supported her reasons for selecting certain teachers for the Excellence Service Award.

The senior assistant reiterated that it was difficult to separate perception from judgment. According to her perception was the basis for evaluating a teacher. She explained, "...in this world people talk about black and white, but most of it is grey area. So, to me, if we have this particular perception of a teacher, that is already quite a good way, actually evaluating them." Joyce suggested that to add credibility to the administrators' selection of the top performing teachers in school they could probably have some sort of written test to evaluate the teachers' knowledge about the affairs of the school and the projects implemented by the government. In this way the evaluation would be based not only on perception but also evidence of teacher's knowledge of matters pertaining to the school. But the summative evaluation instrument in Sri Damai did not test the teacher's subject content knowledge and it evaluated the general aspects of a teacher's job in school.

Analytic Summary

The administrators in Sri Damai were convinced that they had an effective school-based system to evaluate teacher performance. But the methods used to gather evidence of teacher performance was still limited. The evaluation methods were not explicit and there was no direct link between teacher evaluation and better teacher performance. Though the administrators had established a system of check and balance through the use of management books to monitor teacher performance and to provide feedback for improvement, there was still a feeling of discontent with the implementation of teacher evaluation practices in Sri Damai. This feeling of discontent with the existing evaluation system emerged because of the futility of the whole teacher evaluation practice in the school. It was noted that sometimes the administrators were

conducting evaluation just to meet administrative requirements. It was not benefiting the teachers or the school as an educational organization. The administrators had to make sure that when all the monitoring is done, and the reports are collected, some action is taken to improve the overall school-based evaluation system. The evaluation process must not be for the mere fact of collecting data. It must be used to improve teacher quality and ensure better student learning in school.

Instruments Used For Teacher Evaluation

In Sri Damai the administrators used a special instrument for classroom observation and the summative evaluation. The administrators had previously used the classroom observation instruments developed by the school authorities. The latest instrument used for the classroom observation was developed by the Head Teachers Council. The administrators preferred to use the new instrument because it was more detailed compared to their previous instrument. As for the ongoing informal evaluation the administrators had developed their own instruments in this school. They used the log book system to evaluate how teachers performed co-curricular activities and special management books to monitor and record other tasks assigned to the teachers. The Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002 was used for the summative evaluation in this school.

Need to improve instrument. The administrators in Sri Damai had created an instrument for classroom observations and made changes to the instrument based on directives from the district education authorities. Their instrument consisted of eight aspects of teaching and the teacher's personality. A likert scale of one to five indicating weak, satisfactory, good, very good and excellent was used to grade teacher performance in the various aspects.

The main criteria were planning of the lesson and methods used to teach the lesson in the classroom. Other aspects included use of teaching aids, class control, student involvement in the lesson and activities given to the student during the lesson. Lately the administrators have switched to the instrument created by the Head Teachers Council because this instrument was used by most schools in the state. A comparison of the old instrument and the present instrument given by the Head Teachers Council is presented in Table 5.1.

Though the administrators had decided to use the instrument created by the Head Teachers Council for classroom observation, they believed it could be improved further. They wanted to make some changes to the criteria used to evaluate teacher performance in the classroom. As far as the headmistress was concerned the important aspect to consider was how a teacher taught in the classroom. She said the criteria should focus on what actually happened in the classroom.

Table 5.1
Comparison of Main Aspects in the Classroom Observation Instruments

Classroom Observation Instrument by Sri Damai Primary School	Classroom Observation Instrument by the Head Teachers Council
Details About the Teacher	<u>A. Details About the Institution</u>
<u>A. Physical Details of Class</u>	<u>B. Details About the Teacher</u>
- Arrangement	
- Cleanliness	<u>C. Teaching and Learning</u>
- Decoration	<u>Aspects/ Critical Items</u>
<u>B. Teachers' Planning</u>	- Planning for the Year
- Weekly	- Daily Lesson Plan
- Daily	
<u>C. Teaching Methods</u>	- Set Induction
- Introduction	- Presentation and Development of
- Presentation	Teaching and Learning
- Practical/Activity	
- Time Management	
- Closing/Summary	

Table 5.1 (continued)
Comparison of Main Aspects in the Classroom Observation Instruments

Classroom Observation Instrument by Sri Damai Primary School	Classroom Observation Instrument by the Head Teachers Council
<u>D. Use of Teaching Aids</u>	- Questioning Technique
- Suitability	- Student Involvement
- Effectiveness	- Support given
- Variety	- Exercises and Assignments
<u>E. Class Control</u>	- Checking Students Exercises and Assignments
<u>F. Student Involvement</u>	- Closing
<u>G. Student Activity</u>	- Student Outcome
<u>H. Teacher</u>	- Classroom Management
- Dressing/Discipline	- Teacher Character and Personality
- Punctuality	Remarks/Comments
- Voice/Use of <i>Baku</i> Language	
- Confidence	
- Interaction	
- Emotion	
<u>Comments</u>	

Source: Sri Damai Primary School and Head Teachers Council

The administrators said that there was no explanation about the various aspects in the new instrument by the Head Teachers Council. So when they evaluated the teachers in the classroom, they had to think and interpret the criteria according to their individual perspective. Besides this, the senior assistant was baffled about the need to fill in the teacher's personal particulars such as the race and religion in the instrument. These details were not required in the previous instruments used by the administrators in Sri Damai. They felt that several aspects such as the classroom environment, planning, instruction and teaching aids were considered more important in evaluating teacher performance in the classroom. Joyce explained the criteria she used in her observation thus:

You have the introduction, how it is done and then the activities and how the teacher manages time whether he is on time and how he allocates the time for different activities and then the closing activity and then the use of teaching

materials. You see the suitability, whether it is suitable or not, and whether it is effective and the number of teaching aids used.

Since the instrument was just confined to what happened in the classroom, the administrators were unable to observe other aspects such as concern for students' welfare, how the teachers handled student discipline and leadership qualities. Joyce pointed out that though "we cannot give marks, but we know." These other aspects were gleaned from their perception of how teachers performed their other duties in school.

According to Joyce the classroom observation instrument was only 60 percent reliable to evaluate teacher performance in school. She wanted the evaluation to be more complete but since this instrument was only looking at the teacher's performance in the academic area it could not give an overall picture of the teacher's duties. She explained that teaching in the classroom depicted only 50 percent of what a teacher did in school. The other aspects of teacher performance in school had to be evaluated based on how they carried out the myriad duties assigned to them in school.

The teachers in Sri Damai did not know how the new instrument was developed and why it was introduced in this school. They were divided in their opinion about its adequacy. Munir and Iman remarked that the instrument was sufficient for formative evaluation in the school, while Shreya and Esther thought otherwise. But Munir agreed that the instrument could be improved further because some items were not relevant to what the teacher was doing in the classroom.

The teachers thought that the instrument was too general and subjective. They wanted the criteria to be based more on the student aspect and the character of the teacher. Shreya believed that 90 percent of the evaluation must be based on the academic aspect. She felt the teaching and learning that occurred in the classroom was of utmost importance and when the administrators evaluated teachers they should take into consideration the teacher's instructional practice. The teacher's punctuality was also

considered an important criterion. They should be in class on time to conduct their lessons. Besides that, they should also ensure that the students' exercise books were marked and corrections were completed. Shreya's main concern was the students because she considered them to be her 'customers' and the final student outcomes were solely dependent on how the teachers taught them in the classroom. Finally she considered the teachers' attitude and their relationship with the students in the classroom as essential criteria that would determine the outcome of the teaching and learning process.

Inadequate instrument. The administrators and teachers concurred that the Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002 which was used for summative evaluation was insufficient for evaluating all aspects of teacher performance in school. Rehan said "I think for government schools, the instrument has to be modified also. It's not enough." There were certain aspects that could not be evaluated using the summative instrument. The teacher's effort in increasing student learning could not be evaluated using the present instrument. The on-going monitoring system enabled the administrators to look into areas which were not measured using the instrument given by the department.

The criteria in the summative instrument included various aspects such as the teachers' work output, knowledge, skills, personality and contributions outside school. Esther said that the criteria examined the teacher's character, especially "...how you present yourself to the students, to the administrators, to our colleagues, you know. Were you rude? All these aspects it's all in the criteria there." But the criteria only indicated the surface level of what the teachers did in school. The teachers wanted the criteria in the instrument to include their commitment, skills, creativeness, being proactive, attitude towards colleagues and students, as well as how teachers shaped students' character to improve learning in school.

Shreya added that the present instrument did not indicate the teachers' interactions and their achievements with the students. It was very general, making it too subjective during interpretation. She wanted the instrument to examine the student aspect more, especially the teachers' contributions towards improving student learning. As far as she was concerned the main aspect of evaluation should be based on the teachers' potential in achieving student learning gains.

The teachers stressed that the instrument was inadequate to evaluate everything they did in school and therefore it had to be improved further. They explained that the details of how they performed their tasks or responsibilities were not elaborated in the present instrument. Therefore they believed that if the administrators' judgment was based on what was written in the instrument, then they would not be able to see the entire achievements of the teachers. The teachers wanted more specific criteria pertaining to what the teachers did in school.

Most teachers considered the space provided in the instrument to list down their contributions for the whole year was insufficient to elaborate their actual achievements in the school. The teachers were also concerned with the comments given by the evaluators in the instrument because it indicated the administrators' overall perception of the teachers' performance in school. It was the deciding factor on whether the teacher would score high ratings and eventually receive the Excellence Service Award.

In Section Six of the instrument the teachers were given five percent of the marks for their contributions outside the school. But some teachers were frustrated because the administrators had not considered their contributions even though they were actively involved in state and district level co-curricular activities. One of the teachers explained why the headmistress did not want her to be active in co-curricular activities outside school. She said, "... she is sacred, afraid that I might be out of the school very often. She doesn't like it." The administrators had discouraged the teachers from being

actively involved in activities outside school. But the teachers were invited by the state and district level authorities to contribute their expertise in various fields. This created a dilemma for the teachers, especially for those who were actively involved outside school. The teachers wanted the summative instrument to evaluate the performance of all duties in school, as well as their contributions in co-curricular activities outside school.

The teachers were unhappy with the evaluation instrument and the overall summative evaluation process. They believed that the administrators were not serious about the whole evaluation process. Iman said "...actually they couldn't be bothered, you know. They couldn't be bothered because at the end of the day the power is still in their hand. They are the administrators." The feeling of resignation that nothing could be done because the administrators had the power to make decisions about the ratings in the summative evaluation instrument prevailed among the teachers. This feeling partly contributed towards the indifferent attitude shown towards the summative evaluation practice in this school.

Analytic Summary

In Sri Damai, the administrators and the teachers did not contribute towards the development of the instruments used for teacher evaluation. The instrument was provided by external authorities and they had decided to use it because it was more convenient to use a pre-designed instrument. It was quite obvious they were ignorant about the validity and reliability of the instrument used in the school. The administrators assumed that since the classroom observation instrument was reproduced from the Federal Inspectorate of Schools' quality standards, therefore it was valid and reliable. But the instruments did not meet the expectations of the teachers who wanted all aspects of their duties to be evaluated in school. The teachers were unhappy with the summative evaluation instrument which did not include adequate criteria to measure all aspects of

teacher performance in school. The teachers were concerned with student learning and wanted the administrators to use appropriate criteria which could measure their contribution towards student learning in school.

Utilization of Evaluation Findings

The administrators in this school sent their classroom observation findings to the District Education Office twice a year. The District Education Office did not take any action based on the results of the classroom observation. But they made it mandatory for the schools to send the results because they wanted to ensure that school administrators were doing frequent classroom observations to provide feedback to teachers. The findings of the summative evaluation were also sent to the State Education Department through the District Education Office. The names of the teachers who had been selected for the Excellence Service Award were submitted to the authorities for further action.

Limited use of findings. The administrators acknowledged that the findings of the evaluation were not used for any major decisions pertaining to teacher development in the school. Sometimes they used the formative evaluation findings as evidence of teacher performance in the classroom when they rated the teachers during summative evaluation. They realized that on-going evaluation provided more accurate evidence of how teachers performed their respective duties in school daily. Generally the teachers were not sure about the utilization of the evaluation findings. But they were aware that the administrators used formative evaluation findings for summative evaluation.

The teachers did not consider the summative evaluation findings as a motivating factor to perform better in school. However, some of the teachers were aware that the evaluation findings were important for future use. The teachers were not truly concerned with how the administrators utilized the evaluation findings. According to them the

findings of the summative evaluation were not always accurate because sometimes a teacher who was given high ratings in a year would suddenly receive lower ratings the following year. This did not make sense to the teachers who were aware that most teachers performed at the same competency level without a drastic change in their performance. So they concluded that the results of the summative evaluation were very subjective and not acceptable.

Analytic Summary

The teacher evaluation findings were rarely used to make any important decisions on teacher retention, promotion or salary increment. The administrators were frustrated that they could not use the evaluation findings to remove incompetent teachers, whereas the teachers lamented that they did not receive any benefits from the utilization of the evaluation findings. The overall teacher evaluation practice was not considered an important process that could improve teacher performance or change teacher behaviour in school. Only the summative results were used to select suitable candidates for the Excellence Service Award. But the principal rating method used in summative evaluation was considered very subjective and therefore it diminished the credibility of the findings. Teachers were not concerned about how the evaluation findings were used by the administrators or the higher authorities. They performed their duties in school without being duly affected by the findings of the evaluation process.

Contextual Factors Affecting the School-based Teacher Evaluation System

There were several factors that affected school-based teacher evaluation practices in Sri Damai. According to the administrators most of the factors were supporting factors and there were only a few factors that hindered the proper implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation system. But a careful analysis of the data indicated that there

were more challenges that affected the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in this school.

The administrators had established a good management system which helped them gather information on how teachers performed their duties in school. They had a monitoring system for everything and therefore the teachers were aware of what they were supposed to do. The management books and other forms of report enabled the administrators to gather evidence about how teachers performed their respective duties daily. The information gathered was used to make final judgment of teacher performance in school.

The teachers in Sri Damai had been compliant towards the evaluation process and hardly ever questioned the administrators about the methods used to evaluate their performance. This had made it easier for the administrators to plan the classroom observations and other forms of formative evaluation in school. The headmistress could conduct the classroom observations without any problem because the teachers followed the schedule planned by the administrators. The senior assistant said that the evaluation process had been a rewarding one for her because she had learnt a lot from the teachers. She realized that it was important to have a pact with the teachers so that they could work together. The evaluators had worked as a team and the support they gave each other had facilitated the teacher evaluation process in school.

Another factor which supported the school-based teacher evaluation practice in this school was the cooperation from the parents. The headmistress said that she received a lot of feedback about the teachers from the parents. Based on this feedback the administrators could take action to improve teacher performance and motivate teachers to perform even better. The indirect help by the parents contributed towards the implementation of the teacher evaluation system in this school.

The administrators had a lot of responsibilities in school and sometimes it affected their evaluation process. Due to time constraints they could only conduct two classroom observations per year though they would like to do four classroom observations per year. The administrators could not go back to check whether the teachers had improved or changed their instructional practice based on the feedback given by the administrators. The large number of teachers in this school was another reason why the administrators could not evaluate them more than twice. There were five administrators and more than fifty teachers in this school. Some of them could not observe all the teachers in their list.

Due to the double session in this school the administrators could hardly find time to meet all the teachers together in one place. It was also difficult to find a suitable time to disseminate information to the teachers. The teachers were aware that the administrators could not observe them more often due to the many administrative duties they had to perform. This affected teacher performance because they were not evaluated regularly and very little feedback was given to help them improve their performance.

Generally the administrators were of the opinion that there were no major problems in implementing the evaluation practice in Sri Damai. But the teachers were more aware of the feelings of dissatisfaction that existed in the school due to the evaluation practices. The teachers did not voice their dissatisfactions openly. This gave the administrators the impression that all's well with their school-based evaluation practice. The teachers were not comfortable with the evaluation process in school because they looked at it more as a process to find their weakness and not help them improve their performance. Esther said "I think it causes a lot of dissatisfaction among teachers. It is one of the challenges. I think teachers don't like to be observed you know."

Besides that, the administrators faced the challenge of not being able to sack incompetent teachers. The administrators could not give too low or too high ratings

because then they would be answerable to the authorities in the District Education Office. They would be required to justify their ratings they have given in the summative evaluation. The headmistress said if she had the choice she would rate some teachers low because they were not performing well. There were no clear policy guidelines for the administrators to evaluate and take action on underperformers in school.

Conclusion

The teacher evaluation practice was seen as an indispensable aspect of the administrative system in Sri Damai Primary School. Both the administrators and teachers agreed that evaluation could provide feedback on teacher performance in the school. The evaluators in this school conducted formative evaluation mainly to “keep the teachers on their toes.” They felt that regular monitoring and proper feedback could help improve instructional practice in school. The teachers admitted that some teachers in this school needed the occasional push to perform their job better. So formative teacher evaluation throughout the year could provide this thrust to teachers to excel in their job.

The administrators used classroom observation as the main method of evaluating teaching in the classroom. But there were many inconsistencies in the implementation of the classroom observations in this school. The administrators considered classroom observation as a complete package that evaluated all aspects of the teacher’s instructional practice. The teachers thought otherwise. They felt that the classroom observation was insufficient because it only focused on what they were doing in the classroom and it was only conducted once or twice a year. So it did not provide appropriate data about the teachers’ overall performance in the classroom.

The school administrators in Sri Damai conducted the mandated summative evaluation system mainly to identify recipients of the Excellence Service Award. They identified teachers who had the potential to perform their duties well in the beginning of

the year and groomed these teachers to excel in their work performance. The administrators were of the view that they were giving the teachers the opportunity to prove their capabilities and be eligible for high ratings in the summative evaluation. But sometimes this system of grooming potential candidates created a feeling of dissatisfaction among teachers in school.

The feeling of indifference towards the teacher evaluation process prevailed among some teachers in this school because there was no transparency in the summative evaluation process. The teachers were not completely satisfied with the summative evaluation practice but they had decided to acknowledge the decisions made by the administrators since the power was in their hands. There was very little feedback based on the formative and summative evaluation and the teachers were also not aware of how the findings of the evaluations were utilized by the administrators in school. The teachers' sense of helplessness in the whole teacher evaluation process in school and the lack of opportunity to contribute positively towards the evaluation process have reduced the effectiveness of the school-based teacher evaluation system in this school.

Case 4: Kiarra Primary School

The Setting

Kiarra Primary School which is situated in a sub-urban area was established in 1998. There are altogether about 1145 students comprising of 575 boys and 570 girls. Most of the students from this school live in the same locality. The school is located away from the near-by residential areas and is placed next to a secondary school. After six years of primary education in Kiarra, most of the students continue their education in the secondary school.

This school has constantly performed well in the Primary School Assessment Examination (*UPSR*) which is held every year in the country. It is one of the top

performing schools in the state with a passing rate of more than 92 percent for the last five years. The school has various programs which are carried out every year to help upgrade the students' performance. Besides excelling in the academic aspect, the students in this school have also been successful in co-curricular activities, such as athletics, public speaking, story-telling, language activities, art, chess, quiz, Koran recital, aquatic, swimming, netball, cricket, rugby, tae kwon do, robotic and cross-country run. They have participated in various championships and won numerous awards at the zone, district, state and national levels for the school. The teachers and students in this school have worked hard to make it an exemplary school in the district. In Kiarra the whole environment projects an educational aura which promotes indirect learning constantly for the students.

Azreen is the headmistress in this school and she is assisted by four senior assistants and 59 teachers. The five supporting staff in the office performed routine administrative duties and helped to manage the school. The administrators in Kiarra had set a management system which functioned very well. They had a work procedure manual for the teachers to inform them about their duties and how to perform them. All details pertaining to their job descriptions, circulars and work procedures were included in this manual. It also explained instructions on evaluating student's work, supervision and classroom observation. The main evaluators in the evaluation process were the headmistress and the senior assistant. They were chosen to give the administrators' perspective of how teachers were evaluated in Kiarra Primary School.

Implementation of School-Based Teacher Evaluation Practices

The administrators explained that there was no special circular in the school asking them to carry out formative teacher evaluation. But based on their job descriptions they knew that they had to evaluate the teachers in their school. The work procedure manual in the school stated that administrators had to evaluate the teachers at

least twice a year. An analysis of the document indicated that there was a section on supervision and the performance of classroom observation periodically. The administrators were only given brief instructions on how to carry out teacher evaluation. They practiced formative teacher evaluation throughout the year and performed the mandatory summative evaluation at the end of the year.

The school-based teacher evaluation practices in Kiarra had been established since 1998 when the school was newly opened. The present administrators continued the existing practices with a few amendments over the years. Suraya, the senior assistant, said "... we found this system in school. So we followed it and made some improvements." From time to time the State Education Department and the District Education Office would instruct the school to make some minor changes to the teacher evaluation process. Teachers who have been with the school since its establishment revealed that they had not seen any circular or policy on the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Kiarra. They just followed instructions given by the administrators about performance evaluation and they were rarely consulted about the implementation of the teacher evaluation practices in this school.

The administrators were in favour of having an internal auditing system to monitor teacher performance in school. But Azreen reiterated that most administrators did not do it because there were no instructions from the local education authorities. She also revealed that the authorities in the State Education Department and the District Education Office were too busy and therefore did not monitor the teacher evaluation practices in schools. Furthermore, there were no guidelines from these authorities on how to establish an effective school-based evaluation system in schools. So most school administrators in the state had different views on how to evaluate teacher performance in school, but their ultimate goal was the same, that is, to improve the quality of teaching and promote student learning.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

The critical question of why teacher performance needs to be evaluated in schools was discussed among the participants in this school. The findings indicated various insightful views on the purpose of teacher evaluation in Kiarra. The common trend of thought was that evaluation was necessary to ensure that teachers performed their best and continuously improved their instructional practice in school.

Measuring excellence in school. The administrators conducted formative and summative evaluation to measure teacher performance and promote excellence in school. They believed that there was a relationship between teacher evaluation and the overall functioning of the school as an educational institution. They explained that if there were no evaluation, it would affect the performance of the school. Teachers would remain in their comfort zone assuming that their performance was good and they would not attempt to improve their performance. Azreen considered evaluation as a means of measuring excellence in her school. She said, "... if we want to measure any form of excellence there must be evaluation, right? If not, if we don't do it, then the school will be just like that, you know." Teacher evaluation helped her determine who among her teachers were good and effective, as well as those who needed further guidance or the occasional push to perform better. Azreen was convinced that without teacher evaluation mediocrity would prevail amongst teachers and this will lead to lack of excellence in school. However, she stressed that in order for evaluation practices to be effective it had to be carried out in a fair manner. She said, "...I feel performance appraisal is good even though part of it is not fair, but it is good for the teacher if it is fair. If there is unfairness I cannot say anything. But that which is fair, it's good for the teachers.

The teachers supported the view that evaluation could measure teacher excellence in school. They agreed that in the local context some teachers did not teach well or

performed their duties superficially when they were not evaluated. This was due to basic human nature where human beings usually performed their best only when they were evaluated. Therefore, with regular monitoring and evaluation teachers would be conscious of the fact that they had to perform their best at all times. All the teachers were aware that the reason for summative evaluation was to identify excellent teachers in school. It was a known fact that when they performed their duties exceptionally well they would be rewarded at the end of the year based on the findings of the summative evaluation.

The administrators believed that the ultimate purpose of evaluation was to produce good quality teachers in school. Kiarra Primary School had visions of attaining the status of an 'Excellent School' in the state. So the administrators were working towards improving teacher performance and student achievement in school. They believed that through ongoing evaluation practices they would be able to help teachers improve the quality of their instructional practices in school.

Presenting evidence of teacher quality. The administrators were aware that they were also accountable to parents who expected the best performance from the teachers at all times. Parents wanted reassurance that teachers were providing quality education to their children in school. The administrators had to play their part in reassuring parents that their children were taught by effective teachers who were knowledgeable in the teaching and learning process. Therefore, the administrators reassured parents by having a teacher evaluation system to monitor and evaluate how teachers performed their instructional practice in the classroom, as well as other duties in school.

Parents usually judged teachers by their communication skills, mannerisms, body language, and their overall competence in teaching. Suraya believed that everything was interconnected. In some cases when a few teachers did not perform their duties well,

parents would assume that all teachers were inefficient in the school. Therefore to win the confidence of the parents all teachers had to ensure that they performed their best throughout the year.

In the local context the teachers were not evaluated to renew their licence to teach or for extension of their teaching contract. Due to this, Azreen believed that some teachers were not performing their best in school. There were underperformers who needed constant pushing to upgrade their performance. So the administrators concluded that regular teacher evaluation could help mediocre teacher improve their performance. Azreen summed it up by saying that the good and bad image of a school was based mainly on the teacher's performance. She said, "... the performance of the teachers comes first, I think only then the students."

Improving performance of novice teachers. Another purpose of evaluation in this school was to improve the performance of novice teachers. The administrators stressed on the need to evaluate novice teachers who were still not experts in their areas of specialization. These teachers were fresh from the teacher training institutes and they were uncertain of the appropriate pedagogical approaches in the classroom. The administrators used evaluation to provide feedback to these young teachers who were in the beginning of their career. Suraya said, "... we give feedback and then we are not going to pinpoint their mistakes. We are going to help them. Help them to improve how to become a good teacher. From experience you can be a good teacher." She believed that even if a teacher was highly qualified it did not mean that he or she was a good teacher. To her, experience was an important aspect that determined teacher effectiveness in school. She stressed that to be a good teacher one should have more than ten years of experience.

Teacher evaluation was also carried out to ensure that novice teachers adhered to stated requirements such as following the curriculum and syllabus provided by the Ministry of Education. Anita explained that evaluation was carried out "... to see whether teachers do their work and if they were following the syllabus given by the ministry. They also want to see whether the pupils learned according to the syllabus." Being a novice teacher she agreed that evaluation provided feedback about her performance in school. She said, "...it is good for me because they can tell me what is right and what is wrong. So if we can get the feedback, then the teachers won't be lost."

The novice teachers in Kiarra agreed that they lacked experience in performing some of the duties and were open to the idea of receiving feedback based on teacher evaluation in school. But they insisted that the feedback on their instructional practice should be from someone who was well-versed in the subject matter they taught in school. This would increase the teacher's confidence in the feedback provided by the evaluator.

Providing feedback on teacher performance. The school-based teacher evaluation system was used as a mechanism to identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses and help them upgrade their performance. It was agreed that even senior teachers needed guidance because they might go on teaching the same content for many years without making any changes to meet the challenges of the present education system. The initial idea was to provide teachers regular feedback on how they were performing their duties and to help them enhance their instructional practice in the classroom.

The administrators were aware that not all teachers were effective in school. Some teachers could not cope with the new policy changes and had difficulties teaching their subjects in the classroom. They needed constant feedback to help them adapt to the new methods of teaching in the classroom. Others came to school with personal

problems and they were constantly scolding the students in the classroom. These teachers needed feedback on how to manage their students and communicate effectively in the classroom.

It was also imperative to ensure that teachers were on track and taught the correct lessons according to the mandated syllabus. The teacher evaluation system in school was seen as an avenue for achieving this goal. Therefore the administrators had to observe the teacher's overall performance by looking at various aspects in the classroom and provide feedback for further improvement. The teachers would be given feedback on various aspects of teaching such as methods of teaching, subject content, language proficiency and classroom management.

The teachers concurred that teacher evaluation was a good mechanism to get feedback on how they performed their duties in school. They also reasoned that they were human and they were bound to make mistakes. So if they were provided feedback on their performance they would be able to do their job better. The teachers were open to the idea of receiving constructive criticism from the administrators in order to improve their instructional practice. Izzana said "... when we teach we might not know how well we teach. If we get the opinion from somebody else they might have a different view. Not really to judge, just to give constructive criticism for us to upgrade ourselves." However the teachers cautioned that the evaluation practices should not be carried out too often. Noreen said:

... I think it is good, but not always, usually our school maybe twice a year, so that the administrator will know whether they are doing their work, their capabilities in handling the class. And then the administrator also can check the pupils work.

It was quite apparent that the teachers preferred a more supervisory approach and they were uncomfortable being judged on their performance. They wanted the focus of the

evaluation to be on providing feedback for improvement and not to identify deficiencies in their teaching practice.

Evaluation for career advancement. As in other schools, the main purpose of the summative evaluation in Kiarra was to select teachers who would be given the Excellence Service Award. But the administrators in Kiarra revealed that summative evaluation was also carried out to make decisions on career advancements. This included confirmation in the teacher's post and promotion to a higher level in the education sector. Beginning teachers had to serve for three years before they were confirmed in their position in the school system. They had to receive high ratings in the summative evaluation to be confirmed in their position. The experienced teachers had chances of being promoted to become senior assistants or head teachers based on their performance in the summative evaluation. They had to perform well to obtain high ratings consecutively for at least three years in order to be considered for promotion to a higher level in their respective schools.

Besides that, sometimes those who were chosen to attend professional development courses or awarded scholarships to pursue further studies were selected based on their high ratings in the summative evaluation. However, there was no remuneration in the form of salary increment based on the summative evaluation. Previously those who received high ratings in summative evaluation were given an increment in salary according to their grade level. But now, the teachers were only selected to receive the Excellence Service Award and they received a token sum of a thousand *ringgit* as part of their reward.

Furthermore, the administrators pointed out that if a teacher received high ratings in the summative evaluation it would affect his or her performance ratings in a new school. The good ratings received in the old school would create preconceived notion

about the teacher's abilities because the administrators in the new school would automatically consider the teacher with high ratings to be a good teacher. Suraya said:

... But sometimes say if there is a new teacher here. I see his previous one say he got 80 something. I'm not going to give him 70. Maybe his performance is good, right. Sometimes in the first six months nothing has been achieved, we can call him. We want to help him, if he wants to ask anything because this evaluation is not to fail him, right.

The administrators could not give very low ratings for the summative evaluation because then it would affect the teachers' chances of promotion in the future. So they tried their best to be fair in their judgment of teacher performance in summative evaluation.

As far as the novice teachers were concerned summative evaluation was only carried out to show appreciation to the teachers and it did not provide any chance for promotion. They explained that even though the teachers had been recognized as excellent teachers more than once, their salary and grade level remained the same. Their chance to move up the career ladder depended on the external assessment of teachers and eventually a gradual increment was based on number of years served as a teacher. The teachers believed that their promotion was dependent on the outcome of the Competency Level Assessment which was carried out by authorities in the Ministry of Education. The administrators in Kiarra knew that the summative evaluation findings had an effect on the chances for promotion, whereas the novice teachers were ignorant of it. This was partly due to the fact that the teachers were not involved in the decision making process on matters pertaining to teacher evaluation in school.

Analytic Summary

The administrators believed that excellent teachers were a catalyst for excellent schools. They could help students achieve excellence, which was the ultimate aim of

every school system. One of the ways of measuring excellence in school was through an effective teacher evaluation system. So the focus of the evaluation system in Kiarra was to provide feedback so that teachers improve their performance and become excellent teachers in school. This included novice teachers who had a lot to learn and senior teachers who needed the occasional push to upgrade themselves. There were different views on the purpose of summative evaluation in school. The teachers assumed it was only carried out to select the recipients of the Excellence Service Award annually. But the administrators knew that the consequence of the findings of the summative evaluation was far greater than what the teachers had anticipated. The uncertainty about the purpose of the summative evaluation was due to the lack of knowledge among the teachers and the lack of transparency in the method of carrying out the summative evaluation in this school.

Methods of Evaluation

The administrators in Kiarra conducted both formative and summative evaluation to help improve teacher performance in school. The emphasis of the formative evaluation was to constantly provide feedback to improve instructional practice in the classroom. But due to the irregular evaluation practices the teachers could not see how teacher evaluation had an impact on their performance. The common method of formative evaluation was classroom observations and evaluating students' work in the classroom. The summative evaluation was carried out at the end of the year and it encompassed the overall duties performed by a teacher in school. Several themes pertaining to the methods used to evaluate teachers in Kiarra are discussed further in the following paragraphs.

Limited classroom observation. The main source of data on teacher practice was derived from classroom observations. Due to time constraints the administrators carried out only two observations in a year to evaluate instructional practice in the classroom. The headmistress did not have the time to observe all her teachers and she depended on the senior assistants to assist her. The administrators were aware that observations twice a year was not sufficient to evaluate the teacher's competencies. They admitted that sometimes it was not possible to observe every aspect in the classroom observation instrument in one visit. They did not have the time for a return visit to identify changes that had taken place in the teacher's instructional practice. Besides, the teachers would be prepared for their visit and what they observe in one or two visits might not be an everyday occurrence.

The teachers agreed that two observations a year would not provide adequate information on how they taught in the classroom or their contribution towards student learning in school. They pointed out that there were other factors that affected their teaching in the classroom. There were days that their lessons were not interesting because the topic they taught was dull and dry or maybe the teacher was not feeling well on that particular day. Sometimes it was not fair on the teachers because those who were observed usually panicked when someone was watching them. So what the administrators saw during an observation was not the normal practice.

Based on the teachers' opinion a minimum of three observations a year was required to see student learning outcomes in the classroom. Some of the teachers did not have the time to give exercises in the classroom and therefore it was hard to determine whether the students had understood the lesson taught by their teachers. The administrators usually took the overall value of the whole lesson. But they would only be able to observe what happened at that moment they were in the classroom and not the after effects of the teaching.

There were times when the teachers could not teach according to the lesson plan because the students came late for their lesson. They were probably held up in their earlier class and it took some time for them to get from one classroom to another. Sometimes the children could not complete the task the teacher had given them in one lesson because they had not mastered the skills. So if the administrators wanted to observe the learning outcomes then they would have to come again the following week. Due to all these constraints in the classroom the teachers were convinced that the administrators had to do follow-up observations to see how a teacher taught a topic and how the objectives of the lesson were achieved in actual classroom situations. They believed that the administrators should try to get feedback from multiple sources because classroom observation alone was not sufficient to judge teacher performance in school.

Preference for peer evaluation. The administrators encouraged senior teachers who were experienced to observe their peers in the classroom. Most of the teachers were in favour of peer evaluation because they believed they could get better feedback from peers who taught the same subjects. Anita said she preferred her peers, especially senior teachers to observe and provide feedback on her teaching. She wanted the evaluator to be someone from her area of specialization. She said "...for me the most suitable evaluator is the Head of the English Language Panel." She explained that there was a gap between the teachers and administrator and this made it difficult for them to receive feedback from the administrators. The teachers also believed that the administrators who had observed them did not have the content knowledge and sometimes the terms they used were inappropriate, especially for the English language. They stressed that they did not discount the fact that the administrators were knowledgeable and had many years of experience, but they could only give feedback on other matters pertaining to classroom

management. If the teachers wanted feedback on subject content, then it had to be the subject panel head because they taught the same subject in school.

Sometimes when administrators who were not specialist in the subject content matter provided feedback, there were conflicting views on how teachers should teach in the classroom. For example, the administrators wanted the English language teachers to teach many skills in a lesson but the teachers disagreed. Izzana said that "... in normal practice we don't teach so many skills." Based on her past experiences both the administrators and her peers had observed and given her feedback about her teaching and she preferred feedback from her peers.

However, peer evaluation was not a usual practice in Kiarra because the teachers were reluctant to evaluate their peers. Noreen who was a panel head said "no, although I'm the panel head, but I don't observe." Previously some of the subject panel heads had conducted classroom observations. Azlan was observed by his subject panel head and he concluded that since the subject he taught in school was not a core subject the administrators did not observe his teaching and they left it to the subject panel head.

Azlan did not have the confidence to conduct peer evaluation even though he was a subject panel head because he was a novice teacher in this school. He felt that he did not possess sufficient experience to evaluate his peers who were senior teachers in the school. The common practice of selecting novice teachers as subject panel heads in school posed a problem for the young teachers who lacked the confidence to carry out peer evaluation. Therefore, peer evaluation which was a preferred method of teacher evaluation, was not carried out regularly in Kiarra.

Insufficient information on formative evaluation. In Kiarra there was a lack of communication between the administrators and teachers about the evaluation practices in school. The teachers did not have a clear understanding of how the administrators carried

out teacher evaluation in school. The administrators usually did not have a pre-observation conference with the teachers because they had no time to sit and talk to the teachers before entering their class. Most of the time the teachers were just told about the classroom visits during meetings and there was no individual discussion with the teachers on what would be observed during the visit.

Post-observation discussion was carried out to give teachers feedback on their instructional practice in the classroom. In some occasions the administrators did not give any feedback after the classroom observation process because they were too busy. Based on the teachers' experience the post-observation conference was held on a different day when the administrators and the teachers were free. Sometimes while the students were doing their work in the classroom the administrators would call the teachers aside and give their feedback.

Administrator feedback was considered important because it helped teachers improve their instructional practice. One of the teachers explained, "... if they give feedback, then it is okay. She will tell our weaknesses. If we don't have any, then she will just observe. If she doesn't inform, we can't change. We will think we are right in what we are doing." Most teachers who did not receive any feedback assumed that their teaching was perfect. The teachers had received both positive and negative feedback about their teaching. But generally there was a lack of positive feedback from the administrators. Anita said "for me, my senior assistant will touch both the strength and weaknesses, but of course more on the weakness. The strength is just like a compliment something like that."

Anita said that sometimes she could not accept the feedback given by the administrators because their expectations were too high, especially when dealing with weak students. The teachers knew the needs of their students better because they were teaching them daily and their lessons were planned to suit the proficiency level of the

students. But the teachers rarely voiced their opinions or had discussions with the administrators about the findings of the classroom observation. They usually accepted the feedback given even if they disagreed with the administrators' comments because they did not want to antagonize them. In such instances there was only one-way communication between the administrators and teachers. This did not benefit the teachers who remained passive participants in the school-based teacher evaluation system.

Evaluating teachers based on students' work. Evaluating students' work was considered part of the formative evaluation process in this school. The administrators evaluated the students' work in the exercise books twice a year to determine the outcome of the teaching and learning process in the classroom. They examined the work given by the teachers and the students' capacity to understand and do the exercises given to them. While examining the books the administrators evaluated the quality of work given by the teachers by looking at the content of the work, frequency of giving exercises and how often the teachers marked and gave feedback. They also evaluated the students' handwriting and the promptness in doing corrections.

The administrators stressed that evaluating students' work was not to find fault with the teachers. They believed that it would actually help teachers to be more systematic in planning their lessons. Suraya said that if teachers had given exercises to their students, then they should mark the work within two or three days. Only after marking the books they would be able to identify the common mistakes made by the students and teach the respective sections or topic again. If they were planning to teach a new topic, then they had to ensure that the students had understood the earlier lesson. Only then could they move on to something new. All this required the teachers to be efficient in marking their students' exercise books and identifying the students' needs.

The teachers were aware that evaluating students' work was one method of monitoring how well teachers implemented classroom instruction. Generally the teachers could not really see how the process of evaluating students' work could indicate teacher effectiveness in the classroom. To them, it was a mere routine process that had to be carried out twice a year. This method of formative evaluation did not have a direct effect on teacher practice in the classroom. Furthermore, there was no proper instrument to measure teacher performance based on the work given to the students. The teachers concluded that the administrators could only obtain limited data on teacher effectiveness based on the evaluation of the student's work in the exercise book.

Evaluation is mostly informal. Informal evaluation was given prominence in gathering information on teacher performance in Kiarra. This inconspicuous method of evaluation helped administrators make judgment about how teachers performed the various duties in school. The headmistress said "indirect, that one is very important. The indirect evaluation, that I feel I can see the real situation." The teachers were aware that the school-based teacher evaluation system consisted mainly of informal evaluations. Anita said "...if it is 100 percent, I can give you 80 percent of it is informal evaluation."

The administrators walked around the school compound to observe the activities that were happening in the school. They were indirectly carrying out observations and forming perception of how teachers functioned in the classroom. The administrators believed that they could get a glimpse of the actual scenario through unannounced visits and discrete observation around the school. During their rounds they took note of how teachers performed their duties, especially teaching and learning in the classroom, as well as the teacher's classroom management skills. The administrators were aware that some teachers behaved differently during direct observation and on other occasions they slacked in their performance. The observation carried out while walking around was

considered the first stage of observation and the next stage was sitting and observing the teachers directly in the classroom.

The teachers were uncomfortable with the constant indirect evaluation but they realized that it was good for them because it helped them to be prepared at all times. Most of the teachers were not really prepared when the administrators observed them from outside the classroom. Though the teachers knew that the administrators could possibly have misperceptions about what was happening in the classroom based on five to ten minutes of observations from outside, they still felt that occasionally it was necessary to do so.

The teachers were also aware that they were informally evaluated on how they performed the tasks assigned to them in school. Anita explained, "So if they give me work, like the senior assistants give me work, they evaluate from my work. For example, special duties, like being a photographer, if I did it well, they will just keep smiling." She added that if the administrators were pleased with her performance then they would keep giving her more tasks. If the administrators were not happy with her work then she would have to put in more effort to gain their confidence in her ability to perform her duties.

The teachers were evaluated according to a checklist prepared by the administrators. Izzana said, "What I see from this present administration, they do it throughout the year, that's what I can see. They have this checklist, if you have not carried out your duties, during the meetings she will ask." How teachers performed their duties throughout the year had an effect on their ratings in the summative evaluation. Anita said "... I think they are evaluating also because when we did not do our work that means our marks will go down. So sometimes even though it is not our work we still have to do the tasks." She further elaborated that if the teachers were not able to meet the administrators' benchmark while performing their duties that too could result in lower

ratings in the summative evaluation. Evaluating the performance of tasks was considered an essential part of evaluation because teachers not only spent time in the classroom but they also had various other duties that they had to perform to help the school function successfully. Though the marks for performing tasks were not always recorded throughout the year, the impression of how a teacher performed his or her duty left an indelible mark in the administrators' mind.

Performance of duties pertaining to co-curricular activities was also given due consideration during informal evaluation. All teachers were given co-curricular duties in school. They were assigned the duties in the beginning of the year and it was up to them to perform their best. The administrators could gauge how teachers had performed their duties based on reports for each activity. Besides the reports prepared by the teachers, feedback provided by the students were also taken into consideration to assess the implementation of the co-curriculum programs. When co-curricular activities were taken into consideration, then the teacher had a chance to show his or her versatility in performing various duties in school. Some teachers trained students for competitions and if the students were successful due credit was given to the teacher. The headmistress said "if he wins or become a champion that is one bonus mark. If he doesn't win anything, just train the students only, then not enough."

The teachers were of the opinion that the administrators should not base their evaluation solely on whether they were successful in training champions in competitions. This was because only a few teachers were involved in training students for competitions. So if the evaluation was based on who won the competitions then it would not be fair for teachers who did not train students for competitions. The teachers felt the focus should be on whether the teachers were conducting the co-curricular activities regularly and the benefits accrued by the students in the long term.

The headmistress said that she usually made it clear to the teachers that they should not reject the extra special duties given to them. The acceptance or rejection of extra duties influenced the administrators' perception of the teacher's attitude towards work in the school. They believed that those who performed more duties without much complaint deserved higher ratings than those who performed fewer duties or those who refused to do extra duties given by the administrators.

Teacher's contribution outside school was not recognized. When the administrators carried out teacher evaluation they hardly obtained data on teacher contribution in activities outside school. The teachers complained that when they became too involved in co-curricular activities outside school their ratings for summative evaluation were affected. Sometimes the teachers were invited by other schools or authorities to help out in training or competitions. They were also invited by the district or state level officials to be involved in national level competitions. But the administrators in their school were not too happy if they went out too often. So the teachers were in a dilemma about whether they should cooperate with the outside authorities whenever they were asked to contribute towards co-curricular activities outside the school. Some teachers performed a lot of duties outside school. But the administrators did not take into consideration the duties performed outside school because it did not directly contribute towards the school's success.

Anita said that sometimes there were veiled threats that if the teachers went out of school for other duties, then their ratings would be affected. Anita expressed her dissatisfaction thus, "For me sometimes it is unfair because sometimes I have got a letter saying I have to go out. Some of the administrators will sometimes like threaten me, you know. If I have to go out very frequently it will affect my marks." The teachers felt that it was unfair to penalize them for duties performed outside the school because they were

instructed to perform the duties for the Ministry of Education. Some of teachers contributed their service in games at the international level and yet they felt that their contribution was not taken into account in the summative evaluation at the end of the year. The teachers felt that what they did outside should be given due consideration.

Lack of openness in teacher evaluation. Sometimes the administrators were not transparent in the methods they used to evaluate teachers in Kiarra. The administrators instructed the class monitors to keep record of the time a teacher entered and left the classroom during every subject. In this way they could monitor the teacher's promptness in entering the classroom and carrying out their teaching. According to Azlan this was done secretly and the teachers were not aware of it. In his opinion this practice was not very fair to certain teachers because sometimes they could not be on time due to unavoidable circumstances. However, the administrators had not taken any action on those who were not punctual. But they definitely took note of those who were constantly late for their classes and this indirectly affected their ratings at the end of the year.

Another discrete method of gathering information on teachers for summative evaluation indicated the lack of transparency and trust in the teacher evaluation process in this school. The headmistress kept secret records of teacher performance in school. If the teachers who scored low ratings in summative evaluation did not agree with their scores, the headmistress would show her evidence from her special administrator's book with information about the teachers. It was used when there was a query about a teacher's performance. Azreen explained about her book:

I have a book. I do my record book, index book actually. Teachers' name everything and what they do throughout the year is in this one book. If those teachers who have any problem or what, people have complained I have like a book. I follow alphabetical order. I write what they do, good or not good, I record

it. After that time, time to give marks for the performance, if they don't agree with the scores given I will open the book and show the issues that came up. So I can show proof, if not he will tell when did I do, I didn't do. I don't remember this. I write down, if they come late, how many times they send their books late. If many times then I will write down.

Most of the information gathered in the special book reflected negative aspects of the teacher's performance. The information in the book provided evidence of problems encountered with the teacher and it was later used to justify low scores given to the teacher during the summative evaluation. The teachers were unaware that the headmistress had such a book. This indicated the lack of openness in the teacher evaluation process and the summative evaluation seemed more like a punitive measure for teachers who did not perform according to administrators' expectations in school.

Dissatisfaction with summative evaluation. The teachers were mostly dissatisfied with the summative evaluation practices in this school. There was a need to revise the summative evaluation practices because the teachers were frustrated with the final selection of teachers for the Excellence Service Award. The administrators gave the final ratings for the summative evaluation after consulting the other senior assistants to ensure that the teachers had performed well in all areas, that is, curriculum, student affairs and co-curriculum. Once the summative evaluation was completed the teachers who were given high ratings were selected as recipients of the Excellence Service Award. In Kiarra the administrators could only select the best five teachers for the Excellence Service Award. This caused a dilemma for the administrators because they had many teachers who performed their duties well in this school.

The teachers felt that more teachers should be selected for the award. Noreen explained that in a school with a large number of teachers not all the teachers had a

chance of getting the award. Some teachers who performed their duties well in the school had to wait for their turn to receive their award. Even if they had performed well in that particular year they could not get the award because others who had been waiting for their turn would receive it first. The administrators assured that the award was not given based on seniority. They insisted that it was given to those who really deserved it. However, the belief that those who ingratiated with the administrators received better ratings in their summative evaluation was prevalent among the teachers. It seemed as if teachers who had a good rapport with the administrators received better ratings compared to those who did not get on well with them.

The teachers were generally ignorant of how administrators judged their performance and gave the ratings for summative evaluation. Azlan confessed that he had never seen his scores for the summative evaluation in his three years of teaching in Kiarra. This was because there was still a veil of secrecy in the summative evaluation process in the school. Azlan felt that the administrators should inform the teachers about their scores and explain what they ought to do to improve their scores in the future. But presently this was not practiced by the administrators in Kiarra. The teachers were also not given an opportunity to discuss the findings or question the ratings given to them during the summative evaluation. The administrators hardly gave feedback to the teachers after the summative evaluation. The headmistress only called those who had the lowest scores and those who had high scores. As for those in the middle, she did not call them personally. She just commented generally about their performance during the staff meeting.

Noreen was not sure if the summative evaluation carried out in the school could fully judge a teacher. She felt that the reliability of the whole process was still very subjective. To receive high ratings in the summative evaluation a teacher had to perform well in every aspect of the duties given in school. The administrators' perception of how

the teachers had performed their work was the determining factor in the summative evaluation process. The prevailing misconception was that those who performed their duties actively outside the classroom were considered as good teachers. But Noreen believed that what teachers did in the classroom was more important than the other duties they performed in school.

Analytic Summary

The teachers in Kiarra could not distinguish between the usual supervisory practice by the administrators and the discrete formative evaluation of their performance in school. They did not understand the implication of the on-going formative evaluation carried out by the administrators. Therefore the teachers did not take the formative evaluation practices seriously. Classroom observations were not carried out regularly and therefore it did not fully achieve its intended purpose of helping teachers improve their performance. The administrators depended heavily on informal evaluation to provide them data on how teachers performed their various duties in school. This indirect evaluation helped them form judgment of the teachers' knowledge, competencies, personal qualities and their work outputs which were the main aspects evaluated during summative evaluation. It was evident that the core business of teaching was only evaluated twice a year in school and the emphasis of the school-based teacher evaluation was on the summative evaluation which rewarded teachers for their performance. The teachers were more concerned about the summative evaluation because the findings of the evaluation had far reaching consequences which affected their teaching career.

Instruments Used for Teacher Evaluation

Initially the school administrators in Kiarra had used their own instrument modified by the previous school authorities for classroom observation. But lately they

switched to the classroom observation instrument developed by the Head Teachers Council. As for the summative evaluation they used the Performance Evaluation Report PSD4/2002. This was the mandated instrument given by the Ministry of Education to all schools. The old classroom observation instrument had thirteen different aspects and the items in the individual aspect had been detailed out clearly. The scores were based on a likert scale and the frequency and average score were stated for each aspect. The present instrument given by the Head Teachers Council was in a booklet form and the administrators decided to use it because it was much simpler and the criteria in that instrument were similar to the criteria in the instrument used by external evaluators.

Table 5.2 shows a comparison of the instruments created by the school authorities and the Head Teachers Council Instrument.

Table 5.2
Comparison of Criteria in the Classroom Observation Instruments

Classroom Observation Instrument by Kiarra Primary School	Classroom Observation Instrument By the Head Teachers Council
Dimension III : Management of Education Program	
Element 9 : Teaching And Learning	Section A. Details About the Institution
Basic Details	Section B. Details About the Teacher
<u>Aspects</u>	Section C. Teaching and Learning
1. Planning for the Year	<u>Aspects/ Critical Items</u>
2. Daily Lesson Plan	- Planning for the Year
3. Set Induction	- Daily Lesson Plan
4. Presentation and Development Lesson	- Set Induction
5. Teacher's Questioning Technique	- Presentation and Development of
6. Student Involvement	Teaching & Learning
7. Support given	- Teacher's Questioning Technique
8. Exercises and Assignments	- Student Involvement
9. Checking Students Exercises and Assignments	- Support given
10. Closing	- Exercises and Assignments
11. Student Outcome	- Checking Students Exercises and
12. Classroom Management	Assignments
13. Teacher Character and Personality	Closing
	- Student Outcome
	- Classroom Management
	- Teacher Character and Personality
	Remarks/Comments

Source: Kiarra Primary School and Head Teachers Council

The administrators had changed their classroom observation instrument from the instrument created by previous school authorities to the instrument developed by the Head Teachers Council because this new instrument used criteria recommended by the Federal Inspectorate of Schools. They explained that if the external evaluators visited their school then they could show that the criteria used to evaluate classroom instruction in Kiarra were in line with the standard criteria used by the school inspectors.

Using inadequate instrument. It was quite apparent that there was a need to improve the instrument used for classroom observation in Kiarra. This was due to the inadequacy of the present instrument used by the administrators. The administrators and teachers were not aware of the validity and reliability of the instruments used to evaluate instructional practice in the classroom. They assumed that the classroom observation instrument must be valid since it was developed based on the instrument used by the Federal Inspectorate of Schools. They believed that those who were involved in the preparation of the instrument would have discussed with the officials in the Federal Inspectorate of Schools before coming out with the criteria for evaluating teachers in the classroom. They assumed that the instrument would have been piloted in some schools before it was introduced to all schools. Based on all these assumptions they accepted the instruments and used it in their school without any reservations.

Azreen, who was a member of the Head Teachers Council, said that the validity of the instrument depended on how the individual evaluator gave the marks for the different aspects in the instrument. Some might be strict whereas others just took a cursory look and decided to give their scores. So finally the scores for each aspect depended on the administrator's personal judgment in interpreting the criteria in the instrument. According to Azreen "... the evaluator must be very particular and see properly. Only then the validity is there." If all evaluators carried out the evaluation

correctly, then it was fine. Otherwise it would eventually affect the teachers and the formative evaluation process in school.

Furthermore the constant change in the format of the instrument created problems for the school administrators. The Federal Inspectorate of Schools wanted one format that was more detailed and the Head Teachers Council came out with another format which was simplified. All these had caused more confusion in the use of the instrument in schools. The administrators revealed that even though the instrument had been in use since 2006, the Head Teachers Council had not asked for their feedback and there was no review of the instrument after its initial use in schools.

The classroom observation instrument required information pertaining to race, religion and other personal details of the teachers. The administrators felt that this information was irrelevant and it was not going to help them evaluate instructional practice in the classroom. Azreen was of the opinion that if the administrators in school were made to fill in too many irrelevant details then they would just do it for the sake of doing and they would not do a good job. This would eventually affect the validity and reliability of the instrument.

The administrators also realized that not every aspect in the instrument could be evaluated in just one classroom visit. They could only observe certain aspects in their first visit to the classroom and the others had to be evaluated during their subsequent visits. The teachers concurred that the administrators could not see every aspect when they carried out classroom observation, especially if the observation lasted for only half an hour. They explained that the student's learning outcome could not be seen based on one classroom observation because at the end of a lesson the students would have just started doing the work given to them and the outcome would not be seen. Therefore it was imperative that the administrators carried out more than one classroom observation in a year.

Ratings based on achievement of targets. In Kiarra the administrators evaluated teachers based on the achievement of targets set in the summative evaluation instrument. The instrument was given to the teachers in the beginning of the year and they were required to write their main duties and set their targets. The targets were set for each area such as curriculum, student affairs, co-curriculum, general administration and special duties. The teachers were required to achieve their targets by the end of the year. This was considered as one of the ways of planning their teaching outcomes for the year. Noreen explained how the teachers set their target:

Let's say we target for example teaching English, for teaching English for eight classes, what's your target, we have to plan. Let's say I target 98 percent pass with A's and then the rest pass with grade B. We have the target and then end of the year we have to make a report whether you achieve the target or not; if we achieve good, if not we have to give reason why we can't achieve that.

After the first six months the teachers were asked to review their targets and report to what extent they had achieved any of their targets. In the middle of the year the teachers were asked to review their list of duties and add new duties which were given to them by the administrators or drop duties they no longer performed. If they had represented the administrators at any special function then they had to include that in their list of duties.

The administrators believed that the achievement of the targets provided them evidence of how well the teachers had performed their duties in school. Their ratings were mainly based on how teachers achieved their work targets in school. The headmistress said that usually teachers who had achieved their targets were given higher ratings compared to those who had not achieved their targets.

The teachers explained that for teaching the targets were usually based on student learning outcomes. Izzana said "Target, for us teaching in Year Six our target will be UPSR (Primary School Assessment Examination) to see how many students get A's and

from the last class if possible eliminate failures.” She stressed that in an examination-oriented system student achievement in examination was given emphasis. She said “... we are so exam-oriented, more on pushing them from a D to a C and a C to a B.” The teachers had to work hard to achieve their targets in order to receive better ratings in their summative evaluation.

As for the co-curricular activities, the teachers felt that it was difficult to set targets because whenever they entered a competition they were not aware of the strength or weakness of the other teams. So they might not be able to achieve their target of being the champion if their opponents were a stronger team. Therefore the teachers felt that the administrators should not give their ratings just based on achievement of targets set by the teachers.

Generally when teachers set their targets they usually set achievable targets but the teachers concurred that sometimes not all the targets they had set could be achieved. Sometimes only 40 to 50 percent of the targets were achieved. During the mid-year review the headmistress said that if necessary she would call the teachers up to ask them why they had set so many targets but had not achieved any of them. She would give them the following six months to achieve their targets. The common belief among teachers was that achievement of targets based on student learning outcome was not a good indicator of teacher effectiveness. This was because there were many other factors that influenced student achievement in school.

Inappropriate criteria in summative instrument. The prevailing notion among administrators and teachers in Kiarra was that the instrument used for summative evaluation was not entirely suitable to evaluate teacher performance in school. The instrument was too general and some of the criteria were not relevant to evaluate the teachers. The headmistress explained:

“It is general for all civil servants. So if it is for teachers I feel teachers’ duties are different. Theirs is a lot with the students, you know. This one is a lot on work output, quantity of work. Teachers’ quantity of work cannot be compared with other people.”

The criteria in the instrument had to be changed so that they were more specific and based on duties performed by teachers in school. Some sections of the instrument were difficult to rate because it did not depict what teachers did in the school. Furthermore, the aspect on finances was not relevant to the teachers because they hardly dealt with financial matters in school.

The administrators said that the section where the teachers were given five percent marks for duties performed outside their official duties was usually the most difficult part to rate. They explained that this section did not include the duties performed by the teachers at the district, state or national level. It also did not take into consideration the duties performed by the teachers for the Ministry of Education. So the administrators found it difficult to give the teachers the ratings even though they had actively participated in activities outside school. The administrators were in a dilemma because they personally felt that if the teachers had contributed towards the Ministry of Education then they deserved the extra mark.

The administrators felt that their hands were tied and they could not give full marks in this section because it was specified that the teachers’ contribution should not be related to their official duties. It had to be contributions to the society and nation which included their work with the union or other non-governmental organization. But not many teachers were active in the teachers’ union and neither were they part of the village committee or other non-governmental organization. The teachers did not have the time to be involved in other outside activities. Generally the administrators were

confused about the ratings for this section and they gave their scores based on their personal judgment.

The criteria in the instrument could be interpreted differently by individual evaluators. The administrators seemed to have their own interpretations which affected their perception of a teacher's attitude, behavior and personal qualities in school. The headmistress said that she looked at various aspects such as how teachers communicated with them and how they reacted when they were given extra duties in school. If a teacher accepted extra duties without excuses, then she or he was considered to have the right attitude. The teacher's body language and facial expression was also indicative of their overall attitude towards performing their duties in school. Besides that, interaction with colleagues, communication with the staff and a pleasant disposition were considered indicators of right behavior by the administrators. The administrators seldom communicated their expectations to the teachers and this resulted in teachers being penalized for incorrect attitude and behaviour in school.

The teachers were confused about the evaluation of work output in the instrument. They said they were not sure which work output would be evaluated since teachers performed so many different types of work in school. They pointed out that nowadays teachers were involved in many duties outside the classroom and as such the administrators must take this into consideration during summative evaluation. They further stressed that the administrators should not only look at the output but also the performance of the duty because the teacher might have put in a lot of effort but the students were not able to achieve the intended output. So the effort put in by the teachers must be given due consideration during summative evaluation. Furthermore there were other indicators of performance in school. These included promptness in setting test papers, the quality of the test papers and how teachers dealt with parents who were considered as their client.

Most of the teachers were displeased with the summative instrument. They felt that the instrument was quite standardized and not so suitable to evaluate their overall performance. The teachers felt a sense of hopelessness because they could not do anything about the instrument. It was a standard instrument provided by the ministry and even the school administrators did not have the authority to make changes to it. Noreen said "... it is the government's one, whether we like it or not we have to follow." She felt that the criteria to evaluate teachers could be improved by getting feedback from various sources. The teachers were of the opinion that the instrument had to be modified to suit the work environment for teachers in the school. Both the administrators and the teachers stressed that the duties the teachers performed in school were not comparable to duties performed by other government employees. They felt that teachers should be evaluated more based on their competency in teaching in the classroom. Therefore the criteria used in the summative instrument had to be changed to make them more suitable to evaluate teacher performance in school.

Analytic Summary

The instruments used for teacher evaluation in Kiarra were created by external agencies. The administrators used these instruments even though they did not agree on the criteria used to assess teacher performance in school. Some of the information, especially asking for personal details of the teachers, did not make sense to them. However, they still used the instruments without making any changes because it was used by most schools in the district. There was a lack of knowledge about the instrument and this resulted in varied interpretation of the criteria by individual evaluators. This affected the reliability of the instruments used for evaluating teacher performance in school. The teachers wanted the evaluation instruments to be revised to suit the work they performed in school. Unfortunately they were not given an opportunity to voice

their concerns about the instruments. They were just passive recipients of the teacher evaluation process in school and they had no influence in determining the criteria or instrument used to evaluate their performance.

Utilization of Evaluation Findings

The administrators sent the findings of the classroom observations to the State Education Department because they were required to show proof of having carried out classroom observations at least twice a year. The results were sent more as a practice of keeping records rather than to initiate further actions to improve instructional practice in the school. The teachers' summative evaluation findings were kept in their personal files and it was referred to whenever the administrators wanted to make some administrative decisions pertaining to the particular teacher. The results of the summative evaluation influenced many aspects of the teachers' career in the school system even though the main concern was to reward the teachers for their excellent performance in school.

Indirect use of formative evaluation findings. There was no direct use of the evaluation findings to plan programmes to upgrade teacher performance in school. The usual professional development programmes in school were hardly based on the feedback obtained from formative evaluation. Sometimes the administrators used the findings of the formative evaluation to make decisions during the final evaluation. However, they did not depend on it hundred percent. The formative evaluation findings helped the administrators to form impression of the teachers' capabilities and suitability in performing their duties. Azreen said it helped her make decisions about selecting teachers for important posts in the school. Her direct and indirect formative evaluation had helped her to select the right candidate to perform the various duties in school.

Most of the teachers were unaware of how the findings of the formative evaluation were utilized by the administrators in this school. The teachers were not sure whether the administrators referred to the formative evaluation findings when they gave their ratings for the summative evaluations at the end of the year. But all of them were of the opinion that the findings of the formative evaluation should be used for the summative evaluation at the end of the year because the formative evaluation indicated what they had done throughout the year. The teachers believed that the overall evaluation of a teacher's performance should be based on a combination of formative and summative evaluation. This would provide an inclusive view of the teacher's capabilities in every aspect in the school.

Ignorant about the utilization of findings. The findings of the summative evaluation were used to make decisions about rewarding teachers in schools. It was also used for other decisions pertaining to career advancement in school. However, the novice teachers in Kiarra were ignorant of the outcomes of the summative evaluation and how the findings were utilized by the education authorities. Anita presumed that the results were sent to the State Education Department. She said "Department maybe, I don't know. The department keeps it and at the end of the year they will throw it." She was not aware of the far-reaching consequences of her summative evaluation and how the ratings would affect her career in the future.

Azlan also said that he did not know what happened to the findings of the summative evaluation. Being a novice teacher, he had never asked the administrators about the ratings they had given him in the four years that he had been in Kiarra. He assumed that his performance was good because he had not been called up by the administrators. The general assumption was, only teachers who did not meet the administrator's expectations were called to be informed about their poor performance.

The rest of the teachers assumed that they were given high ratings for their excellent performance. According to the administrators the findings of the summative evaluation were used to determine the recipients of the Excellence Service Awards in school. Azreen said that the department usually did not take any further action based on the summative results. They awarded the Excellence Service Awards to the recommended teachers and they expected the school authorities to take action on underperformers.

In some instances the results of the summative evaluation were utilized for making personnel decisions in the future. The findings of the summative evaluation for three consecutive years were referred to when the authorities wanted to promote the teachers to a higher salary level. The findings were also taken into consideration when the administrators selected teachers to attend professional development courses and when the teachers applied for scholarships to further their studies. However, the novice teachers were not aware of this and they were unconcerned about the whole evaluation process in school.

Analytic Summary

The school authorities kept the findings of the evaluation as records in the school files and referred to them when necessary. The classroom observation findings were merely evidence to indicate that the observations had been carried out. This reaffirmed the belief that the formative evaluation, especially the classroom observation was a mere administrative practice which had very little effect on the instructional practice in school. As for the summative evaluation, the teachers had very little information about how the administrators rated their performance and what happened to the final results of the evaluation. The novice teachers were ignorant about the consequences of the evaluation findings on their opportunities to develop professionally. They also had no clue that the administrators used the findings to help teachers advance in their careers. This ignorance

was due to the insignificant role played by the teachers in the school-based teacher evaluation system.

Contextual Factors Affecting the School-based Teacher Evaluation System

The findings of the study indicated that there were several factors that influenced the effective implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Kiarra. The administrators' main concern was not having enough time to evaluate the teachers and provide sufficient feedback to help improve the quality of instructional practice in school.

The cooperation given by the teachers had helped the administrators carry out the evaluation process with ease in this school. The teachers realized that the administrators had to carry out the classroom observation at least twice a year. So they followed instructions and allowed the administrators into their classrooms. Azreen said "... here the teachers are easy, not very stubborn, there aren't any who oppose. But some of my friends say, they can't do this, their teachers oppose ..."

The teachers rarely questioned the administrators about the teacher evaluation process in school. The administrators had total control over the process and they practiced a top-down system which gave the teachers very little opportunities to voice their opinions. Azlan pointed out that some teachers kept quiet in front of the administrators but showed their displeasure later. He said, "They have to follow instructions, forced to. Surely they won't refuse, even though in their hearts they want to refuse this." Generally the teachers kept their feeling of discontent to themselves and worked together with the administrators.

Another supporting factor in Kiarra was the administrators' vast experience. They had many years experience being a teacher and also an administrator and this had prepared them to carry out the school-based evaluation. The headmistress had been part

of the panel which selected excellent schools in the state. So the experience she gained while judging the schools had provided insight on how to assess teacher performance in school. She had many visitors to her school and she had also taken her teachers to visit other schools to learn from them and also to share ideas to improve the school. This experience had given her knowledge on how to gauge teacher performance in school.

There were not many factors that hampered the implementation of the school-based teacher evaluation practices in Kiarra. Their main hindering factor was the lack of time to carry out formal evaluation more frequently. The headmistress could not carry out frequent classroom observations due to her other administrative duties. Ideally she would prefer to observe the teachers at least three times a year, but she could not do so due to heavy workload. Generally the senior assistants carried out the classroom observations in this school. The headmistress was always busy and sometimes she was away attending to duties outside school. Some of the teachers were not observed because the observation schedule which was prepared at the beginning of the year could not be followed. Sometimes the teachers were not in school when the administrators carried out classroom observation in school. The administrators did not have the time to reschedule the classroom observation to ensure that all teachers were twice a year.

Conclusion

The administrators believed that teacher evaluation would help them assess how teachers performed their designated duties in school. The administrators acknowledged that the teachers, especially the novice teachers needed to be evaluated and given feedback on how to enhance their performance in school. The limited methods used to gather information on how teachers performed their duties affected the implementation of the evaluation process in this school. The bulk of the data was based on indirect evaluations. This led to the issue of bias in using personal judgment to evaluate teacher

performance. Furthermore the administrators' perception dominated the overall decision making process in the school-based teacher evaluation practices in this school. The teachers had limited role to play in the overall teacher evaluation process in school. The school-based teacher evaluation practices did not directly influence the way teachers performed their main duties in school.

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the findings in Sri Damai Primary School and Kiarra Primary School. A comparison of the findings in the two schools indicated common patterns of teacher evaluation practices which were the result of a centralized system of education in the local context. The findings indicated that even though the schools had strong and effective head teachers who were good managers, the school-based teacher evaluation systems in these schools were not well-designed to effectively evaluate teacher performance in school. There were other methods of monitoring teacher performance but it did not influence what teachers did in their classroom to promote student learning.