



Research Article

© 2020 Musodza et al..
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

A Test of Significance of Process on Effectiveness of Teacher Evaluation in Kwekwe Schools of Zimbabwe

Belinda R. Musodza

*Department of Continuing Professional Teacher Development,
Faculty of Educational Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, South Africa*

Mamotena Mpeta

*Department of Professional Studies, School of Education,
University of Venda, South Africa*

Tawanda Runhare

*Department of Foundations of Education, School of Education,
University of Venda, South Africa*

Elphinah N. Ciske

*Department of Continuing Professional Teacher Development,
Faculty of Educational Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, South Africa*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2020-0096>

Abstract

Zimbabwe adopted Results Based Management (RBM) in order to evaluate the performance of its workers. For the process to be 'significant' and meet the basic attribute of utility, evaluation information should be focused towards predetermined uses. The objective of this study was to assess the significance of the teacher performance evaluation process and examine the relationship between the significance and the effectiveness of the evaluation system of Kwekwe district in Zimbabwe. The study was situated in the pragmatic worldview and underpinned by the Readiness Assessment, Design, Process, Significance (RADPS) conceptual framework. It adopted the convergent mixed method design and the concurrent sampling design. Simple random and purposive sampling techniques were used to select 292 teachers and 12 educators for the quantitative and qualitative research strands respectively. SPSS version 26 was used to analyse the quantitative data and qualitative data were analysed using Atlas ti. 8. Findings show that the evaluation process in the Kwekwe district has no meaningful consequences or implications on effectiveness of the evaluation system. RBM has failed to fulfil both the professional and accountability functions. The inferential statistics proved that the significance of an evaluation process is statistically significant in predicting and influencing the effectiveness of an evaluation system and in the case of Kwekwe district, the evaluation process negatively impacted on the effectiveness of evaluation of teachers. The study findings imply that an evaluation process should be carefully planned and implemented for professional and accountability functions of teachers to be effective.

Keywords: accountability; effectiveness; evaluation; professional development; significance

1. Introduction

Teacher performance evaluation is a critical aspect in the improvement reform effort in education (Stronge, 2011). Although it is accepted that a well-designed and properly implemented performance evaluation system largely contributes to school effectiveness, it has, however, been observed that most of the current evaluation systems are not doing much to enhance the instructional capacity or decision making on personnel issues (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel & Rothstein, 2012; Donaldson, 2009). Observations are that while the evaluation process is cumbersome, most of the evaluation systems have failed to be practically useful (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Callahan & Sadeghi, 2015). For an evaluation process to earn respect and support from its users, it should be consequential and its findings should be utilised (Madhekeni, 2012; The New teacher Project (TNTP), 2010). An effective evaluation system should be able to meet the utility standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluations, 1994). The utility standard states that an evaluation process should be 'informative, timely and influential' (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995:124). To achieve the utility standard, Shinkfield and Stufflebeam explain that the evaluation process should have predetermined uses that should inform decisions on promotion and provide direction for staff development so that it helps teachers to deliver exceptional service. Madhekeni (2012) adds that performance information should be utilised and be 'seen' to be utilised for the system to gain credibility. This explains the importance of convincing the users of the utility value of the evaluation process which in turn determines their attitude and the seriousness with which they conduct the process. Some studies have established that in the absence of this conviction, users then take the whole process as mere routine exercise that they do to fulfil policy requirements (Gutuza, 2016; Musingafi, Dumbu & Chadamoyo, 2013).

Teacher performance evaluation entails diagnosing the professional capacity of an employee by identifying his/her strengths and weaknesses (Choi & Park, 2016; Kang, 2013, Seo, 2012). After the identification of the strengths and weaknesses, the strengths should be acknowledged and reinforced while the weaknesses are corrected and improved. Literature identifies two main purposes of performance evaluation, namely, the formative purpose that has an improvement and developmental functions, and, the summative purpose that has an accountability and administrative functions (Danielson, 2011; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Marzano, 2012; Santiago & Benavides, 2009; Williams & Engel, 2013). Formative evaluation aims at ascertaining the training needs of a teacher by identifying the strengths and inadequacies to facilitate further professional development (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Haeefe, 1993; Hinchey, 2010; Santiago & Benavides, 2009). Professional development will then involve counselling the individual and providing targeted instructional capacitation. Summative evaluation on the other hand, involves judging the performance of an employee to inform administrative decisions on issues such as merit pay, promotion or tenure (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Hinchey, 2010; Khan, 2013). Summative evaluation aims at making teachers account for their performance and relates the level of performance to different consequences for their career. The process of summative evaluation, thus, focuses on encouraging maximum effort by teachers to perform at their best and creates a platform to recognising teachers' efforts (Santiago & Benavides, 2009).

In view of these two functions of evaluation, there are conflicting arguments on how to focus the evaluation process. One school of thought argues against the merging of the development and accountability functions, whilst on the other hand, another view argues for the combination of the two. The view against the merging contends that combining the two functions makes them counterproductive, while on the other hand, keeping them separately makes them more effective (Carroll, 1997; Popham, 1988). Evidence however exists that the two functions can co-exist and have been found to be mutually supportive, complementary, and reinforcing rather than conflicting (Zhang & Ng, 2017). Chile and China are examples of countries that have managed to successfully combine the two functions in their evaluation systems. It is, however, acknowledged that successfully combining the two functions can be challenging even though possible (Danielson & McGreal, 2000;

Hinchey, 2010; Santiago & Benavides, 2009).

In an effort to improve service provision, the government of Zimbabwe adopted Results Based Management (RBM) system as a performance evaluation system for the whole public sector in 2005 (Zvavahera, 2014). The education sector, as part of the public sector, also uses this system for the evaluation of the performance of teachers. The performance evaluation process is regulated by the Statutory Instrument (SI) 1 of 2000 (Public Service Commission (PSC), 2000). The SI gives the following as possible consequences of the evaluation process:

- Advancement or promotion.
- Transfer to a post commensurate with the member's competence.
- Participation in targeted skills development program.
- Granting or withholding of any performance award.
- Demotion or discharge in line with disciplinary procedures in Part VIII of the regulation (PSC, 2000:12-13).

It should, however, be noted that the action that is taken is discretionary to the Commission, Head of Ministry or Department. As indicated earlier, literature points out that the utility of most of the current evaluation systems is contentious. Most of the systems have failed to satisfy the professional and/or accountability functions. It is therefore against this background that this study sought to assess the significance of the evaluation system in promoting professional development and accountability functions.

A number of studies have been conducted on the implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe for the general public sector. Very few studies have, nevertheless, been done on the use of RBM in the education sector specifically. This study, therefore, sought to fill that gap bearing in mind that the education sector is a special service sector that is unique and could thus make it a bit challenging to adhere to some of the tenets of RBM without some modifications to the system. Some of the studies that were conducted have established that the effectiveness of RBM has been compromised by lack of incentives which has in turn affected the morale of the users and the way they implement the system (Mavhiki, Nyamwanza & Dhoro, 2013; Zvavahera, 2014). It has also been established that advancement and promotion are not tied to performance (Zvavahera, 2014). Machingambi (2013) also established that there are no professional development programmes in schools. There, however, hasn't been much work done to establish the relationship between the significance and the effectiveness of an evaluation process. This study, therefore, sought to establish the significance of RBM in promoting accountability and professional development among the teachers in particular, and at the same time, establish the extent to which significance of an evaluation process influences the effectiveness of RBM as a teacher evaluation system.

2. Conceptual Framework

This study was premised on the Readiness Assessment, Design, Process, Significance (RADPS) conceptual framework which was developed from elements of the Systems theory, Vroom's Expectancy theory and Locke and Latham's Goal-setting theory (Kusek and Rist, 2004; Santiago & Benavides, 2009; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Stronge, 1995; TNTP, 2010). The RADPS framework constitutes 4 components namely *Readiness Assessment*, *Design*, *Process* and *Significance*. The framework asserts that the four components are interconnected and determine the effectiveness of a performance evaluation system with regards to teacher professionalism and accountability. This report, however, confines itself to the *Significance* component of the framework as prescribed by the focus of the paper. In brief, the *Significance* component proposes that:

- Evaluation information should be utilised to make the evaluation process significant.
- Clear and specific evaluation uses should be predetermined and communicated to all stakeholders; and
- Evaluation information should have both formative and summative uses.

2.1 The teacher professional development function

Professional development involves providing teachers with opportunities that allow them to learn on the basis of the evaluation information to improve their instructional practice. The professional development function is achieved by aligning evaluation findings to the staff development programmes (Looney, 2011). Observations are that while evaluation systems have managed to identify teacher's weaknesses, they have, however, failed to fully transform the weaknesses into strengths to improve the instructional capacity of the concerned teachers. Smylie (2014) identified what he described as the 'weak link problem'. The problem exists where the evaluation process fails to emphasise the importance of professional development or makes weak and unclear provisions for professional development. To prevent the 'weak link problem', the evaluation policy has to articulate the connection between the evaluation information and professional development activities whilst the policy implementation process should exhibit this association. Goe, Holdheide and Miller (2014) echo that the most important part of an evaluation process is the use of evaluation results to inform professional development activities. Linking evaluation information and professional development programmes assists to advance the improvement function. Darling- Hammond (2013) reasons that evaluation on its own cannot improve practice, but can only be effective if it is linked to both formal professional development and job-embedded opportunities. This means that the evaluation process should create a platform where timeous and actionable feedback on performance is given so that weaknesses can be addressed through both daily practice and prescribed forums. Literature further explain that the feedback that is availed to employees during evaluations can only be productive if accompanied by learning opportunities that offer specific coaching and, development support and provide collaborative opportunities (Darling- Hammond, 2013; Murphy, Hallinger & Heck, 2013). It can thus be summed up that an effective evaluation process should assist teachers to increase and improve their knowledge and skills, thereby enhancing their confidence and instructional competency (Musingafi et al., 2013). Therefore, according to the RADPS conceptual framework, the *significance* of an evaluation system is determined by the capacity of the system to facilitate effective professional development.

2.2 The teacher accountability function

TNTP (2010) posits that for good teaching to be maintained, it has to be valued and acknowledged. This is important if effective teachers are to be retained and the teaching career is to be an attractive career choice. Using evaluation information to inform career advancement, performance rewards or sanctioning underperformers can enhance the accountability function of an evaluation system (Danielson, 2011; Isoré, 2009; Santiago & Benavides, 2009). Furthermore, Santiago and Benavides (2009) recommend that evaluation can be used to:

- Inform decisions at end of probation or employment contract.
- Determine the rate at which the teacher advances through the career ladder.
- Determine performance rewards in the form of once-off bonus pay, support for postgraduate study, and opportunities for in-service education. Rewards may also be given at department or school levels besides the individual level.
- Inform decisions to sanction teachers that continually under-perform by either removing them from teaching duties or even terminating their service.

In support, the theories of personnel economics postulate that compensation can inspire the workers to improve their practice, thereby boosting organisational performance and at the same time luring and retaining high performers while on the other hand, discouraging underperformers from either entering or staying in the system (Pham, Nguyen & Springer, 2017). Likewise, Muralidharan & Sundararaman (2011) also posit that linking a part of teachers' pay to objective measures of performance is popular with teachers. It is, however, cautioned that material incentives should be

used with care so that they are not divisive and perceived as punitive (Santiago & Benavides, 2009). Isoré (2009) on the other hand, points out that evaluation results are sometimes used for the promotion of teachers to administrative positions like Head of Department (HOD) and/or school head. Isoré proceeds to highlight that such a move can be retrogressive since it removes a good teacher from the classroom. Promotion can, therefore, be in a form that will retain a good teacher in the classroom where he/she performs best rather than in the office.

Another school of thought, however, argues against the use of material incentives as a consequence of the evaluation process. Teachers are said to place more value on their profession and intention for their students to succeed rather than on material incentives (Finnigan & Gross, 2007). In spite of these contestations, we however acknowledge the importance of making the evaluation process consequential by making effective use of the evaluation information to inform personnel decisions. The use of evaluation information for both administrative personnel and professional development purposes enhances the *significance* of an evaluation process, thereby increasing the credibility and effectiveness of that evaluation process.

3. Research Focus

The research assessed the significance of the teacher evaluation process on teacher professional development and accountability in Kwekwe district of Zimbabwe. Precisely, the research aimed to:

- establish the significance of RBM in promoting professional development and accountability among teachers,
- determine the relationship between significance and effectiveness of RBM,
- and ascertain the extent to which significance of the evaluation process influences the effectiveness of the teacher performance evaluation system.

4. Research Methodology

This study was conducted in Kwekwe district in the Midlands Province of Zimbabwe. The district has both rural and urban parts. The schools that participated in the study were thus drawn from both the rural and urban parts. The study focused on government secondary schools that use RBM as a teacher performance evaluation system. The study population consisted of the educators at school level which included the teachers, Heads of Departments and the school heads. It should be noted that before conducting the study, ethical clearance was sought and granted by the University of Venda under Project Number: SEDU/17/CSEM/08/0708. Permission to conduct the study was granted by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education of Zimbabwe.

The study was premised on the Pragmatic worldview which accepts both the observable phenomena and subjective meanings as acceptable knowledge depending on the task at hand (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). Pragmatism focuses more on what works to address the research problem and hence uses all the possible approaches to tackle the presenting issue (Creswell, 2014; Feilzer, 2010). Due to the complex nature of teacher performance evaluation, we adopted the convergent mixed method design. The mixed method design, which combines elements of both the quantitative and qualitative approaches, allowed us to combine the statistical trends from the quantitative strand and the stories and personal experiences from the qualitative strand thereby providing a fuller picture and deeper understanding of the issue (Creswell, 2015; Freshwater & Cahill, 2014).

The stratified purposive sampling technique was used to select the secondary schools that took part in the study. The criteria considered in the selection of the schools were geographical location, administering authority and staff establishment. Only government schools were considered and both urban and rural schools had to be represented. Schools classified as rural had to be at least 45km from the town centre and under the jurisdiction of a rural district council. Participating schools had

to have a minimum of 20 teachers. A total of 10 secondary schools were selected and of these ten, five were urban and the other five were rural. From these 10 schools, four schools, constituting 2 urban and 2 rural participated in the interviews.

The concurrent mixed method sampling design was used to select the educators that took part in the study. The quantitative and qualitative samples were selected simultaneously and had a parallel relationship, meaning that they were different although they were drawn from the same underlying population (Collins, Onwuegbuzie & Jiao, 2007). The educators that were considered in the selection had to have been in service by 2005 when the Government of Zimbabwe adopted RBM as a performance evaluation system for the public sector (Zvavahera, 2014). The random sampling technique was used to select 310 teachers from the 10 schools. In deciding the quantitative sample size, we were guided by statistical analyses that we planned to do, the accuracy level of results we desired and the size of the population (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). The population size was 985 and the desired confidence and interval levels for the study were 95% and 5% respectively. We also intended to conduct inferential analyses, so our sample size had to be large enough for such analyses. As the population size was known, we therefore used a sample determination table to determine the sample size. We rounded up the population to 1000, used the 95% and 5% confidence level (Standard error margin) and interval respectively, and came up with the sample size of 278 (Cohen et al., 2011; Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). We however decided on 310 to accommodate the issue of non-response rate. A total of 292 from the 310 questionnaires that had been issued out were returned. For the qualitative sample, we were guided by the principles of saturation and information power. Cohen et al. (2011) assert that saturation is a point when all ideas have been heard and no new information is being generated. Information power demonstrates that the more information that a sample holds, the lower the number of participants needed (Malterud, Siersma & Guassora, 2016). Taking into consideration these two principles, a sample size of 12 was decided for the qualitative strand. Three participants (teacher, HOD and school head) were selected from each of the four schools to take part in the interviews. Research established that by the twelfth interview, saturation is achieved and no new data emerges (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2006; Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007). The purposive sampling technique assisted to ensure that only information rich cases with high information power were selected.

Since the study was a convergent mixed method study, the quantitative and qualitative strands had different data collection strategies. A questionnaire with close-ended questions and a 5 set response category on Likert Scale was used for the quantitative strand. The questionnaire was pilot tested and the test-retest reliability test was done as a way of measuring the reliability of the questionnaire. The co-efficient of stability of the questionnaire was 0.9 indicating high reliability (Pietersen & Maree, 2016). Internal reliability to assess the degree of interrelatedness between items measuring the same construct was also conducted and the value of the Cronbach's coefficient measure was 0.95. This indicated high internal consistency (Scholtes, Terwee & Poolman, 2011). Face and content validity was also checked by piloting the questionnaire and having it reviewed by peers. For quality assurance purposes, the interview schedule was pilot-tested to assess the clarity and relevance of the questions, determine the length of the interview and assess the flow of the questions before conducting the full study (Castillo-Montoya, 2016).

Questionnaires were given out to the participants to complete in the morning and collected at the end of the day at each of the participating schools. The semi-structured interviews were then conducted to get the opinions and experiences of educators, and a digital voice recorder was used to capture the discussions. The individual participants were interviewed at their respective schools. Interview session took about thirty to forty-five minutes each.

The quantitative data from the questionnaires was analysed using SPSS version 26 and descriptive and inferential statistics were conducted. Frequency/percentage tables were produced and ANOVA and Beta coefficient tests were done. Qualitative data was analysed using Atlas. ti 8 to produce themes and quotations.

5. Results

The significance of an evaluation process is judged on the basis of its ability to fulfil the professional development and accountability functions. It is against this background that we sought to establish the perceptions of the teachers on the significance of the evaluation process relative to the professional and accountability functions. Table 1 summarises the opinions of the teachers about the significance of the evaluation process on the effectiveness of their professional and accountability job effectiveness.

Table 1: Perception of teachers on the significance of evaluation process

Significance of the appraisal process	Frequency/Percentage				
	S	D	NS	A	SA
The feedback on my appraisal helps me to improve my teaching	145 49.7%	52 17.8%	19 6.5%	33 11.3%	43 14.7%
Appraisal results inform decisions on promotion.	82 28.1%	60 20.5%	87 29.8%	50 17.1%	13 4.5%
Appraisal results inform decisions on regrading.	52 17.8%	59 20.2%	101 34.6%	64 21.9%	16 5.5%
Appraisal results inform decisions on whether one continues to be on probation.	57 19.5%	63 21.6%	117 40.1%	51 17.5%	4 1.4%
Appraisal results inform decisions on termination.	60 20.5%	62 21.2%	131 44.9%	34 11.6%	5 1.7%
Outstanding teachers are rewarded through teacher appraisal.	80 27.4%	79 27.1%	80 27.4%	46 15.8%	7 2.4%
Teachers at my school who perform poorly are mentored by more experienced and well-performing teachers.	79 27.1%	81 27.7%	61 20.9%	62 21.2%	9 3.1%
Appraised teachers that continue to perform poorly in spite of remediation have their employment terminated.	89 30.5%	105 36%	77 26.4%	17 5.8%	4 1.4%
Appraisal results help to decide what is covered in our school staff development programmes	106 36.3%	63 21.6%	71 24.3%	42 14.4%	10 3.4%
We are given time for collaborations as teachers to help us to improve performance.	120 41.1%	72 24.7%	42 14.4%	53 18.2%	5 1.7%
We are given manpower development support if appraisal results require training that cannot be provided within the school	67 22.9%	101 34.6%	51 17.5%	69 23.6%	4 1.4%
Teachers at my school are given a chance to say their contributions on how the performance appraisal system can be improved	70 24%	81 27.7%	44 15.1%	85 29.1%	12 4.1%

The results from the study are presented under the two evaluation functions, professional development and accountability purposes. This approach was used in an effort to ensure that the objectives of the study were addressed. In presenting the results, information from both the quantitative and qualitative strands of the study were considered.

5.1 The teacher professional development function

A number of issues emerged from both the quantitative and qualitative strands of the study suggesting the failure by the evaluation process in this district to satisfactorily fulfil the professional development function. Issues that emerged included the fact that feedback is meaningless and useless, there is lack of mentorship and collaborative programmes, and the link between evaluation results and school staff development programmes is debatable.

5.1.1 Meaningless feedback

Table 1 presents a summary of the perceptions of the teachers on the significance of the RBM in Kwekwe district. Indications by 67.5% of the teachers were that they disagree that the feedback they get during the appraisal process helps them to improve their teaching. The majority of the teachers felt that the appraisal process did not help them to improve their practice. Only 26% of the teachers agreed that the feedback assists them to improve. The indications by many of the interviewees corroborated the fact that the feedback was not helpful. To substantiate this point, one participant explained, "... there is nothing that actually happens between the beginning and end of the appraisal cycle. It's usual teaching... and if things have gone wrong during the cycle, then they will only be seen at the end when it's too late to do anything" (HOD 2). This statement implied that the appraisal process is just a smokescreen as nothing actually takes place on the ground except at the end of the cycle for the ratings. By that time, it would be too late for corrective measures for that appraisal cycle. It therefore means that there is no monitoring through the cycle, thereby greatly hampering timeous and fruitful feedback.

5.1.2 Lack of mentorship and development support

It was also disputed by 58.8% against 18% of the teachers that those who perform poorly are mentored by more experienced and better performing teachers. Most of the teachers, 57.5%, also disputed that manpower development support is provided to those whose evaluation results require them to have training that cannot be provided within a school. To express the need for developmental support, one of the school heads indicated that, "Yea, there is no manpower development support... Many people have families and they can't go to upgrade themselves without a salary... with the current levels of teachers' salaries, it is not easy to spare anything towards that" (School head 2). This statement by a school head expresses the challenges that teachers face in terms of accessing further trainings that may be necessary in the absence the employer's support. Failure to provide neither mentoring for the poor performers nor support for those requiring developmental training outside the school greatly compromises the professional development function of the evaluation process in the district.

5.1.3 Contested link between evaluation results and school staff development programmes

Although 57.9% of the teachers in the survey disagreed that evaluation information is used to inform staff development programmes that are conducted at school level, there was, however, contradicting information by some of the interviewees. Five of the eight educators in administrative positions acknowledged the existence of a link between the evaluation information and staff development programmes that are planned at school level. To explain this claim, one participant said, "We can however say appraisal informs staff development in a way. During a lesson or exercise book supervision you can note a common trend, then organise for staff development in that area" (School head 1). In support of this position, another participant elucidated, "... if I say I am not good at financial management and one or two other heads also make similar indications, the district office will pick it and that is how they organise workshops and invite resource persons to come and facilitate" (School head 3). As further clarification to the link, it was indicated that, "... some teachers are not teacher-trained so they do not know some teaching methodologies and issues like planning, so staff development is informed by what comes out of the appraisal process..." (HOD 4). Most of the participants that professed the existence of a link between evaluation information and school staff development programmes were mostly school heads and HODs. There were, however some participants, among them administrative educators that refuted this position. To counter the existence of a link, one explained that, "No, not even a single day did we sit down and say let's look at our KRA, let's revisit those areas that we feel need improvement. We are not using it to be very honest.

... as a recommendation, this is supposed to be done” (School head 2). This suggested that although the importance of having staff development programmes that are linked to the evaluation results was appreciated, the current scenario was however different. Another educator added that, “We haven’t had any workshops on issues that arise from the appraisal process since it’s just a fallacy...” (Teacher 3). This controversy could emanate from the fact that, observations on the ground show that there is no uniformity in the way the evaluation process is conducted across the schools. There may be a need for regular and consistent monitoring by district officials to minimise discrepancies in the way evaluation is done within the district.

5.1.4 The teacher accountability Function

The broad picture from the results is that evaluation results are barely used for the accountability function. Most educators testified that evaluation results are neither used to inform teacher promotion, probation procedures, nor does the process acknowledge outstanding teacher performance.

5.1.5 Teacher promotions not informed by evaluation results

Many of the teachers, 48.6% against 21.6%, as indicated in Table 1, refuted that evaluation results inform decisions on promotion. A statement by a participant that, “We only hear through rumour that those who apply for administrative posts and are shortlisted for interviews have the ratings from the appraisal process being considered for promotion” suggests that it is not clear to the teachers if the evaluation results are considered at all. There is need to ensure that the use of evaluation results is clear to all the evaluation system users for the process to be revered.

5.1.6 Evaluation results disregarded on teacher probation procedures

It was also noted that 41.1% of the teachers contested that evaluation results were used to inform the decision on whether one has successfully completed probation, while on the other hand, only 18.9% consented to this. From the interviews, this claim was reaffirmed through sentiments like, “... I have never seen anyone going for retraining although I have seen people who deserve to be sent for retraining due to their level of performance (Teacher 3). A period of probation is designed to assess the capabilities and appropriateness of an employee for a given job. Disregarding the evaluation results that report on the performance of an employee is thus a gross neglect of the important information. It is logical that where performance information is available, then it should be used to inform career development decisions like the one on whether an employee has passed probation or not.

5.1.7 Evaluation process not acknowledging teacher performance

The majority of the teachers (54.5%) disagreed that the evaluation process rewards outstanding teachers. Indications by 66.5% of the teachers were that, even though a teacher continues to perform poorly in spite of remediation, he/she would not have his/her employment terminated. This claim was confirmed by the interviewees who expressed that the evaluation process was meaningless since it has no consequences. One remark that expressed this was, “I have never seen anyone being charged because of incompetence or negligence of duty or anyone being rewarded for outstanding performance either. So we just think it’s an instrument meant to while up time because no one is being rewarded and no one is being assisted to improve (Teacher 3)

Such a statement from a user is suggestive of a process that has totally lost respect. The sentiment by the participant showed that the process had lost respect from the participants. The fact that nothing happens to a teacher in spite of his/her level of performance makes the process hollow. In support, another participant reiterated that,

... we were concerned about the rating that we would get because we thought that something would come out of the process. We thought that probably we were going to be remunerated or to be called in for an explanation if one performed poorly but nothing actually happened. It's just a matter of filling in the forms and nothing happens thereafter...The fact that nothing really happens in spite of the rating that one gets has made this process ineffective and lose any semblance of respect that I had (Teacher 2).

Indications from the participants suggest that although they initially had respect for the evaluation process, this has since waned after realising that the process is inconsequential. These sentiments show that the RBM users had expected that the evaluation information and results would be put to use. This appears not to be the case in this district and this has ultimately led to the users regarding the process as a sheer waste of time. Another participant added that,

...whether you achieve very high or you do not achieve at all, there are no consequences. There are no rewards, there is nothing. It has a very negative impact on the whole process because as long as I know that nothing will happen in spite of my performance, then, I won't have respect for the process at all. The fact that there is nothing that is attached to it makes it useless, actually (HOD 2).

The results of the study suggest that the process is generally perfunctory as it has no clear consequences. Most of the teachers concurred that the evaluation process should have repercussions for it to earn respect. The lack of consequences therefore renders the evaluation process ineffective and an exercise in futility.

5.2 Relationship between the regression model and the data

Table 2: Statistical significance of the model

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	103.249	4	25.812	35187.882	.000 ^b
	Residual	.211	287	.001		
	Total	103.460	291			
a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness						
b. Predictor: (Constant) significance.						

Findings from the surveys and interviews were buttressed by the results of the inferential statistics. The ANOVA test results in Table 2 shows that the Regression model was a suitable model of analysis as shown by the regression sum of squares (103.249) being considerably larger than the residual sum of squares (.211). This means that most of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. The significant value of 0.000 means that there is a statistically significant relationship between the significance of an evaluation system and its effectiveness (Cohen et al. (2011). In other words, this means that the *significance of an evaluation process* is statistically significant in predicting the effectiveness of teacher performance evaluation system.

5.3 The Beta coefficient table on strength of relationship of significance of evaluation process and its effectiveness.

The Beta coefficient value explains the strength of the relationship between the independent variable (effectiveness of evaluation process) and the dependent variable (significance of evaluation process). Table 3 presents a summary of the Beta coefficient test results.

Table 3: Coefficients

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	-.016	.009		-1.709	.089
	Timing	.186	.003	.213	60.308	.000
	Design	.204	.004	.204	50.944	.000
	Implementation	.298	.004	.368	81.983	.000
	Significance	.313	.004	.368	81.801	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

The standardised coefficient was used as the variables had been standardised by transforming the data from categorical scale to continuous scale. The results in Table 3 show that *significance* has a Beta coefficient value of 0.368, which is the highest, meaning that *significance* is one of the variables with the strongest influence on effectiveness of a performance evaluation process. This reiterates the importance of ensuring that a performance evaluation process has consequences or is significant for it to be effective.

6. Discussion of Results

Literature asserts that for an evaluation process to be revered and remain credible, it is critical that its findings are utilised (Madhekeni, 2012; TNTP, 2010). Performance evaluation processes should thus have purpose and meaningful consequences to earn support and respect from users (TNTP, 2010). This is, however, not the case in Kwekwe district where the educators indicated that they have since lost the respect that they initially had for the process after realising that it does not have any consequences and is therefore insignificant. Teachers were not concerned about the rating they were given for their performance as it does not affect anything. They simply do the evaluations to be compliant with the policy since the evaluation process has neither professional development nor personnel related consequences.

Findings from the study suggest that RBM has failed to achieve both the professional and accountability functions. In terms of the professional development function, evaluation feedback is said to be meaningless, there is no mentoring of underperformers, there is no development support, no collaborative opportunities, and there are mixed feelings on the alignment of evaluation information to staff development programmes. It also emerged from the study that evaluation information is not used for accountability purposes. Indications are that the information is not used to decide on tenure or regrading and it's doubtful if it is considered for promotions. Outstanding teachers have not been rewarded or underperforming teachers sanctioned on the basis of the evaluation results. The inconsequentiality of the process has negatively affected the motivation and attitude of the teachers as they no longer respect the process.

The failure by RBM to satisfactorily address the professional and accountability functions can make the evaluatees regard it as just a mere compliance exercise. If an evaluation process has no consequences, it therefore fails to meet the utility standards (Callahan & Sadeigh, 2015; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluations, 1994). Indications from the educators in Kwekwe district that the feedback from the evaluation was not meaningful resonates with findings from previous studies by Zvavahera (2014) and Musingafi et al. (2013) which established that the final rating may not be supported since there is no active monitoring of the teacher's performance throughout the evaluation cycle making the process a façade. This is usually the case if the final rating is hurriedly done at the end of the year to fulfil policy requirements. Such a situation unfortunately contradicts best practices where feedback should be actionable and given timeously (Murphy et al., 2013). Meaningful and fruitful feedback requires regular and consistent monitoring for

it to remain valid. The absence of mentorship and collaborative opportunities further impedes the development function of the evaluation process. This finding contradicts existing knowledge which posits that feedback should be backed by targeted support and coaching for maximum benefit (Darling-Hammond, 2013).

Given that an effective evaluation process aims to identify and correct weaknesses, while at the same time reinforcing the strengths, it is important that the evaluation findings and the professional development programmes should be strongly linked (Khan, 2013; Goe et al., 2014; Smylie, 2014). This study established that there were some mixed feelings about the alignment of evaluation information with professional development activities. Machingambi (2013), likewise, noted that no meaningful professional development programmes are conducted in Zimbabwe. The existing situation is that the evaluation process has very minimal professional development function which greatly opposes the propositions by the RADPS conceptual framework for a strong connection between the evaluation information and professional development. Professional development activities have to be **targeted** as stipulated by the evaluation policy, but, this just seems to be in theory and not in practice.

It also emerged from the study that RBM has failed to fulfil the accountability function as the evaluation information appears not to inform personnel decisions. Even though the SI 1 of 2000 states that evaluation results should be used for advancement or promotion, that rewards should be performance related and that underperformers should be demoted or even discharged from service, this is nonetheless not happening in practice. Indications are that it is not clear if evaluation information is even regarded for promotions. Teachers also highlighted that outstanding performers are not rewarded and that underperformers are not sanctioned at all, in contravention of the SI of 2000 and the RADPS conceptual framework. There is therefore no consistency between the policy and practice. This finding matches one by Zvavahera (2014) who also established that performance related awards have not been effected since 2007 and that promotion and advancement are not tied to performance. The practice in Kwekwe district also contradicts existing knowledge that evaluation information should inform personnel administrative decisions. Based on the findings made, it is therefore evident that RBM has no significance on the accountability of the teachers.

The inferential statistics suggest that the relationship between the *significance* and effectiveness of the evaluation process is statically significant. This means that the *significance* of an evaluation process is statistically significant in predicting the effectiveness of teacher performance evaluation system. The Beta coefficient test also confirmed that the *significance* of the evaluation process has the strongest influence on effectiveness of the evaluation system relative to other factors such as the design and implementation process of the system. These inferences resonate with the conclusions made by other studies that RBM system in Zimbabwe has become a mere routine exercise because of its lack of consequentiality thereby making it insignificant.

We would like to highlight that the findings from the study are very credible considering the thoroughness of the methodological approach that was employed in the research process. The use of the mixed method design allowed a comprehensive examination of the problem for both breadth and depth. The trends and patterns generated from the quantitative data and the rich narrations of the educators' experiences assisted to provide a deeper understanding of the issue. The use of the stratified purposive sampling technique further ensured that the views from the different groups was represented to give a balanced picture on the significance of the teacher evaluation process in Kwekwe district. The use of inferential statistics also provided additional details in terms of the relationship between significance and effectiveness of an evaluation system, thereby facilitating a clearer understanding of the problem. On the other hand, the limitation of the study was the use of a 5 category Likert Scale which had a neutral (not sure) response category. This category could have distorted the picture to an extent as there were situations where a noteworthy proportion of the teachers opted for the 'not sure' response category. The use of the interviews in triangulating data collection methods however minimised any effects this could have on the final findings.

7. Conclusion

Based on the findings that there is no meaningful feedback, no mentoring or collaborative opportunities, no development support for trainings outside the school and debatable connection between the evaluation information and professional development programmes, we therefore concluded that RBM has failed to fulfil the development function. The disconnection between performance and career path, lack of incentives for outstanding performers and sanctions for underperformers led us to conclude that the accountability function of the evaluation process has not been fulfilled either. Based on the fact that RBM has failed to promote both professional development and accountability among the teachers, we therefore concluded that the evaluation process in this district is insignificant and subsequently ineffective.

Findings from this study call for the need to conduct further research to examine the quality of professional development programmes that are provided and establish the extent to which they are assisting the improvement of instructional practice. Findings show that there is disharmony between the evaluation policy and practice. This anomaly should be addressed by improving the policy to make it clearer on:

- Articulating the consequences for the different levels of performance.
- Specifying the relevant authority to action the identified measures.

Clarity on the above issues will ensure that teachers are clearer on the rewards and penalties to expect based on their performance and the responsible authority to action which gives them room to follow up when necessary. Findings suggest that the implementation of the evaluation process is not standard across the schools. This could be the reason why there is a disconnection between evaluation information and professional development programmes in most of the schools whereas in other cases this link is purported to exist. Refresher trainings for both the evaluators and evaluatees to improve understanding and ensure uniformity in implementation and increased monitoring by the district officials could help to ensure a standardised approach to the evaluation process.

References

- Callahan, K., & Sadeghi, L. (2015). Teacher Perceptions of the Value of Teacher Evaluations: New Jersey's ACHIEVE NJ. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(1), 46-59.
- Carroll, D. H. (1997). A Comparison of Clinical Supervision and Evaluation. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX, January 23-26, 1997.*
- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for Interview Research: The Interview Protocol Refinement Framework. *Qualitative Report*, 21(5), 811-831.
- Choi, H. J., & Park, J. H. (2016). An analysis of critical issues in Korean teacher evaluation systems. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 6(2), 151-171.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. 7th Ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. routledge.
- Collins, K. M., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Jiao, Q. G. (2007). A mixed methods investigation of mixed methods sampling designs in social and health science research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(3), 267-294.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J.W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Danielson, C. and McGreal, T.L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Ascd.
- Danielson, C. (2011). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational leadership*, 68(4), 35-39.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement?*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E. and Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8-15.
- Donaldson, M.L. (2009). So long, Lake Wobegon?. Using teacher evaluation to raise teacher quality. *Center for American Progress*, 1-32.

- Feilzer, Y.M. (2010). Doing mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for the rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 4(1), 6-16.
- Finnigan, K.S. and Gross, B. (2007). Do accountability policy sanctions influence teacher motivation? Lessons from Chicago's low-performing schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 594-630.
- Freshwater, D. and Cahill, J. (2014). 'Mixed method research' in Mantosh-Scott, A., Mason, T., Mason-Whitehead, E., and Coyle, D. (eds.) *Key concepts in nursing and health care research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Goe, L., Holdheide, L. and Miller, T. (2014). Practical guide to designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems, revised edition. [Online] Available: <https://files.eric.ed.gov> (November 27, 2017)
- Guest, G., Bunce, A. and Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field methods*, 18(1), 59-82.
- Gutuza, R.F. (2016). An investigation on the challenges faced by schools in implementation of the Result Based Management system in Mutasa district of Zimbabwe. *Global Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(5), 389-396.
- Haefele, D.L. (1993). Evaluating teachers: A call for change. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(1), 21-31.
- Hinchey, P.H. (2010). Getting Teacher Assessment Right: What Policymakers Can Learn from Research. *National Education Policy Center*. [Online] Available: <http://nepc.colorado.edu> (August 28, 2018)
- Isoré, M. (2009). "Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and a Literature Review", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 23, Paris: OECD Publishing. [Online] Available : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/223283631428> (October 4, 2017)
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluations. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Kang, N. (2013). Teacher evaluation policy development in South Korea. *Teacher reforms around the world: Implementations and outcomes*, 147-177.
- Khan, M.F.U. (2013). Role of performance appraisal system on employees' motivation. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 8(4), 66-83.
- Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Kusek, J.Z. and Rist, R.C. (2004). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: a handbook for development practitioners*. [Online] Available: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/14926/296720PAPER0100steps.pdf>. (December 19, 2018)
- Looney, J. (2011). Developing High-Quality Teachers: teacher evaluation for improvement. *European Journal of Education*, 46(4), 440-455.
- Machingambi, S. (2013). Teachers' perceptions on the implementation of the performance management system in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(3), 217-225.
- Madhekeni, A. (2012). Implementing results-based management systems in Zimbabwe: Context and implications for the public sector. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(8), 122-129.
- Malterud, K., Siersma, V.D. and Guassora, A.D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: guided by information power. *Qualitative health research*, 26(13), 1753-1760.
- Marzano, R.J. (2012). Teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 14-19.
- Mavhiki, S., Nyamwanza, T. and Dhorro, L., 2013. An evaluation of RBM implementation in the civil service sector in Zimbabwe. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(32), 135-139.
- Muralidharan, K. and Sundararaman, V. (2011). Teacher opinions on performance pay: Evidence from India. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(3), 394-403.
- Murphy, J., Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (2013). Leading via teacher evaluation: The case of the missing clothes. *Educational Researcher*, 42(6), 349-354.
- Musingafi, M.C., Dumbu, E., and Chadamoyo, P. (2013). Improving Performance in the African Civil Service: Empirical Evidence from Zimbabwe. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 3(2), 19-26.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J. and Collins, K.M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The qualitative report*, 12(2), 281-316.
- Pham, L. D., Nguyen, T. D., & Springer, M. G. (2017, June). Teacher merit pay and student test scores: A meta-analysis. In *Association for Education Finance and Policy Annual Meeting, Washington, DC*.
- Pietersen, J., and Maree, K. (2016). 'Overview of some of the most popular statistical techniques' in Maree, K. (Ed) *First steps in research 2* (2nd Ed). (pp.249-304). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Popham, W.J. (1988). The dysfunctional marriage of formative and summative teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1(3), 269-273.
- Public Service Commission. (2000). *Public Service Regulations: Statutory Instrument 1 of 2000*. Harare: Government Printers.

- Santiago, P. and Benavides, F. (2009). Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices. *Paper for presentation at the OECD Mexico*. [Online] Available: <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/44568106.pdf> (September 17, 2018)
- Scholtes, V.A., Terwee, C.B. and Poolman, R.W. (2011). What makes a measurement instrument valid and reliable?. *Injury*, 42(3), 236-240.
- Seo, K. (2012). Lessons from Korea. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 75-78.
- Shinkfield, A. J. and Stufflebeam, D.L. (1995). *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers. [Online] Available: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED435632.pdf> (September 17, 2018)
- Smylie, M.A. (2014). Teacher Evaluation and the Problem of Professional Development. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 26(2).
- Smylie, M.A. (2014). Teacher Evaluation and the Problem of Professional Development. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 26(2).
- Stronge, J.H. (1995). Balancing individual and institutional goals in educational personnel evaluation: A conceptual framework. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 21(2), 131-151.
- Stronge, J.H. (2011). 'Teacher evaluation and school improvement: Improving the educational landscape' in Stronge, J.H., *Evaluating teaching*, 2-24.
- Teddle, C. and Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- The New Teacher Project (TNTP). (2010). *Evaluation 2.0* [Online] Available: www.tntp.org/assets/documents/Teacher-Evaluation-Oct10F.pdf (September 18, 2018)
- Williams, J.H. and Engel, L.C. (2012). How do other countries evaluate teachers?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(4), 53-57.
- Zhang, X.F. and Ng, H.M. (2017). An effective model of teacher appraisal: Evidence from secondary schools in Shanghai, China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(2), 196-218.
- Zvavahera, P. (2014). An evaluation of the effectiveness of performance management systems on service delivery in the Zimbabwean civil service. *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 14, 1-8.