ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
FACULTY OF BUSINESS

ASSESSMENT OF KEY ASPECTS OF TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: THE CASE OF SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SEBETA, OROMIA

By

HUSSEN KALID

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

April, 2023

ASSESSMENT OF KEY ASPECTS OF TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: THE CASE OF SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SEBETA, OROMIA

BY

HUSSEN KALID

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ST.MARY'S UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN GENERAL MANAGMENT

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

April, 2023

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
FACULTY OF BUSINESS

ASSESSMENT OF KEY ASPECTS OF TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: THE CASE OF SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SEBETA, OROMIA

BY

HUSSEN KALID

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____   _____

Dean, Graduate Studies   **Signature**

Melaku Girma(PhD)   _____

Advisor   **Signature**

_____   _____

External Examiner   **Signature**

_____   _____

Internal Examiner   **Signature**

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, presented under the guidance of Melaku Girma (PhD). All sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged. I further confirm that the thesis has not been submitted either in part or in full to any other higher institution for the purpose of earning any degree.

Name   **Signature**

_____   **_____**

St. Mary University, Addis Ababa   **April, 2023**

ENDORSEMENT

This thesis has been submitted to St. Mary's University, School of Graduate Studies for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Melaku Girma (PhD)   _____

Advisor   **Signature**

St. Mary University, Addis Ababa   **April, 2023**

TABLE OF CONTENT

Title   **Page**

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

Chapter Four

Data Analysis, Presentation and Interpretation

Chapter Five

Summary, Conclusion and recommendations

Acknowledgements

List of Acronyms

CPE: Criteria of Performance Evaluation

MBO: Management by Objectives

MOE: Ministry of Education

PE: Performance Evaluation

PPE: Purpose of Performance Evaluation

PEC: Principle of Effective Communication

TPE: Teachers' Performance Evaluation

PET: Principle of Evaluation Training

SPSS: statistical package for social science

List of Tables

Abstract

The goal of this study was to assess the core TPE components' strengths and shortcomings in a sample of private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia, and to make potential improvements to the TPE program there that could serve as a model for other institutions with a comparable educational environment. The area of concern believed to be relevant to examine the TPE system were the purposes and criteria of TPE, the evaluation process, problems and errors associated with the current TPE. With respect to this, a descriptive survey research method was employed. Three selected private primary schools were included in the study. The subjects of this study were 130 teachers, 26 unit leaders and 3 directors. Questionnaire, interview and relevant documents were used for the purpose of data collection. The major findings of the study include: the TPE scheme of the schools hardly served the developmental purposes. It has served the administrative purposes to some extent; teachers did not participate in the formulation of the TPE criteria. Some of the criteria were found to be vague, general, and irrelevant to the actual performance of the teachers; major sources of evaluation were directors, unit leaders, peers and students. However, most of the evaluators lack the necessary knowledge, skill and commitment to evaluate teachers. Evaluations of teachers have been conducted twice a year at the end of each semester. The current TPE method has not been executed as it was intended to be, and the main issues with TPE, like the evaluators' lack of the requisite knowledge and skills and the way the whole evaluation process was managed, were encountered. To address these, it was suggested that teachers who performed poorly should receive short-term trainings, in-service training, and orientation programs; those who performed better should receive results and rewards; all evaluatees and evaluators should receive training and orientation on TPE; and the process of TPE should be regarded as one of the crucial steps in the teaching and learning process.

Key words*: Evaluation, Evaluators, Performance, Performance Evaluation, purpose, criteria, process, evaluation errors*

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Through education, society is able to contribute to the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Gatlua, 2018). Through the dissemination of science and technology within the community, education plays a significant role in the progress, transformation, development, and preservation of the environment for the sake of advancement. Every business has its own set of goals and tasks to complete. They operate in accordance with the main priority of their establishment. The management of human resources includes a performance evaluation system, and performance appraisal is a key component of work force development for institutions like schools. Considering the difficulties of working in the education sector, (teaching profession), performance appraisals offer a valuable opportunity to recognize and reward staffs efforts and performance, detect key barriers and facilitation to work practice and identify professional development needs and opportunities (Namuddu, 2005).

A formal organization is a collection of resources, both human and material, that are grouped and organized in a methodical manner to achieve the objectives of the organization. The human resources of an organization are the most crucial component in determining whether it succeeds or fails among all of its other resources. To successfully accomplish the specified organizational objectives, it is the human resource that provides the knowledge, skills, creativity, effort, and leadership to use other resources in an effective and efficient manner. (Verspoor, 2013)

An organization's goals can be achieved only when people are put in their best effort. Thus, the human resource management of any organization has an obligation to motivate, develop and utilize people effectively and efficiently at work. Moreover, to ascertain whether the employee has shown his / her best performance on a given job, to make employee assessment is one of the fundamental duties of management. Organizations, therefore, found a systematic performance evaluation to be an essential aspects of a management not only to make sound personnel decisions, but also to identify employees' development needs and to ensure that those needs are satisfied, to promote the communication between management and employees, and to Improve

the employee's' level of productivity (King, 2013). Hence, the aim of employee performance evaluation is to provide an accurate picture of past and /or present employee performance and ultimately to help both the employee and the organization become competent in goal achievement. However, system of performance evaluation may fail.

The failure or malfunction of evaluation system may relate to the design and operation of the system, skill and competence of evaluations, and attitude of employee towards performance evaluation. Similarly, educational institutions are social organizations formed to achieve desired educational objectives and goals. They are established to educate learners and to realize the intended behavioral changes of the students. Actually, to attain these objectives, the necessity of providing relatively high quality education is unquestionable. But, the accomplishment of this depends basically on the performance level of teachers. Therefore, teachers have to be contingent, motivated, developed and upgraded in order to improve the quality of their service in the teaching - learning process. To ensure this, a system of teachers performance evaluation purposed at the developmental need of teachers should be designed and implemented. According to Melaku (1992) the teachers' performance evaluation system that is properly designed and implemented is believed to have positive consequences in teachers' professional development, in their job satisfaction, and in the academic performance of the learners as a whole. Hence, teachers' performance evaluation has to be properly designed and well revised before implementing the evaluation, if the desired objectives have to be met. Properly designed teachers performance evaluation serves as a device for better communication and development of individual teachers as well as for the attainment of educational goals and objectives of the educational institutions.

In Ethiopia evaluating the performance of teachers was started in 1945 by the team of three inspectors formed to carryout different educational activities. Such as visiting schools, organizing and analyzing data collected on the learning-teaching process (Melaku, 1992). Until 1994 , Teachers' evaluation had been carried out by supervisors, principals and other group of teachers (MoE, 1987 E.C). As a result of the new Educational and Training Policy, since 1995/96 teachers' performance has been rated by principals, students and parents. The objective of this study is, therefore, to systematically investigate the key aspects of the current system of

teachers' performance evaluation in selected private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia and to identify the strengths and weaknesses encountered.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Teachers Performance Evaluation should not be made simply for the sake of evaluating them. The purpose of the evaluation program and the evaluation criteria should be well defined and known both by the evaluators and the teachers to be evaluated. Whatever the result of the evaluation is, the teachers have to get the feedback of their own result of the evaluation along with suggestions for improvement as soon as possible. For the teachers to accomplish their jobs by using their effort to the maximum extent their performance should be properly evaluated and the required assistance for their developmental need has to be met. The area of concern believed to be relevant to examine the key aspects of TPE are the purposes and criteria of TPE, the evaluation process, problems and errors associated with it.

However, if the purpose of teachers' performance evaluation and the evaluation criteria are not clearly defined, specified and communicated, and its process fails to operate effectively, then the evaluation results are often inaccurate and subjective. This results not only in malfunction of the evaluation program but also in deterioration of teachers' performance since their attitude towards the job may be negatively affected. This study focus on Teachers Performance evaluation in selected private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia because the current system of performance evaluation of teachers in these schools is new and lack experiences in terms serving the administrative purposes and some of the TPE criterion were found to be vague, general, and irrelevant to the actual performance of the teachers. Moreover, the student researcher, being a teacher in one of these schools, observed various problems in identifying and implementation of TPE, which need to be investigated. The purpose of TPE, the validity and reliability of the evaluation criteria and the timely feedback of evaluation results of teachers are all need to be investigated in order to make sure that the TPE working systems of the schools is on the right truck. Regarding this and other related factors teachers of these schools may have different views and perceptions on the fairness of their performance evaluation. Thus, this research tries to make an attempt of examining the key aspects of implementation of TPE in selected private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia.

1.3 Research question

This research addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the major purposes of teachers' performance evaluation?

2. To what extent the evaluation criteria are clear and mutually agreed?

3. What is the process that the current system of teachers' performance evaluation involves?

4. What are the major problems or errors associated with the current TPE?

1.4 Objective of the study

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of the study is to systematically investigate the key aspects of teachers' performance evaluation in selected private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia and to identify the strengths and weaknesses encountered. The key aspects of TPE are the purposes and criteria of TPE, the evaluation process, problems and errors.

1.4.2 Specific objective

The specific objective of this study is to:

1. Assess the major purposes of the teachers' performance evaluation.

2. Investigate the evaluation criteria and mutually agreed on it with the evaluatees.

3. Assess the process that the current system of teachers' performance evaluation involves.

4. Determine major problems and errors associated with it.

1.5 Significance of the study

The student researcher believes that the significance of this study may be seen in the following ways: It gives insight to primary school teachers and administrative personnel some of the weaknesses of the system of teachers' performance evaluation and enables them to make some improvements. It may serve as a feedback to policy maker, primary school principals and regional office authorities to reconsider or revise the system of school teachers' performance evaluation. It may also serve as a springboard for further study and also could serve as a document for future use.

1.6   Scope of the study

The study is limited on Teachers' Performance Evaluation (TPE) of three private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia. The investigator selected the three schools to get adequate information for the study. Therefore, this study is delimited to the current system of key aspects of Teachers Performance Evaluation operating in Adirot school systems, Mayeos academy and Prime bridge academy that are operating in Sebeta, Oromia.

1.7   Limitations of the Study

The student researcher does not believe that the study is totally free from all sorts of limitations. **Shortage of finance**, **lack of cooperation on the side of the respondents** filling and returning questionnaire on time, and **unavailability of the directors on their appointment time** to conduct interview were among the limitations that faced the study. Their magnitude, however, was not large enough to affect the findings basically; but might have only changed the frequencies of the required responses to be obtained on time. In order to overcome those limitations the student researcher acted on how to manage the problems in a proactive way by searching for alternative solutions. For example, by tolerating the unavailability of the directors and fixing other convenient time for them. Concerning the financial shortage the student researcher managed it by asking his friends' support particularly the laptop that is being used now for the study purpose is contributed by one of my friends whose name is mentioned on the acknowledgement part of this final paper.

1.8   Operational Definition of Terms

The following are the key terms with their respective meanings as used in this study.

- ➢ **Evaluators**: Refers to school directors, unit leaders, students and peer teachers who are involved in evaluating the performance of teachers.
- ➢ **Evaluatees**: Refers to school teaches whose performance is subject to evaluation.
- ➢ **Evaluation**: Refers to the assessment of the past and present, an overview of current and potential skill, resources and capability available for the human resource management in the school to meet present and future challenges, and identification of training needs of the teachers.

➢ **Performance**: It is the manner in which and the extent to which the tasks making teacher's job are accomplished.

➢ **Performance Evaluation**: is a process of arriving at judgments about on teacher's past and present performance against the background of his/her work environment, and about his/her professional competence.

1.9 Organization of the Study

The research is organized into five chapters. The first chapter deals with the introduction. The second chapter covers review of the related literatures. The third chapter presents the research methodology. The fourth chapter deals with the interpretation and analysis of the data. The fifth chapter is about summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Chapter Two
Related Literature Review

2.1. Performance Evaluation

The term "performance evaluation" is used in a variety of ways. Some of the often used phrases for performance evaluation include merit rating, personnel rating, employee rating, efficiency rating, performance appraisal, employee assessment, and employee evaluation. Depending on the objective it is meant to achieve, several sources define the term "performance evaluation" in a variety of ways. Following are a few definitions provided by various academics. According to (Kinfe, 2017), evaluating an employee's performance is an objective way to determine how valuable or competent they are at doing their jobs. Evaluations that are conducted with objectivity can aid in differentiating between good and bad employees.

According to (Gatluak, 2018), performance evaluation includes assessing the past and present, taking a look at current and potential skill sets, resources, and capabilities available to the organization's human resource management to address current and upcoming challenges, and identifying training requirements. Performance reviews are thought of as a tool for periodically comparing an employee's performance and capabilities to the demands of their job and career goals. Schermerhorn (1996) further defines performance evaluation as the formal process of evaluating someone's work and offering feedback on performance. In other words, most of the time, employees don't know how well or poorly they are doing their jobs. Therefore, ongoing evaluation and feedback are necessary to inspire people at work or to improve their working abilities. This means that for employees to know whether they are on the correct track or not and whether their performances are respected or appreciated by their managers, they need feedback and information.

Dessler (2003) defined performance evaluation as the process of assessing an employee's previous or present performance in relation to the person's criteria. He added that evaluation entails establishing work standards, evaluating an employee's actual performance in relation to those standards, and giving the employee feedback with the intention of inspiring them to correct any shortcomings or perform above average. Teachers have many obligations in regards to schools, including a variety of tasks. The definition of sufficient teacher performance, according

to educators, goes well beyond the instructor's simple physical presence in the classroom and school (Befekadu, 1996). This is to imply that a teacher's performance goes beyond his or her attendance in class and preparation of lessons. In comparison to other occupations, teaching is a difficult activity. Therefore, in order to enhance the teaching-learning process and raise the bar of achievement for all students, the definition of instructors' performance should also concentrate on specific organizational and delivery strategies. In this way, a significant aspect of any teacher's job is the evaluation of their performance.

Since all of the authors agree that performance evaluation is a process of assessing employees' performance to separate out those performing above par from those operating below norms, the definitions provided by each author are generally similar. Their disagreement, however, stems from the positions they have chosen when debating who it benefits. While some said it just benefited the company and the managers, others revealed that it benefited the entire company, the management, and the employees. Accordingly, the definitions that discuss how performance evaluation benefits an organization, managers, and employees equally are thought to be pertinent to this study.

2.2. Importance of Performance Evaluation

Insofar as it aids in reaching organizational and personal goals, performance evaluation has developed into a crucial management tool. Performance review, when done well and methodically, can benefit both the employer organization and the personnel. "All performance evaluation should highlight individual aims, organizational objectives, and mutual objectives," is how Monga puts it in Saiyadain (1995). The individual objectives may include such areas as personal growth, pleasure and participation of the individual, and the feeling of fair and just recompense, the author continued. Regarding the goals of the organization, performance evaluation should produce data on the workforce, aid in the development of human resources, enhance productivity and effectiveness as well as employee relations, act as a control mechanism, and offer a fair reward scheme. Growth and development, harmony, efficacy, and profitability were highlighted as examples of shared objectives.

Evaluation performance is significant for the following four reasons, according to Dessler (2003). First, evaluation offers data from which you base judgments about pay and promotion.

Second, they provide you and your subordinate a chance to discuss how they have behaved at work. This then enables the two of you to create a plan for fixing any flaws the evaluation may have uncovered and for reinforcing things done correctly. Third, the evaluation is a step in the career-planning process because it gives the individual a chance to review their intentions for the future in light of their strengths and limitations. Finally, evaluation enables you to control and enhance the performance of your company. The explanation given above makes it abundantly evident how an employee performance evaluation system supports the most crucial facets of human resource management. It aids the employer in deciding on administrative matters like employee promotions, pay raises, and transfers, as well as the training and development needs of its human resources. Additionally, it educates the employee about his skills and weaknesses and provides him with a learning opportunity that inspires him to advance.

2.3. Principles of Performance Evaluation

There are several fundamental ideas that have arisen from study and experience and have been shown to be applicable to all performance evaluation systems. According to Namuddu (2005), A good employee performance review program can be established and run in the interest of promoting the development of an individual employee and the organization in which he works by keeping in mind these essential elements.

2.3.1. Principles of Effective Communication

The efficient operation of the performance evaluation system depends on effective two-way communication between the evaluator and the evaluated party. When evaluation and those being evaluated have a shared understanding of the objectives, standards, and procedures of the evaluation program, full support and dedication can be guaranteed. It might cause ambiguity and concern, especially among employees, if the purpose, criteria, and procedure of the evaluation program are not adequately communicated. pertaining to teachers According to Gorton (2019), when teachers are evaluated without having a clear understanding of the evaluation program, they frequently exhibit reluctance to cooperate in the evaluation process and accept the performance grade that their assessor presents.

2.3.2. Principles of Evaluators Training

It takes enough competence in interpersonal, technical, and conceptual skills to evaluate an employee's performance, which is a difficult and delicate assignment. Many evaluators approach the work of evaluating teachers' performance with some trepidation and nervousness because they have received insufficient training in performance evaluation techniques. Additionally, evaluators who lack the necessary training frequently make mistakes during the evaluation process, which eventually leads to subjectivity of the evaluation outcome (Gorton, 2019). Therefore, it is crucial to equip evaluators with the knowledge and abilities required for performance evaluation through trainings.

2.4. Purpose of Performance Evaluation

Determining the aim of any system of performance evaluation is arguably the most important step in the design process. The goal of the assessment scheme dictates the performance standards and evaluation techniques to be used, as well as the evaluator's function, the method for receiving information, and the format for providing feedback. A well-defined and clearly stated purpose is therefore a key requirement for performance evaluation. The effectiveness of an evaluation scheme must be assessed in terms of how effectively it serves the purpose or reasons for which it was designed. So many evaluation programs failed because they have been launched without a clear definition of the purpose to be achieved, Bittle (1978). In this regard, Paisey (1983) has forwarded some major reasons why performance evaluation purposes have to be clearly defined:

• The type of information the rater should gather is frequently determined by the objective of the rating.

• It also indicates the type of technique or method that should be chosen or employed in conjunction with the relevant data and

• People experience stress since evaluation requires their time and effort, which can only be given voluntarily when people feel that their efforts are valuable and satisfying.

In companies, performance evaluation has several uses. First, management makes general personnel decisions using evaluation. It offers details for such crucial decisions. It offers details

for crucial choices including promotions, transfers, terminations, and more. Evaluation also reveals areas that require training and improvement. They identify staff abilities and competences that are lacking at the moment but might be improved with the creation of suitable programs. Third, selection and development programs can be validated using performance evaluation as a criterion. Fourth, evaluations serve the objective of giving employees feedback on how the company views their performance. Finally, incentive distribution might be based on performance evaluation (Robbins, 1997). The aforementioned considerations made by Robbins highlight the fact that performance evaluation has administrative as well as developmental implications.

Two categories—administrative and developmental—can be used to categorize the objectives of performance evaluation. Pay, promotion, demotion, and termination decisions are among the administrative goals. Research, feedback, management and career development, human resource planning, performance improvement, and communication are among the developmental goals (Dessler, 2008). Turner and Clift (2015) observed that there are two primary goals of teacher assessment programs with regard to schools. Which are:

a) Formative evaluation focuses on improving practice by recognizing strengths, shortcomings, needs, and interests. It also addresses professional growth.

b) Summative evaluation is concerned with the selection, promotion, redeployment and dismissal of teachers.

Gorton (in Melaku 1992) provides the following clarification on the two aforementioned goals that Turner and Clift discussed: In essence, formative evaluation is developmental in nature, focused on teachers' ongoing, sustained professional development and increasing their sense of job satisfaction. Summative evaluation, on the other hand, serves a judging purpose in that administrative or personnel choices are made about teacher promotion, demotion, tenure, transfer, and compensation increases. The explanation above suggests that both goals of teachers' performance reviews are intended to enhance their short-term professional performance and may have implications for their careers in the long run.

There is debate among academics over whether a single evaluation system can successfully fulfill both summative and formative functions at the same time, according to evidence from

recent studies. Even though a dual system would be ideal, proponents of one system for the two goals frequently claim that there are constraints on time, money, and staff that prevent them from being processed efficiently. Therefore, they advocate for an evaluation system that is adequately constructed to fulfill both summative and formative objectives at once (Miller, 1987). Although lists of purposes vary in content and length, Millman and Linda (1990) listed four purposes for which teachers evaluation can be used.

These are:

1. Accountability: to ensure that only effective teachers continue in the classrooms

2. Professional growth: to foster the professional growth of new and continuing teachers.

3. School improvement: to promote school improvement and the enhancement of students learning.

4 . Selection: to ensure that the best qualified teachers are hired.

As a result, the goal of performance evaluation is to enhance both an individual's and an organization's performance. That is, both institutional and individual improvement can be achieved through expanding and maximizing the educational opportunities for children through teachers' professional development.

Webb and Scott (1999) also cite the following as the purpose of teachers' performance evaluation:

• To ensure that students are provided with high quality instruction.

• To meet statutory and contractual requirements.

 • To recognize outstanding teachers performance.

• To provide opportunities for teachers to develop their professional skills.

As previously said, even if many writers have discussed the objective of performance evaluations, the main focus is still on performance improvement and the expansion of instructors' performance-related skills and knowledge. Of course, the nature and substance of the measurement criteria as well as the evaluation method are determined by the objective of an evaluation system. Therefore, the goal of the performance evaluation program should be well

stated and understood by both the evaluators and the evaluated from the very beginning of the system's design.

2.5. Criteria for Performance Evaluation

The exact work duties that an employee is required to carry out successfully are represented by performance criteria. The important results area, which must be carefully defined, understood, and agreed upon by both the evaluators and the evaluated as being critical for the fulfillment of the desired outcome from the task, is reflected in the criteria for evaluating employees' performance. In a nutshell, criteria are declarations of norms against which the proficiency of a worker in carrying out particular tasks is evaluated (pinnington and Tonny, 2000). The requirements of the job itself should serve as the benchmark for measuring an employee's success on the job. The basis for creating performance evaluation criteria is a job analysis and the ensuing job description. It goes without saying that the requirements should correspond to the job (Aswathappa, 2002). Aswathappa further pointed out that the following factors should be taken into account when formulating three performance evaluation criteria.

The level of work produced its efficiency in terms of cost and time, as well as the impact on the workers' demand for supervision and interpersonal relationships. Regarding the aforementioned topic, the criteria for evaluating an employee's performance should concentrate on work-related factors such the quantity and quality of work completed as well as how well the person gets along with coworkers. The performance evaluation criteria must be precisely defined and well-developed in order to implement this. The creation of criteria that denote effective performance is a crucial and essential step in the construction of a performance evaluation system, according to Donnelly et al. (1992). But this does not imply that we disregard subjective elements like initiative, zeal, devotion, and cooperation. Such characteristics shouldn't be included in formal evaluations unless it can be demonstrated that they are directly relevant to the work. As a result, performance evaluation criteria need to be accurate and valid.

Similar to this, instructors' performance criteria are declarations of standards that serve as a benchmark for evaluating a teacher's proficiency in carrying out specific teaching activities (Melaku 1992: 19). He goes on to say that "validity, reliability, and utility are believed to be the three main aspects of successful performance criteria to measure teacher competency." If a set of

13

performance criteria accurately assesses what it is intended to measure, it is said to be valid. Both the criteria and the way they are measured shouldn't be subjective or pointless. Instead, they ought to be pertinent to each teacher's individual performance. Utility refers to an accurate cost and benefit, whereas reliability relates to the consistency of measurement across evaluation observations. Heneman (1986), highlighted two conditions for creating successful performance standards. Establishing standards comes after first determining the performance dimensions. Therefore, the criteria should be based on the goal that the system of performance evaluation is meant to achieve.

They should be performance-related if the evaluation program's goal is to boost performance. If a potential promotion is the primary goal, the criteria would be created to aid in determining how well a person might perform in their new role. According to Harris (1986), a meaningful evaluation of teaching necessitates paying close attention to the definition of teaching, the emphasis placed on it, and the effectiveness standards that will be applied. He also noted how the term "teaching" may be used to refer to a variety of social and political professional endeavors as well as events that take place just within the classroom. Evaluation cannot be done without some form of strict definition for teaching. With a focus on classroom procedures, the teacher is appropriately highlighted for educational purposes within the context of the school.

2.6. Who Should Do the Evaluation?

Studies and research conducted in schools demonstrate that more consideration has been given to questions such as who should perform evaluations and what qualifications, expertise, or other qualities an ideal evaluator should possess, (Turner and Cliff (2015)). They went on to say that simply assigning someone the task of evaluation is insufficient. Performance evaluation is innately difficult, according to Thomson and Christopher (1994). To complete this difficult assignment successfully, you'll need well-defined criteria and people who have the necessary training or skills. Regarding the query of who in an organization should assess an employee's performance: A lot of authors cite immediate supervisors, peers, self-assessment, customers / clients, and various sources (360-degree) evaluation as reliable sources.

2.6.1. Immediate Supervisor

The performance of a subordinate should be evaluated by the immediate supervisor, according to several scholars. Aswathappa (2002) cites three arguments in favor of this decision. Which are:

1. There is no one more familiar with the subordinate's performance than his /her supervisor,

2. The supervisor has the responsibility of managing a particular unit. Unless he does the evaluation himself he cannot adequately discharge his responsibility for assisting and teaching his subordinate;

3. Since the evaluation programs are often clearly linked to training and development, the immediate supervisor may be the logical choice to conduct the performance evaluation.

There are benefits and drawbacks to having a direct supervisor evaluate an employee. The benefits include the fact that the direct supervisor is typically the best qualified to evaluate the performance of his or her subordinates because they have the best understanding of their specific tasks, goals, and overall results. On the other side, the issue of friendship is the biggest drawback of appraisal by immediate supervisor. It is fairly possible for interpersonal relationships to negatively or favourably slant performance ratings (Hume, 2000).

2.6.2. Self- Evaluation

When performing a self-evaluation, an employee assesses their own performance (Aswathappa, 2002). Self-evaluation is frequently utilized for growth purposes in various companies. It might act as a means of enhancing one's career, bringing about long-lasting transformation and enhancing workers' performance caliber and competence. An employee can examine his current performance in light of the competence required for desired performance by using self-evaluation to define improvement objectives Mathis and John (1997). They go on to say that if an employee is working alone or has a special ability, they might be the only ones equipped to assess their performance. This indicates that if an employee has good knowledge about the objectives he / she is expected to achieve and has a better skills of the tasks he / she is performing, then he/ she is in the best position to evaluate his/her own performance.

2.6.3. Peer Evaluation

Peers are coworkers who perform the same degree and kind of work in any given organization. Because of their regular interactions as well as their need on one another to complete shared tasks and goals, the peer assessment approach is regarded as a valid source of performance data. Each employee analyzes each of the other members of the work group individually (Glueck , 1982). Peers are also better qualified to assess certain aspects of job performance than supervisors or others can. Peers are in a better position to make correct judgments when their working relationships are close and they have a large number of personal contacts (Aswathappa, 2002). Simply put, this means that individuals working as equals know one another well and typically have a clear understanding of the nature of the position. Peers are therefore generally more qualified to appropriately assess a person's performance.

Despite the fact that friendships, enmities, and prejudice might be issues, studies have proven that peer rating is a trustworthy indicator of performance (Dessler, 2003). Aswathappa (2002) made the following observation in support of this notion: Despite the fact that peer evaluation helps work groups perceive open communication, task motivation, social loafing, group viability, cohesion, and satisfaction, it is unfortunate that friendship or animosity may lead to evaluation distortion. Furthermore, major disagreement amongst coworkers may arise when award distribution is based on peer evaluation, and eventually all the peers may band together to rate each other highly. In a classroom setting, teachers engage in a variety of peer interactions. They collaborate on materials, discuss students, sit on committees, attend in-service training sessions together, go on strike, and socialize. This connection gives each teacher access to information about any other teacher who is actually a colleague. Teachers do have some knowledge of the classmates they have worked most closely with throughout the years.

2.6.4. Clients

Members of the organization who interact directly with the evaluatee and make use of an output (good or service) this employee produces may be considered clients. Customers can provide rating information for a variety of traits, including interest, courtesies, dependability, and creativity (Aswathappa 2002). Students make up the clientele of a school system. They get numerous opportunities to witness classes in action and gauge the effectiveness of various

professors over time. As a result, their evaluation report can be unbiased, trustworthy, and legitimate. Due to their special position in the school where they are able to watch their teachers' work performance better than anybody else, kids could therefore be an excellent source of data. Researchers contend that when limited to straightforward and understandable evaluations of teaching proficiency, student rating results are extremely valid. In order to do this, students can give sufficient information on the instructional process because they are the last recipients of instructions and because they have their own expectations of schools. However, pupils are less able to articulate a view regarding the efficiency of their lecturers due to a lack of knowledge and experience.

2.6.5. Multi-Source (360-degree) Evaluation

The 360-degree evaluation technique involves the systematic gathering of performance information from a variety of stakeholders, including the immediate supervisors, team members, customers, colleagues (clients), and one's own self (Aswathappa, 2002). Multisource feedback is helpful for one's development because it enables an employee to compare his or her perception of self with perceptions of others, according to Dessler (2003). This approach provides abroad perspectives about an employee's performance and additionally facilitates greater self-development of the employee. Robbin (1997) stressed that this technique gives performance feedback from all of an employee's daily contacts, highlighting the importance of this. This method centers the multi-source evaluation on the supervisor.

360-degree feedback does have certain limitations, though. Some of these include the fact that getting performance reviews from several different sources can be intimidating, that companies that use this technique take a long time to choose the raters, create questionnaires, and analyze data, and that multiple raters are less skilled at giving supervisors who are being replaced balanced and objective feedback. Raters frequently struggle to distinguish between genuine observations and personal preferences and prejudices (Aswathappa, 2002). Even while multiple source evaluation has drawbacks, they are probably more severe than those of single sources. In general, evaluatees believe it to be fair. A new innovation in education is the multi-source evaluation of teachers and lecturers by their students, peers, and supervisors (Thomson and Mabey, 1994). As a result, an increasing number of businesses are employing 360-degree

evaluation methodologies to evaluate the performance of their staff. Three parties—students, the instructors' peers, and the unit leaders—evaluate Oromia teachers in private primary schools in Sebeta.

2.7. When and How often to Evaluate

Any assessment scheme's design should answer the questions of when and how frequently to evaluate. These inquiries deal with the frequency and timing of examination. Based on the circumstances and the goal of the evaluation scheme, these two fundamental factors must be taken into consideration. Donnley stated in support of these that "the time to evaluation vary with the situation and on the objective of the evaluation" (1992:412). A formative evaluation, which serves a developmental goal, entails an ongoing process of professional observation and counseling (Manatt, 1987). Performance reviews should be conducted as frequently as feasible for this aim to be effectively served because employees require frequent feedback to enhance their performance. feedback on performance based on accurate and trustworthy performance data (Burnham, 1995).

It makes more sense to arrange evaluation programs near the end of a task cycle, according to Costello (1994:32), regarding the time of performance review. To get thorough information regarding the type and amount of labor the employee performs, this strategy may be noteworthy. In general, it is advisable to evaluate an employee's performance as regularly as possible because frequent feedback encourages people to work more. Aswathappa (2002) stated that frequent assessment is preferable to phase evaluation in support of this. In the latter, feedback is given later, negating the benefit of the employee taking prompt corrective action. Regular assessment provides ongoing feedback. to the ratee, allowing him or her to correct any deficiencies in performance.

Regarding the system for evaluating instructors According to Robert and David (1990), the evaluation of a teacher's performance should take place for three hours each week. However, training is typically offered twice a year if it is for advancement. While monitoring instructors' instructional activities on a daily basis is part of the evaluation process, some nations opt to have evaluations twice a year (Lucio and Meneil, 1979). As previously stated, the defined standard is not advised for time of evaluation until alternatives are suggested. In our nation, teacher

evaluations should be completed twice a year at the conclusion of each semester in accordance with the new educational policy MOE (1988 E.C). However, it is anticipated that evaluations of instructors at the research schools will be done four times a year, at the end of each quarter.

2.8. Processes and Methods of Performance Evaluation

Evaluation of performance is not just another task. It is carried out in accordance with a set of sequentially ordered processes. The process of performance evaluation is described in many ways by different authors. The assessment process should, according to Marchington and Wilkinson (2000), contain the following: planning, doing, monitoring, reviewing, and also watching what were done; creating the requirements; talking about the evaluation with employees; and so forth. According to Kyriacou (in Melaku, 1992), the following is a detailed process for evaluating instructors' performance:

1. Pre- evaluation meeting of the evaluatees and the evaluator.

2. Classroom Task observation and collection of other data.

3. Post- evaluation conference and target-setting.

4. Follow-up discussion between the evaluatees and the evaluator.

By following these logical processes, disputes that might develop between the evaluatees and the evaluator as a result of inadequate performance evaluation may be minimized or lessened. The selection of an evaluation method is influenced by the corporate culture, objectives, size, product, technology, etc. According to Saiyadain (1995) and Dessler (2003), some of the more popular techniques include the following:

1. **Rating scale method**: It is the most straightforward and widely used technique for rating performance. It is made up of a variety of numerical scales and can be used to evaluate traits including dependability, initiative, output, attendance, attitude, cooperation, and the like.

2. **Checklist method**: This strategy involves creating a checklist of questions about the employee's actions and work duties with a "yes" and "no" option for each. If the response is affirmative, the rater checks the "yes" column; if the response is negative, they check the "no" column.

3 **. Forced choice method**: is a unique class of checklist. Here, the rater has a choice of two or more alternative assertions. He identifies the sentence that best or worst characterizes the employee.

4. **Critical incident Methods:** In this strategy, the superior notes (records) the individual behaviors of an employee that determine whether a job is performed effectively or ineffectively.

5**. Behaviorally Anchored rating method (BARS)**: By using a specific behavioral example of good or bad performance to anchor the rating scales, this strategy combines the key components of critical incidence and graphical rating scales. The rater should specify which behavior from each scale most accurately characterizes an employee's output.

6**. Simple Ranking method**: The goal of this strategy is to rank employees according to some performance metric from best to worst. The performance of employees is assessed using this method, which is the simplest and oldest.

7. **Paired comparison method:** Every employee is partnered with every other employee in the work group using this strategy. The evaluation in this case determines which of the two employees in each pair is most beneficial to the company. This process continues until all employees have been partnered with one another and their respective ranks have been established.

8. **Management by Objectives (MBO)**: The well-known method of defining goals and gauging how effectively they are attained is management by objectives. A significant component of that procedure is performance evaluation. In these procedures, the employee who will be evaluated participates in setting performance goals with his manager or assessor. The goals are generally expressed in quantitative ways. The goals established by the individual and his managers are measurable and mutually agreed upon. Employees may be more driven to attain goals when they helped set them if the goals are measurable and widely recognized. Additionally, if employees can track their progress toward the goals, they may be able to occasionally adjust their performance. The MBO approach has benefits if used properly. Some of these benefits include improved communication between managers and staff, performance discussions that concentrate on job objectives rather than employee personalities, and the ability to measure goal attainment

objectively with fewer prejudices. The MBO technique does have certain drawbacks, though. These include the fact that establishing vague, impossible goals with a subordinate can occasionally devolve into a struggle. The implementation processes of school teachers evaluation follow the phases below, as mentioned in Sebeta education bureau teachers' evaluation procedures and derivatives, (1999 E.C.).

1. Preparing questionnaire based on pre-established standards.

2. Orienting evaluators about the purpose and the processes of the evaluation and providing the questionnaire.

3. At the end of each semester the questionnaires will be distributed to the evaluators and will be recollected after the rating by the department heads.

4. From the recollected questionnaires the result of ratings will be summarized and registered.

5. After the rating process post- evaluation meeting will be held by evaluators and evaluatees and discussion will be made with low rated teachers.

6. The decision arrived by this meeting will be registered and will be given to the evaluatees through a letter.

2.9. Problems of Performance Evaluation

It is clear that the purpose of any performance review is to accurately portray past and/or current employee performance and, in the end, to assist the business and employee in becoming competent in goal achievement (paisey, 1983). No single system of performance evaluation, however, has been found to be fault-free. Any evaluation system, regardless of how well it is created, has its own advantages and disadvantages. The phrases validity and reliability, according to Szilagyi and Mare (1983), can sum up all the issues with performance evaluation that managers and workers have brought up. Both of these phrases, according to the authors, are characteristics of the overall review process. Discuss how the majority of performance evaluation issues are the kind that jeopardizes the performance measure's validity and reliability in order to substantiate your claim. The employee themselves is likely to consider the performance review to be meaningless if it lacks these qualities. The design and operation of the system, the abilities and competency of the evaluators, and the attitude of the evaluated

individuals toward the performance evaluation are all contributing factors to the failure or malfunction of the evaluation systems.

2.9.1. Problems of Design and Operation

If an assessment system's aim and evaluation criteria are not clearly defined, specific, measurable, reachable, realistically communicated, and have no time frame, it may fail during design and implementation. The nature and content of the evaluation criteria and process are actually determined by the evaluation system's aim. Therefore, the goal of the performance evaluation scheme must be emphasized from the very beginning of the system's design. Both the evaluator and evaluatees should identify and express the performance evaluation program's goal (Costello, 1994). Evaluation must be conducted using a set of standards. The evaluation criteria's lack of validity and reliability is another cause of a potential issue with an evaluation program. The majority of evaluation criteria frequently promote "personal evaluation" as opposed to "performance evaluation, which leads to evaluation outcomes that are frequently unreliable and subjective. If there is a difference between expected and actual performance, it is important to consider if the expectations were completely and explicitly stated to the evaluatees. The validity of the evaluation report can be questioned in the absence of such an endeavor. Measuring criteria that don't produce valid and trustworthy performance data will therefore be useless for both administrative and developmental goals (Saiyada in, 1995).

If the evaluator and evaluatee are not given the chance to participate in establishing the evaluation's goal and criteria, any performance evaluation system will also likely fail. The lack of such participation by the evaluator and evaluatee may not only cause the evaluation program to malfunction, but it may also worsen employee performance because it may have a negative impact on the employees' attitude toward their work (Beverige, 1975).

2.9.2. Problems with the Evaluation

The evaluation processes and results frequently prove ineffective, primarily due to the evaluator's lack of necessary knowledge and skill in evaluation and, occasionally, commitment to evaluate, regardless of how precisely the evaluation purpose is defined and to what extent the evaluation criteria are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and communicated as well. Because of this,

evaluators frequently commit various types of mistakes (Saiyadain, 1995). The significant ones are covered below.

1   The Halo Effect

Halo error is the propensity for the evaluation of one trait to affect the evaluation of other traits. Due to the impression left by a high or low rating on a particular trait, there is a propensity to rate all attributes either highly or poorly. Halo effect occurs when characteristics are ill-defined and unfamiliar (Saiyada in, 1995).

2   The central Tendency Error

Regardless of the real performance disparity between the employees, raters have a tendency to incorrectly rate every individual in a workgroup within a small range of ratings. When the rater lacks sufficient information on an employee's performance, he is hesitant to assess their level of performance and, as a result, is more likely to rate every employee's performance as average or above average (Aswathappa, 2002).

3   Constant Error

When the rater tends to be either lenient or strict when rating an employee's performance, this becomes a problem. Some evaluators are severe raters who give employees exceptionally poor ratings, while others are easy raters who give them extremely high ratings. The inclination of raters to be lenient in evaluating employees' performance may be due to two factors: either they fear that a poor rating will demotivate employees to perform better or they don't want to damage their relationship with the employee. The tendency of the raters to be overly harsh, overly lenient, or to take the middle ground is, in short, consistent (Mondy, 1999).

4   Primacy and Regency Effect

This occurs when the ratee's behavior early in the review period (primacy) or their actions at the conclusion of the review period (regency) have a significant impact on the rater's rating (Aswathappa, 2002).

5   Similar - to - me – Error

A rater's incorrect propensity to favorably assess an evaluatee whose behavior appears to be similar to his own while evaluating performance (Robbins 1997). Szilagyi and Marc (1983) defined similarity mistake as a particular error in which evaluators favorably evaluate people who are similar to them in terms of attitude, interest, race, sex, or other demographic traits.

6   Contrast Error

This frequently happens when ratings are given in order, or when the performance of the evaluatees is used as a benchmark when grading the performance of the others. In other words, average performers will likely be scored low if outstanding performers are assessed first, and high if poor performers are rated first (Flippo, 1984). The issues that evaluators have when carrying out the evaluation process—while limited in number—are present in nearly all evaluation systems, including those that measure teachers' effectiveness.

2.9.3. Problems with the evaluatees

Employees must see the value in a system of performance evaluation for them to be motivated to develop their skills and successfully meet company objectives. However, the majority of performance review initiatives are very simplistic and narrowly focused, paying little attention to how well-liked people are (Burnham, 1995). Employees' mistrust of the accuracy and dependability of the performance feedback or ratings provided by their assessors is the cause of their unfavorable attitude toward evaluation. Additionally, employees frequently doubt the competence of their evaluators, which causes them to lose trust in them and frequently reject accepting performance ratings (Marthis and John, 1997).

Another issue is that most employees find it difficult to accept evaluation results that include critical criticism about their performance, which frequently results in such input. Anxiety, friction, insecurity, embarrassment, irritation, rage, resentment, anti-fillings and behaviors among employees (Lester and Bittel, 1990). The employees must comprehend the performance review program, feel that it is fair, and be work-focused for it to be successful. As a result, how people perceive evaluation and how they really experience evaluation are tightly intertwined. These perceptions are more favorable if the individual being evaluated is aware of the evaluation

procedure, is able to communicate their thoughts and feelings, and feels. that the evaluation concentrates on discovering and assessing issues impacting the worker's performance on the job rather than the personality of the evaluatee (Thomson and Christopher, 1994). Like any other system of performance evaluation, the design and operation of the system in general, the evaluation, and the teachers themselves may all be at fault for issues with the teachers' performance evaluation.

2.10. Making Performance Evaluation More Effective

Given its importance and widespread use in businesses, management should endeavor to enhance performance evaluation. There are some suggestions for enhancing its efficiency from various authors. The following suggestions are made by Saiyadain (1995) to improve the evaluation system:

1. The supervisors should be informed that performance reviews are an essential component of their job responsibilities and that their own performance will be evaluated based on how seriously they take this activity.

2. To help them do this task well, they should be provided with adequate and systematic trainings.

3. Conduct job evaluation studies and prepare job description and develop separate forms for various positions in the organization.

4. Design the system as simple as possible so that it is neither difficult to understand nor impossible to practice.

5. Keep the system to be participative by giving due weightage to the subordinate's points of view.

6. Give the performance evaluation feedback as soon as possible.

7. Finally, reviewing the evaluation system every now and then help updating it, finding the problems of the supervisors, and making suitable evaluation changes in it. This is the most important factor in making performance evaluation effective.

On the other hand, to make the evaluation system more effective (Marthis and , John, 1997) emphasize the followings.

1. Improving the validity and reliability of the performance criteria.

2. Adopting multiple evaluation approaches and different timing.

3. Training the evaluators. And

 4. Providing better feedback.

In general, a system of performance review provides considerable advantages for both the individual employee and the employer organization as long as the evaluation is conducted objectively, using objective criteria and acceptable techniques by evaluators who are trained in and devoted to evaluation.

Chapter Three
Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

This chapter deals with the different methodologies in which the study was conducted. These are the research approach, research design, source of data, population, sample size, sampling technique, data collecting instruments and the likes.

3.1 Research Approach

This research manages the data using qualitative and quantitative. The approach is selected because it enables to have wider and deeper comprehension about the subject under study and gives the detailed picture of people's perceptions, interactions and experiences (Gorton, 2019)

3.2   Research Design

As indicated above, this study is aimed at assessing the aspects of the performance evaluation of teachers in selected private primary schools. Hence, descriptive survey method is employed with the intent that it helps to examine, the opinions of teachers, unit leaders and school directors towards the key aspects of teachers' performance evaluation, and also to identify the similarities and/ or the differences between the study groups, comparison is made regarding their opinion towards the current system of Teachers Performance Evaluation.

3.3 Reliability and Validity test of the Study

 After reading the available related literature on the issues of the system of Teachers Performance Evaluation, the basic questions of the study were established. Based on these basic questions and the reviewed literature of the study, questionnaires and unstructured interview questions were designed. Prior to the pilot test, the questionnaires and the interview questions were checked and corrected by the advisor. Based on the comment secured certain modification were made and questionnaires comprising close-ended and open ended questions were constructed and administered to 13 teachers and three unit leaders one from each school. Further the sample questionnaires were also given to three experts (judges) who have had long experience working as educational administrators and evaluating teachers' performance. Finally,

feedbacks from the pilot-study groups (on reliability and validity of the instruments) served to revise the questionnaire. Accordingly, three items that were found to be vague and irrelevant had been omitted. After ensuring the appropriateness of the instruments, the final copies were employed.

3.4 Sources of Data

The data for this study is collected from both the primary and secondary sources. The primary sources are the first-hand information which is collected from the school directors, through interview and the data obtained from unit leaders, and teachers through questionnaires. In addition, the personal observation of the student researcher is also served as a supplement to the primary data gathering source. The secondary sources are the second-hand information that were obtained from various books, reference materials, other published and unpublished sources and relevant documents.

3.5 Population of the study

A research population is a well-defined collection of all the objects, individuals or members that are well-known to have a common binding characteristic or feature. According to the data obtained from schools administrators, the sample schools have a total number of 432 teachers, 3 school directors and 26 unit leaders as target population.

3.6 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Among the many private schools in Sebeta, Oromia, three schools are selected using purposive sampling technique. The reason is that the student researcher found these three schools to be convenient to yield adequate information for the study. Regarding the participants due to the manageable size, all the 3 directors, and 26 unit leaders of the three schools are to be included in the study. The other group of the participants of the study is teachers. The total number of teachers of the schools under study is 432. Among the total number teachers a sample size of 130 (30%) were selected using simple random sampling technique; that is   130 teachers were randomly selected from the schools with a population of 432 teachers, each person has a 130/432 = 0.3 probability. That's a simple calculation requiring no additional knowledge about the population's composition.

3. 7 Instruments for Data Collection

Three types of data gathering instruments such as questionnaires, unstructured interview and relevant documents were used to collect the data required for the study. All the school principals, unit leaders and teachers can read and write English very well. Hence, both the questionnaire and the interview questions are prepared in English. In all cases, the instruments had been pilot-tested before they were administered to the final subjects of the study. Based on comments secured, necessary corrections were made and administered to the study population. Since the number of directors is few and could be manageable, unstructured interview was held with this source, while questionnaires, Boynton, P.M.(2004) were administered to teachers and unit leaders. In order to have an interpretable data the questionnaire items is prepared in Likert - scale was used in five point rating scale ranging from. "Strongly agree" to "strongly disagree, which had a value of 5 to 1. A "yes" or "no" response type is also used in the problem area.

3. 8 Data Analysis Method

The data collected from the respondents was organized and some statistical computations were made using the statistical package for social science (SPSS 20) to assess the weaknesses and strengths encountered on the implementation of teachers' performance evaluation. The collected data was then categorized and frequency distributions were made from which percentages and mode scores were computed and inherent relationship were analyzed and interpreted. The statistical techniques used in the study were limited to percentages and mode scores considering their appropriateness.

Ethical consideration

The confidentiality of information supplied by research subjects and the anonymity of respondents is respected. And also research participants participated in a voluntary way, free from any coercion. Harm to research participants is avoided and the independence of research was clear, and any conflicts of interest or partiality was explicit. Participants were informed in person or via phone calls about the study before the interviews. The interviews were taped, deciphered, and were sent to them to confirm. The interview protocol was sent by email before conducting the interviews. All interviews were conducted as per participates' preference location.

Chapter Four
Data Analysis, presentation and Interpretation

This chapter comprises two parts. In the first part the characteristics of the sample population involved in the study are presented. Here the study groups are discussed in terms of sex, age, service years and academic qualification. The second part deals with the analysis, interpretation and discussion of the findings of the study. In this part, the finding on the purpose, criteria, process and problems encountered in the implementation of teachers' performance evaluation system are analyzed based on the responses obtained from the respondents. The findings are presented according to the design and methodology of the study that is descriptive survey. To analyze the findings, data collected were organized in frequency distribution tables. Percentage and mode score were computed to examine inherent relationship.

4.1 Characteristics of the Respondents

The questionnaire copies were distributed to 130 teachers and 26 unit leaders in three private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia. The entire questionnaires administered were appropriately filled and returned. In addition the interview made with the three school directors was also included. Based on the responses obtained from the respondents, the characteristics of the study groups were treated in terms of sex, age, service year in teaching and academic qualification as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

No	Characteristics		Respondents				Total	
			Teachers		Unit Leaders			
			Nº	%	Nº	%	Nº	%
1	Sex	Male	98	62.82	21	13.46	119	76.28
		Female	32	20.51	5	3.21	37	23.72
		Total	130	83.33	26	16.67	156	100
2	Age	≤ 20	-	-	-	-	-	-
		21 - 30	55	35.25	4	2.56	59	37.81
		31 - 40	47	30.13	4	2.56	51	32.69
		41 - 50	25	16.03	9	5.77	34	21.8
		≥51	3	1.92	9	5.77	12	7.69
		Total	130	83.33	26	16.67	156	100
		≤ 5	27	17.31	-	-	27	17.31
		6 - 10	18	11.54	4	2.56	22	14.10
		11- 15	25	16.03	1	.64	26	16.67

3	Service years in teaching	16 - 20	28	17.94.	4	2.57	32	20.51
		21 – 25	12	7.69	3	1.93	15	9.62
		26 – 31	17	10.90	8	5.12	25	16.02
		>31	3	1.92	6	3.85	9	5.77
		Total	130	83.33	26	16.67	156	100
4	Educational qualification	Diploma	25	16.03	-	-	25	16.03
		B.A. /B.Sc	105	67.30	17	10.90	122	78.2
		M.A. /MSc	-	-	9	5.77	9	5.77
		Total	130	83.33	26	16.67	156	100

According to item 1 in Table 1, out of the total respondents 119 (76.28 percent) were males and 37 (23.72 percent) were females. This indicates that the majority of teachers and unit leaders are males. Hence, the proportion of female teachers' representation in the study area is low. As shown in Table 1 item 2, 59 (37.81 percent) teacher and Unit leaders were in the age group of 21 - 30, 51 (32.69 percent) were in the age group of 31 - 40, 34 (21.79 percent) were in the age group of 41 - 50 and 12 (7.69 percent) were in the age group of 51 or above. As the findings imply, considerable number of teachers and unit leaders are in the age range of 21 - 30.

Regarding service years in teaching, item 3 of Table 1, shows that out of the total respondents 27 (17.31 percent) had teaching experiences of 5 years or below. None of the department heads were less than five years experience. This implies that experience was probably considered as one of the requirements to be · assigned as a department head in the colleges under study. From same table the remaining 22 (14 .10 percent) had teaching experience of 6 - 10 years, 26 (16.67 percent) had experience of 11 - 15 years, 32 (20.51 percent) had experience of 16 - 20 years, 15 (9.62 percent) had teaching experience of 26 - 31 years and most of the respondents 32 (20.51 percent) had teaching experience of 16 – 20 years interval.

Item 4 of Table 1 also shows that the majority of the respondents, that is 122 (78.2 percent) were B.A/ BSc holders. While 9 (5.77 percent) of the respondents have M.A/MSc. The rest 25 (16.03) were diploma holders. This indicates that even if the majority of the staffs are qualified teaches, there are a few other teachers working with them under qualification.

4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of Data

4.2.1 Purposes of TPE

Some of the primary purposes of teachers' performance evaluation were listed and teachers and unit leaders were asked to respond to what extent these purposes in practice were achieved in their schools. Accordingly, teachers and unit leaders were categorized into two groups. To analyze the data the five point Likert Scale of very high (5), high (4), moderate (3), minimal (2), and very minimal (1) was used. The data analysis from the percentile scores and mode scores were interpreted based on the following classification: 4 (high) and 5 (very high) as high, 3 (moderate) as moderate, and 2 (low) and 1 (very low) as low.

Table 2: The purposes of TPE in practice

S.Nº	In practice, the primary purpose of TPE is		Respondents Rating Scale									
			Teachers					Unit leaders				
			Very High	High	Moderate	Minimal	Very Minimal	Very High	High	Moderate	Minimal	Very Minimal
			5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1	To improve teachers' professional competence	N	5	12	29	51	33	1	3	5	10	7
		%	3.85	9.23	22.31	39.23	25.38	3.85	11.53	19.23	38.47	26.92
2	To identify teachers' professional training needs	N	2	13	31	50	34	1	2	4	13	6
		%	54	10.00	23.85	38.46	26.15	3.85	7.69	15.38	50.00	23.08
3	To motivate teachers' to their job	N	3	16	30	49	32	1	3	3	15	5
		%	2.31	12.31	23.08	37.69	24.61	3.85	7.69	11.53	57.70	19.23
4	To improve quality of education	N	2	15	28	52	33	-	5	3	9	9
		%	1.54	11.54	21.54	40.00	25.38	-	19.23	11.53	34.62	34.62
5	To decide on teachers' salary increment	N	22	31	32	38	7	4	6	7	7	2
		%	16.92	23.85	24.61	29.23	5.38	15.38	23.08	26.92	26.92	7.69
6	To decide on teachers' promotion	N	15	39	28	41	7	5	6	8	5	2
		%	11.54	30.00	21.54	31.54	5.38	19.23	23.08	30.77	19.23	7.69
7	To decide on teachers' transfer	N	12	19	36	42	21	4	3	6	8	5
		%	9.23	14.61	27.69	32.31	16.16	15.38	11.53	23.08	30.77	19.23
8	To reward outstandingly competent teaches	N	-	5	48	48	29	-	4	5	10	-
		%	-	3.85	36.92	36.92	22.31	-	15.38	19.23	38.47	26.92
9	To select teacher for higher education	N	2	13	29	51	35	-	2	7	11	6
		%	1.54	10.00	22.31	39.23	26.92	-	7.69	26.92	42.31	23.08

Basically, one of the main purposes of teachers' performance evaluation is developmental purposes. This is, to improve teachers' professional competence, to identify teachers' professional training needs, to motivate their jobs and through these to improve the quality of education.

As illustrated in Table 2 item 1, the achievement of the purpose of teachers performance evaluation in improving the teachers competence was found to be low as rated by 84(64.61 percent) of the teachers and 17(65.39percent) of the unit leaders. In the same Table , item 2 indicates that the purpose of TPE in identifying the training needs of teachers was also found to be low as reported by the majority 84(64 .61 percent) of the teachers and 19(73 .08 percent) of the unit leaders.

As exhibited in Table 2, item 3 regarding the purpose of TPE in motivating teachers to their job, was rated low by 81(62 .30 percent) of the teachers. This idea was supported by remarkable number 20(76.93 percent) of the unit leaders. This implies that, the achievement of the purposes of TPE in motivating teachers to their work was found to be low or non-existent.

Item 4 of this Table indicates, majority of the respondents in both groups, 85(65.38 percent) of the teachers and 18(69 .24 percent) of the unit leaders said that the achievement of the purpose of TPE in improving the quality of education was at minimal level in their school.

As it can be seen in items 5 and 6 of Table 2, the achievement of the purposes of TPE in making decisions on teachers' salary increment was found to be high as reported by 53(40.77 percent) of the teachers and 10(38.46 percent) of the unit leaders. Similarly, 54(46.54 percent) of the teachers and 11(42.54 percent) of the unit leaders responded that it served highly in making decisions on teachers promotion. Supporting those ideas, the interview made with the school directors indicated that the current TPE had contribution in promoting teachers from one academic rank to the next and make decisions on salary increment for teachers. This implies that, in practice the purposes of the current TPE in the schools seems to make decisions on teachers' salary increment and promotion.

Items 7 and 8 of Table 2 clearly indicate that the purposes of TPA in making decisions on teachers transfer and in reward allocation were found to be low as rated by the majority (48.48 percent and 59.23 percent) of the teachers and (50.00 percent and 65 .39 percent) of the unit leaders respectively.

Similarly, 86(66. 15 percent) of the teachers and 17(65.39 percent) of the unit leaders reported that, the achievement of the purpose of TPE in selecting teachers for primary education in their schools was low.

According to the responses to the interview questions the school directors said, "the purpose of conducting teachers' performance evaluation is to cross check what is planned and what is achieved". This implies that the intent of TPE in these schools was simply to serve the controlling function.

In general, as illustrated in Table 2, both groups of respondents clearly put that the current TPE system in their schools had been low in achieving the developmental purposes totally and most of the administrative purposes.

4.2.2 The Current TPE Criteria

Performance criteria are statements of standard used for measuring job related performances. Teaching profession includes many tasks and duties. Thus, measuring teachers' performance requires more than one dimension. In line with this, performance criteria should not miss some important job duties and also should not include activities which are irrelevant to the actual performance requirements. Moreover, it should be clear and specific. In this view, some points on TPE criteria were listed and teachers and unit leaders were asked to rate against these points based on their degree of agreements:- strongly agree (SA), agree (A) , neutral (N), disagree (DA) and strongly disagree (SA). The percentile score from the data analysis were interpreted according to the following classifications:- high (SA and A), medium (N) and low (DA and SD).

Table 3: The current TPE criteria

S.Nº	Item		Teachers SA 5	A 4	N 3	DA 2	SD 1	Unit leaders SA 5	A 4	N 3	DA 2	SD 1
1	In the current TPE system: 1.1 There is a high participation of teachers in the development and formulation of criteria	N	3	15	32	46	34	1	5	5	6	9
		%	2.31	11.54	24.62	35.38	26.15	3.85	19.23	19.23	23.08	34.62
	1.2 the criteria used are clear	N	2	18	28	62	20	-	4	6	10	6
		%	1.54	13.85	21.54	47.69	15.38	-	15.38	23.08	38.47	23.08
	1.3 The criteria used are relevant to the purpose of teachers performance evaluation	N	4	18	28	50	30	2	3	5	9	7
		%	3.00	13.85	21.54	38.46	23.07	7.69	11.53	19.23	34.62	26.92
	1.4 The criteria used are better in performing teachers professional responsibilities	N	1	17	38	57	17	-	6	6	8	6
		%	0.78	3.07	29.23	43.45	13.07	-	23.08	23.08	30.77	23.08
2	The current evaluation criteria: 2.1 Measures teachers professional competence	N	-	13	27	52	37	-	5	4	12	5
		%	-	10.00	20.75	40.00	29.25	-	19.23	15.38	46.16	19.23
	2.2 Promotes teachers motivation to work	N	1	18	27	52	32	1	6	5	10	4
		%	0.78	13.85	20.75	40.00	24.62	3.85	23.08	19.23	38.47	15.38
	2.3 Strengthen teacher – student relationship	N	5	14	31	47	33	1	4	4	9	8
		%	3.85	10.77	23.85	36.15	25.38	3.85	15.38	15.38	34.62	30.77
	2.4 Strengthen teacher – administration relationship	N	8	18	28	49	27	1	3	6	11	5
		%	6.15	13.85	21.55	37.70	20.75	3.85	11.53	23.08	42.31	19.23

As shown in Table 3 item 1.1, regarding the idea that teachers had participated in the formulation of TPE criteria, most of the teachers (6 1.53 percent) and unit leaders (57.70 percent) showed their disagreement. This implies that both groups of respondents opposed the above idea. The response of some of the teachers and unit leaders to the open ended questions indicated that neither teachers nor their representatives were involved in the formulation of the TPE criteria. They were only called up on to the implementation of the already established criteria. The responses of the schools' directors to the interview questions also indicated that, the criteria were formulated by Sebeta education bureau where the school directors were invited to participate at a limited level. However, teachers were involved only in the implementation process, specifically in evaluating their peers. As to the above responses, since the criteria were established outside the schools by individuals who were at the distant from the actual teaching learning process without the involvement of teachers, the objective reality of each of the schools were not taken into consideration. As the result the criteria are too many and general as complained by teachers.

According to item 1.2 of Table 3, 82(63.07 percent) of the teachers and 16 (61.55 percent) of the unit leaders reported that the performance criteria used lack clarity. This shows that the criteria used were vague. In support of this idea, the response of teachers and unit leaders to the open ended questions also indicated that the criteria being used in the current TPE are not specific and clear. In the interview made with school directors, they also disclosed that some of the criteria used were subjective and vague. The reason for this might probably be the absence of teachers' participant in the formulation of the criteria.

As shown in item 1.3 of Table 3, 80(61.50 percent) of the teachers and 16(61.54 percent) of the unit leaders rated the relevance of the performance criteria low. This implies that the criteria used were irrelevant to the purpose of TPE. As to the responses of teachers and unit leaders to the open ended question some of the criteria used were not related with teaching activities rather than giving emphasis to the duties and jobs of the teacher, they gave emphasis on individuals' personality. From the above responses we can draw that the criteria used were defective and lack clarity as well as specificity.

In item 1.4 of Table 3, most of the respondents (56.52 percent of the teachers and 53.85 percent of the unit leaders) responded that, the criteria used in the current TPE were poor in promoting teachers professional responsibilities. The responses of the teachers and unit leaders, to the open ended

questions also indicated that some of the criteria were discouraging rather than promoting teachers professional responsibilities.

Accordingly to item 2 .1 of Table 3, 89(69.25 percent) of the teachers and 17(65.39 percent) of the unit leaders reported that the current evaluation criteria lack objectivity in measuring teachers professional competence. This may probably was due to the following two reasons. First, during the establishment of the criteria teachers were not involved and also there was no mutual agreement on the criteria. Second, since the criteria were formulated by individuals who were far from the teaching-learning activities, the objective reality of the schools was not given enough consideration. So that the criteria stated were not objectively measurable.

As indicted in item 2.2 of Table 3, the objectivity of the current evaluation criteria in promoting teachers' motivation to their work was rated low by the majority of both respondent groups (64.62 percent of the teachers and 53 .85 percent of the unit leaders). This implies that the TPE criteria used in those schools had no significant contribution in motivating teachers to their work.

As shown in item 2.3 of Ta ble3, 81(61.53 percent) of the teachers and 17(65.39 percent) of the unit leaders reported their disagreement on the objectivity of the TPE criteria in strengthening teachers-student relationship. Similarly, in item 2.4 of the same table most of the respondents (58.45 percent of the teachers and 61.54 percent of the unit leaders) reported that, the current appraisal criteria did not objectively strengthened teacher-administration relationship. This implies that, the current evaluation criteria were found to be not objective to promote teacher-student and teacher-administration relationship in the schools under study.

In general, as illustrated in Table 3, the current TPE criteria were found to be formulated without the mutual agreement of teachers and their evaluators, vague and subjective as responded by the two groups of respondents.

4.2.3. The Process of the Current System of TPE

Performance evaluation has to be done based on the processes of activities arranged in sequential steps. Hence, performance evaluation of teachers to be successful, it should be implemented following systematic processes ordered in logical steps. One of the main purposes of this study was to investigate the processes of the current TPE scheme in selected primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia. Therefore, some procedures to be followed in the successful ' operation of the current teachers performance evaluation were listed and teachers and unit leaders were asked to rate based

on their degree of agreement, SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), N (Neural), DA (Disagree) or SD (Strongly Disagree). Here percentile scores and mode scores were used to analyze and were interpreted according to the following classification: Agreed · (SA and A), Neutral (N) Disagree (DA and SD).

Table 4: The process of the current TPE

S.No	Item		Respondents Rating Scale									
			Teachers					Unit leaders				
			SA	A	N	DA	SD	SA	A	N	DA	SD
			5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1	Prior to any action both the evaluator and the evaluatees meet and establish agreed upon objectives	N	4	13	21	49	43	-	5	6	9	6
		%	3.08	10.00	16.15	37.69	33.08	-	19.23	23.08	34.61	23.08
2	evaluator and their evaluatees develop action plans from the already set objectives	N	3	17	24	41	45	-	5	5	11	5
		%	2.31	13.08	18.46	31.54	34.61	-	19.23	19.23	42.31	19.23
3	Prior to the a evaluation process orientation about the evaluation is given for both the evaluator and evaluatees	N	5	13	27	42	43	1	4	5	12	4
		%	38.84	10.00	20.77	32.31	33.08	3.85	15.38	19.23	46.16	15.38
4	Evaluation of performance is made against the previously established objectives.	N	2	11	46	35	37	-	5	4	12	5
		%	1.54	8.46	34.62	36.92	28.46	-	19.23	15.38	46.16	19.23
5	Providing feedback to the evaluatees	N	6	14	26	42	42	1	6	3	11	5
		%	4.62	10.76	20.00	32.31	32.31	3.85	23.08	11.53	42.31	19.23

The first step in systematic process of teacher performance evaluation scheme is a pre-evaluation meeting of evaluatees and evaluators and establishing agreed up on objectives. As illustrated in item 1 of Table 4, the first duty of the evaluation process was found to be not accomplished. This was clearly shown by the responses of 92 (70.77 percent) of the teachers and 15(57.69 percent) of the unit leaders.

Literatures in this field suggest that the involvement of employees in establishing objectives may motivate the employees in achieving those objectives, because they have participated in setting them (Dessler, 2003). As it could be seen from the responses of the teachers and the unit leaders, this primary duty is almost neglected in the schools under the study. The directors also approved this idea in the responses of the interview made with them. According to the interviewee, the teaching-learning processes in the schools are conducted based on a certain modules which were formulated by Sebeta education bureau. The teachers are expected to prepare their own action plans based up on the objectives sated in the modules. This indicates that teachers implement the objectives settled by external body.

As shown in item 2 of Table 4, regarding to the duty of developing action plan collectively (evaluatees and evaluators) from the already sated objectives, most of the respondents of both groups (66.15 percent of the teachers and 61.54 percent of the unit leaders) showed their agreement as it was not being practiced in their schools. As to the interview responses of the schools' directors, the reason for this may probably be, preparing action plan was considered to be the responsibility of the teachers.

As depicted in Table 4 item 3, 85(65.39 percent) of the teachers and 16(61.54 percent) of the unit leaders rated the process of giving orientation about the evaluation for the evaluators and evaluatees was not implemented. This shows that even those evaluators who have no single experience in evaluating teachers, specially new teachers and students were forced to rate teachers performance without having a knowhow. As a result, this may end with rating errors.

In Table 4 item 4, majority of the respondents, 72(55.38 percent) of the teachers and 17(65.39 percent) of the unit leaders showed their disagreement to the issue of making performance evaluation against the already established objectives. The reason for this may be, teachers were not involved in setting objectives and they prepared their action plan from those objectives

41

established by other bodies. Thus the standards settled for measuring teachers performance may not be related to the actual performance of teachers.

Similarly, in Table 4 item 5, the process of providing feedback to the evaluatees on time was not practically done. This was indicated by the responses of most of the teachers (64.62 percent) and of the unit leaders (61.54 percent).

The responses of the interview made with the school directors also indicated that in principle teachers should know their performance evaluation result on time, but due to some reasons they could not be able to let the teachers know their results and they believed that as it is their weakness too. This implies that the most crucial action to be implemented in the process of teachers' performance evaluation (providing feedback to the evaluatees) was not being practiced in the schools under the study.

In general, the implementations of the basic activities in the process of TPE in these schools were found to be low. This was clearly shown in Table 5 by the responses of the majority of teachers and the unit leaders. This indicates that, the TPE system in these schools was not properly designed and it was simply made for the sake of evaluating teachers without communicating the evaluation objectives and results to the teachers on time. As shown in literature, this may tend to be a source of dissatisfaction, and conflict between evaluators and teachers, and a source of incorrect performance data which leads to subjective personnel decisions.

4.2.4 Problems of the Current TPE

There are several problems for the failure of the evaluation system, as it was dealt with in chapter two; most of the evaluation problems are the problems of validity and reliability (Dailey, 1988). The performance evaluation lacking these qualities is likely to be considered worthless by the employee themselves. On this ground, an attempt was made to discuss the problems of the current TPE. Thus certain problems of the current TPE in those schools were listed and the two respondent groups were asked to respond, their view on those matters.

Table 5: Problem on the current TPE

Nº	Item	Respondents			
		Teachers(n=130)		Unit leaders(N=26)	
		Nº	%	Nº	%
	What are the major problems encountered in the evaluation system in general? 1. Lack of the necessary knowledge of the evaluators A) Yes B) No	113 17	86.92 13.08	19 7	73.07 26.93
	2. Lack of Adequate skills on the part of the evaluators A) Yes B) No	101 29	77.69 22.31	23 3	88.46 11.54
	3. Poor administration between the evaluators and evaluatees A) Yes B) No	100 30	76.92 23.08	19 7	73.07 26.93
	4. Lack of pre-evaluation discussion between the evaluators and evaluatees A) Yes B) No	115 15	88.46 11.54	22 4	84.61 15.39
	5. Lack of post evaluation discussion between the evaluators and evaluatees A) Yes B) No	114 16	87.69 12.31	21 5	80.76 19.24

As it could be seen in Table 5 item 1, most of the teachers (86.92 percent) and most of the unit leaders (73.07 percent) agreed that one of the , problems of TPE encountered in their schools was lack of the necessary knowledge of the evaluators. This idea was also supported by the responses of the school director in the interview conducted. In item 2 of the same table, regarding to the skills of the evaluators, majority of the teachers (77.69 percent) and majority of the unit leaders (88.46 percent) confirmed that the evaluators lack adequate skills in evaluating teachers.

As shown in Table 5 item 3, among the two group of respondents, 100 (76.92 percent) of the teachers and 19 (73.07 percent) of the unit leaders responded that the administration of the overall evaluation process in their schools was poor. In the interview made the directors also disclosed that, due to lack of commitment, knowledge and skills of evaluators in evaluating teachers they found that, managing the evaluation process in their school as one of the difficult

tasks. This implies that the activity of administrating the overall evaluation process in those schools was found to be poor.

In item 4 of Table 5, most of the teachers (88.46 percent) and most of the unit leaders (84.61 percent) disclosed that as there was no pre evaluation discussion between evaluators and teachers. Similarly, as shown in item 5 of the same table 114 (87.69 percent) of the teachers and 21 (80.76 percent) of the unit leaders respond that as there was no adequate post-evaluation discussions between teachers and their evaluators. In the responses to their interview, school directors confirm that due to scarcity of time and large number of teachers, they could not be able to made pre-and post-evaluation meeting between evaluatees and evaluators in their school. If evaluators lack the required knowledge and skills in evaluation and lack commitment to evaluate, then they may often make different type of errors (Sayadean, 1995). On this ground, in addition to the aforementioned TPE problems, some common evaluation rating errors were listed and teachers and unit leaders were asked to indicate their degree of agreement based upon their observations in the process of evaluating teachers in their schools. To do so, the five point Likert type scale was used. The percent score from the data analysis was interpreted according to the following classifications:. Agree (SA and A), neutral (N), disagree (DA and SD)

Table 6: Common errors in TPE

S.Nº	Item		Respondents Rating Scale									
			Teachers					Unit leaders				
			SA	A	N	DA	SD	SA	A	N	DA	SD
			5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1	Including in the evaluation dimensions that is irrelevant to the performance evaluated	N	35	44	22	20	9	6	11	4	2	3
		%	26.92	33.85	16.92	15.39	6.92	23.08	42.31	15.38	7.69	11.5
2	Taking only one factor of a teacher last positive or negative and giving an overall rating	N	39	51	21	12	7	8	9	3	5	1
		%	30.00	39.23	16.15	9.23	5.39	30.77	34.61	11.54	19.23	3.85
3	Tendency of giving relatively high or low rating to virtually everyone	N	32	40	29	21	8	5	12	4	3	2
		%	24.62	30.77	22.31	16.15	6.15	19.23	46.16	15.38	11.54	7.69
4	Rating most or all teacher average	N	14	48	29	32	7	3	13	5	4	1
		%	10.76	36.92	22.31	24.62	5.39	11.54	50.00	19.23	15.38	3.85
5	Focusing on the behavior of teachers just before the evaluation and ignoring behaviors which are more distant past	N	31	54	30	12	3	4	10	7	4	2
		%	23.85	41.54	23.07	9.23	2.31	15.38	38.47	23.08	15.38	7.69
6	Evaluators tendency of rating high a person who is similar to them in attitude, interest, sex, etc and rating low who are not	N	40	46	23	15	6	4	12	4	5	1
		%	30.77	35.38	17.69	11.54	4.62	15.38	46.16	15.38	19.23	3.85

As it has been illustrated in item 1 of Table 6 79(60.77 percent) of the teachers and 17(65.39 percent) of the unit leaders agreed that one of the most common evaluation error observed in their schools was including those traits which are irrelevant to the performance evaluation of teachers in the evaluation of teachers in its dimension.

In the interview made, the school directors also indicated that some points used to measure the performance of teachers are not as such related to the actual task of the teachers. For instance, community participation of the teacher beyond his actual duties was also considered as one of the major point to give promotion to the teacher. In addition to this, teachers' and unit leaders in their responses reported that the TPE system focuses on traits of teachers that have no relationship with their day-to-day activities.

As to the responses given by 90(69 .39 percent) of the teachers and 17(65 .39 percent) of the unit leaders in item 2 of Table 6 an evaluation error of giving an overall rating high or low only by taking one factor of a teacher as positive or negative was found to be existed in evaluating teachers in these schools.

As it could be seen in item 3 of Table 6 , the majority of both respondents groups (55.39 percent of the teachers and 65.39 percent of the unit leaders) showed their agreement that an evaluation error of giving relatively high or low rating to everyone was seen at high level in their schools.

In item 4 of Table 6, regarding to the evaluation error of rating most or all teachers (central tendency error), 62(47.68 percent) of the teachers and 16(61.54 percent) of the unit leaders showed their agreement as it existed at high level.

As it could be read in Table 6 item 5, both groups of the respondents (65.39 percent of the teachers and 53 .85 percent of the unit leaders) put their agreement as it existed at a high level. In the same table of item 6, both 86(66. 15 percent of the teachers and 16 (6 1.54 percent) of the unit leaders disclosed their agreement that an evaluation error due to the evaluators tendency of rating high a person who is similar to them in attitude, interest, sex, etc. and rating low who are not was found to be at high level in their schools.

In general, the evaluation errors commonly observed in those schools were found to be halo error, central tendency error, constant error, primacy and regency effect, similar to me error and contrast error according to Table 6.

Chapter Five
Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the key aspects of the current system of teachers' performance evaluation in selected private primary schools in Sebata, Oromia and to suggest some possible ways of alleviating the problems encountered. To this end, basic questions addressing the issues related to TPE such as purposes and criteria of TPE, evaluation process, problems and errors associated with TPE were all raised.

In the study descriptive survey method was employed. To address the basic questions raised, the investigator reviewed the relevant literature and prepared two sets of questionnaires and interview guide questions based on the reviewed literature so as to collect data from the subjects of the study. The questionnaires and interview guides, after being evaluated and checked by the thesis advisor, they were pilot - tested. Based on the comments obtained, the necessary correction and modifications were made before used. The questionnaire included close-ended and few open-ended questions.

Regarding the participants of the study, using random sampling technique, a sample size of 130 (30%) teachers, all (26) unit leaders and all (3) directors of the selected three private primary schools were included.

To collect the required data, questionnaire, interview and relevant documents were used. The data obtained were organized, analyzed and interpreted using percentages and mode scores. Accordingly, the major findings drawn from the analysis of the study were the following:

1. The study revealed that the purpose of TPE in developing competence, identifying training needs, motivating to work and improving the quality of education were found to be non-extent as observed by most of the respondents (64 .61, 64 .61, 62.03, 65.38 percent of the teachers and 65.39, 73.08, 76.93, 69 .24 percent of the unit leaders). In

other words, the evaluation schemes of the schools hardly served the developmental purpose.

2. The purpose of TPE in ensuring salary increment, promotion and transfer of teachers were found to be moderate as to the responses obtained (40.77, 46.54 percent of teachers and 38.46, 42.31 percent of unit leaders respectively). In short, the evaluation system of the schools served only the administrative purpose and teachers were evaluated simply to made administrative decisions.

3. Teachers were not involved in the formulation of the current TPE criteria and these criteria were found to be vague, had no relationship with the activities of teachers and subjective to measure teachers' professional competence as indicated by the majority of the respondents. In other words, teaches had been evaluated by already established criteria outside their schools without their participation. As to the responses obtained, these criteria were general and irrelevant to the actual activities of the teachers. It was also indicated that the current TPE criteria do not measure teachers' professional competence, and rather it was found to be discouraging.

4. As revealed by the study most of the teachers and unit leaders showed that the school directors and students were not competent and fit to evaluate teachers (59.3, 66.16, percent of the teachers and 59.24, 69.23 percent of unit leaders respectively). Moreover, (59.23, 56.92 percent) of the teachers and (52.84, 52.07 percent) of the unit leaders respectively rated themselves low.

5. The study pointed out that all the evaluators of teachers (school directors, unit leaders, peers and students) had no adequate training and experience on teachers' performance evaluation. It was also found that all the evaluators showed favoritism or bias and much focus on criticism rather than objectively evaluating teachers as indicated by the responses of the majority of both respondents groups.

6. It was identified that evaluation of teachers' performance in those schools under the study were conducted twice a year at the end of each semester.

7. The study revealed that the basic activities in the process of the current TPE such as establishing a mutually agreed up on objectives, developing action plans, rating of

performance against the established objectives and providing feedback to teachers were found to be almost not implemented in the evaluation process in those schools under study as rated by most of the respondents.

8. It was found in the study that no single orientation concerned teachers performance evaluation had been given as indicated by (61.54 percent) of the unit leaders. It was also revealed that the current evaluation process had insignificant contribution in running the teaching – learning process in those schools.

9. The major problems encountered in the current TPE as revealed by the majority of the respondents were found to be lack of the necessary knowledge and skills of the evaluators, poor administration of the overall evaluation process and lack of pre-evaluation and post-evaluation discussions between the evaluators and teachers.

10. The common TPE errors which had been observed in those schools were found to be halo error, central tendency error, constant error, primacy and regency effect, similar-to-me errors and contrast error as rated by the majority of the respondents.

5.2 Conclusions

1. The current teachers' performance evaluation system in those schools has not served the developmental purposes. But, it has served the administrative purposes to some extent. It seems that teachers were evaluated simply to make personnel decision instead of identifying their weaknesses and strengths in order to develop their professional competence through counseling, training, sharing experiences, etc. As a result, teachers have developed negative attitude towards their performance evaluation, and seen it as a fault-finding activity since the TPE scheme has no contribution in developing the professional competence of teachers. It would be possible to expect teachers to perform below their potential in creating tomorrow's skilled manpower, innovator and creative citizen.

2. Teachers of those schools were not participated in the formulation of the current TPE criteria. They were asked to implement the criteria already established by Sebeta education bureau even without conducting any introductory discussion or orientation on those criteria. Furthermore, some of the criteria were found to be vague, general, and

irrelevant to what was being actually performed by the teachers. It would, therefore, be possible to conclude that the current TPE criteria in those schools have problems of clarity, objectivity and appropriateness to evaluate teachers in relation to the performance they are required to do.

3. The major sources of evaluation in those schools were school directors, unit leaders, peers and students. It seems that a multisource evaluation technique was tried to be used in evaluating teachers. It was generally perceived to be fair by the evaluatees. However, all the evaluators lack the necessary knowledge, skills and commitment to evaluate teachers. In addition to this, no single training or orientation on TPE was given to the evaluators in those schools. These might have resulted in incompetence, lack of objectivity and bias on the part of the evaluators.

4. Evaluation of teachers in those primary schools has been conducted twice a year and at the end of each semester.

5. In the evaluation process, the basic activities such as meetings of evaluators and teachers to establish the current TPE objective and develop action plans from the already set up objectives were not practiced. In addition, the activities of giving orientation for both the evaluators and the teachers, and providing feedback to the teachers were found to be inadequate. Therefore, it would be possible to conclude that the current TPE process in those primary schools has not been implemented in the way it was expected to.

6. The major problems of TPE in those schools were lack of the necessary knowledge and skill on the part of the evaluators, poor administration of the overall evaluation process and lack of pre-and post-evaluation discussion between the teachers and the evaluator. These might have resulted in committing some common rating errors (hallo error, central tendency error, constant error, primacy · and regency effect and similar - to - me error and contrast error) which were pointed out by the study.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded.

1. As indicated in the study, the TPE system of those primary schools have not served the developmental purposes. Even, it served the administrative purposes to a limited amount. However, to make TPE a source to develop teachers' professional competence and motivate teachers to obtain their commitment and enthusiasm, the result of TPE needs to be given a great attention and value. This could be done by the school director by forming an evaluation committee which comprises ethical and experienced teachers of each department and by giving responsibility to this committee to identify the weakness and strengths of each of the teachers based up on their evaluation results. Accordingly, it is expected to provide counseling, orientations and share of experiences for those who showed weaknesses, and give financial or material rewards to those who performed better. In addition to these, Sebeta Education Bureau is expected to:-

   - arrange In-service trainings, short term training and orientation programs for those teachers who are found to be weak in their evaluation results.

   - select teachers based upon their evaluation result for higher education and scholarship chances.

2. It was found that, teachers were not involved in establishing the TPE criteria and the criteria were also found to be general, vague and irrelevant to the actual duties of the teachers.

To alleviate these problems, the current TPE criteria need to be revised. To do this, Sebeta Education Bureau should either:

   - Share the responsibility of the schools to formulate the TPE criteria based on the objective realities of them with the involvement of teachers and concerned evaluators and these criteria formulated by the schools have to be revised and approved by the education bureau before implemented, or

   - Prepare the draft of TPE criteria and expose it for discussion, criticism, amendments and modification by the teachers and all the evaluators before implementation.

3. It is clearly seen that all the evaluators (directors, unit leaders, peers and students) lack the necessary knowledge, skills and commitment in evaluating teachers. Furthermore, they had not been given a single orientation or training concerning teachers' evaluation. To alleviate these problems, the investigator recommends that, Sebeta education bureau, with the collaboration of the school directors, should prepare and give training as well as

orientation on TPE to all the a evaluators in each of the schools under the study. These activities, as a result, may minimize the rating errors to be committed by the evaluators.

4. The study revealed that the process of TPE in those schools has not been implemented in the way it was expected to be. To overcome this problem, the evaluation process need to be given attention and considered as one of the main duties of the teaching-learning process in those schools. This can be done by the school director by forming a body which is responsible to follow up the overall process of TPE based on the objective conditions of the school. The Sebeta education bureau is also expected to form a formal structure up to the school level which is responsible for the total activities of the current TPE scheme.

Reference

Aswatth appa (2002). Human Resource and Personnel Management. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited .

Befekadu G j Tsadik (1996). "Teachers Performance Evaluation: Issues and Strategies" Unpublished Material: Ministry of Education.

Beveridge. W.E. (1995). The interview in Staff Evaluation. London: George Allen an Unwin Ltd.

Bittle, L.R. (1978). Encyclopedia of Personnel Management. New York. McGraw - Hill Book Company.

Boynton, P.M. and Greenhalgh, T., 2004. Selecting, designing, and developing your questionnaire. Bmj, 328(7451), pp.1312-1315.

Burnham (1 995). Evaluating Human Resources, Programs, and Organizations. Malabor, Florida : Krienger Publishing Company.

Dailey R.C. (1988). Understanding People in Organization. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.

David S. (1990). Teachers Appraisal and Self Evaluation, USA. Klwer Academic Publisher.

Dessler G. (2003). Human Resource Management. Ninth ed. Published by Pearson Education (Singapore) Pte. Ltd., Indian Branch, 482 F.l.E. Patparganj, Delhi 10092. India.

Dessler, G. , 2008. Management: Leading people and organization in 21st century. Harlow: Prentice hall,

Donnelly, et. aI., (2012). Fundamentals of Management. Homewood: Richard Irwin, Inc.

Flippo, P. (1984). Personnel Management: New York: McGraw - Hill Book Company.

Gatlua, k. (2018). Factors Affecting Educational Quality in Gambella Town Secondary Schools of Gambella Region. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Glueck , W. (1982). Personnel: a Diagnostic Approach. (3rd. ed.), Plano, Texas: Business Publications, L/C.

Gorton, W. (2019). School Administration and Supervisions. Dubuque Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publisher.

Harris, B. M. (1 986). Developmental Teacher Evaluation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Heneman, H (1 986). Personnel Human Resource (3rd ed.), Homewood Illinois: Rich and D. Irwin. Inc .

Kinfe, T. (2017). Quality of Education in Tarmaber Wereda Secondary Schools'of Amhara Regional StateFactor that Affect. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

King, N. A. (2013). Investigation of Factors Hindering Quality Education in Secondary Schools in Mbeya, Tanzania. International Journal of Learning & Development, 3(6), 52-63.

Lester R. Bittle , (1990) . What Every Supervisor Should Know. The Basic Supervisory Management. New Delhi: Tatta McGraw - Hill Publis hing Company Ltd ..

Lucio, W. and J . McNeil, (1979). Supervision in Thought and Action. New York: McGraw - Hill Book Company.

Manatt, R. (1 987). "Lessons for a Compreh en sive Evaluation Project: Educa tional Leadership. Vol. 44, No. 7.

Marchington and Wilkinson (2000). Core Personnel and Development. London : Chartered Institute of Personnel.

Ma rthis, RL. and John H. (1997). Human Resource Management. New York: West Publishing Company.

Melaku Y. (1 992). "Appraisers - Appraisee Perception of Teachers performance Evaluation". AA U. (Unpublis h ed Masters Thesis).

Millman J . and Linda D.H. (1 990). Teacher Evaluation. New bury Park: Sage Publication.

Milloer R (1987). Evaluating Faculty for Promotion and Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publisher.

MoE (1988). Educational and Tra ining Policy. Addis Aba ba: EMPDA.

Mondy (1999). Human Resource Management. (7th ed.), Boston: Allyn and Bacon .

Namuddu , 2005. Staff Appraisal Systems and Teacher Performance at agakhan schools in kampala district.

Paisey R. (1 983). Organization and Management in Schools. London: Longman.

Pinnington, A. a nd Tonny, E. (2000). Introduction to Human Resource Management: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robbing, S . P. (1997). Essentials of Organizational Behavior, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Saiyadain M. et. a!., (1999). Personnel Management 2nd ed. , New Delhi: McGraw - Hill Company Limited.

Saiyadain, M.S. (1995). Human Resource Management. New Delhi, McGraw Hill Publishing Company.

Schermerhorn, J.R. (1996). Management and Organizational New York: John Wiley and Sons. Behavior.

Scott M. (1999). Human Resources Administration. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Szilagyi, A. and Marc J. (1983). Organizational Behavior. London: Schott; Foresman and Company.

Thomson, R and Christopher M. (1994). Developing Human Resources. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann Ltd.

Turner, G. and Cliff C. (2015) . Studies in Teacher Appraisal. London: Falmer Press.

Verspoor, A. (2013). Secondary Education in Ethiopia: Supporting Growth and Transformation. New York: The World Bank.

APPENDIX 1

St. Mary's University

School of Graduate Studies

Faculty of Business

Interview Questions for school director

1. What are the purposes that teaches' performance evaluation scheme intended to serve in your school?

2. Does the system of TPE in your school involve teachers in reviewing the evaluation criteria? If so, in what way and to what extent?

3. What is your opinion regarding the objectivity, clarity, and relevance of the current TPE criteria?

4. When and how frequently evaluating teachers' performance is being conducted in your school? How adequate it is?

5. Who are involved in evaluating teachers' performance? How skillful and competent they are? And what is the degree of their commitment in evaluating?

6. Have you ever received training in the area of TPE? If so, how adequate were they to evaluate teaches' performance?

7. What is the process you follow in undertaking the TPE in your school?

8. How often do you provide teaches with their evaluation feedback and discuss the result with them?

9. Do you orient your teachers and students about the current TPE? If so how?

10. What are some of the major problems encountered in the TPE system in your school?

II. What measures should be taken to improve those problems?

St. Mary's University

School of Graduate Studies

Faculty of Business

Questionnaire to be filled by unit leaders.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for the thesis entitled "The key aspects of teachers' performance evaluation in selected private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia". In addition to the researcher's endeavor and other related factors. The success of the study also depends upon your genuine responses. Thus, the student researcher kindly requests your sincere responses to each of the items provided in the questionnaire and acknowledges your cooperation to a great extent.

In responding to the questions, please note the following:

1. You are not required to write your name

2. All the questions raised here are equally important to attain the objectives of the study. Failure to complete any of them will adversely affect the overall study.

3. Provide your response by putting "/" or "X" mark in the spaces provided for questions with options and by writing your opinion briefly to the open ended questions.

4. Please know that all your responses will be kept confidential, and will be used only in the analysis of the data to reach on the findings.

PART ONE: 1.

    1. Background Information (unit leaders')

        1.1. Name of the school _____

        1.2. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

        1.3. Age: 20 and below ☐   21 - 30 ☐   31 – 40 ☐ 41 – 50 ☐   51 and above ☐

        1.4. Service years : 5 years and below ☐ 6 - 10 years ☐ 11 - 15 years ☐

16 - 20 years ☐   21 - 25 years ☐   26 - 30 years ☐   31 and above ☐

1.5. Educational Qualification: PhD ☐   MA/MSc ☐   BA/BSc ☐

Others_____

PART TWO:

2. **Purposes of Teachers Performance evaluation**

   Direction: Read each item separately and indicate your degree of agreement by putting a tick mark "/" or "X" under one of the indicated rating scales: (Very High - VH, High - H, Moderate - Mod, Minimal – Min , and Very Minimal - V.Min)

S.Nº	Items **As you see in practice, what is the primary purpose of the current system of teachers performance evaluation**	Responses				
		V H	H	Mo d	Mi n	VMi n
2.1	To improve teachers' professional competence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.2	To identify teachers' professional training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.3	To motivate teachers' to their job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.4	To improve quality of education (training)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.5	To decide on teachers' salary increment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.6	To decide on teachers' promotion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.7	To decide on teachers' transfer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.8	To reward outstandingly competent teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.9	To select teachers' for higher education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART THREE:

3. Participation in the discussion of the evaluation criteria and the objectivity, clarity and relevance of the criteria

Direction: Please respond to the following items. Use the rating scales. (Strongly Agreed - SA, Agree - A, Neutral - N, Disagree - DA, and Strongly Disagree – SD) by putting "/" or "X" under your choice.

S.Nº	Items	Responses				
3.1	**In the current teachers performance evaluation system**	SA	A	N	DA	SD
	3. 1. 1. There is a high participation of teachers in the development and formulation of criteria	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.1.2. The criteria used are clear	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3 .1.3 . The criteria used are relevant to the purpose of teachers performance evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.14. The criteria used are better in promoting teachers' professional responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		Responses				
3.2	**The current evaluation criteria objectivity:**	SA	A	N	DA	SD
	3 .2.1. Measure teachers professional competence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.2.2. promote teachers motivation to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.2.3. Strengthen teacher - student relationship	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3 .2.4. Strengthen teacher - administration relationship	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART FOUR:

The process of teachers' performance evaluation

Direction: The following is a procedure to be followed in the successful operation of teachers' performance evaluation. Indicate your response if this is currently working in your school. Please show your degree of agreement by putting "./" or "X" mark in the space provided.

S.Nº	Items **What is the process of the current system of teachers' performance evaluation?**	Responses				
		SA	A	N	DA	SD
4.1	Prior to any action, both the evaluators and the evaluatee meet and establish agreed upon objectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.2	Evaluators and their evaluatee develop action plans from the already set objectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3	Prior to the evaluation process orientation about the evaluation is given for both the evaluator and evaluatee	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.4	Evaluation of performance is made against the previously established objective	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.5	Providing feedback to the evaluatee	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.6	I orient teachers on the current teachers performance evaluation in collaboration with colleagues prior to the evaluation process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.7	The current TPE process in the school is successful in running the teaching learning process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART FIVE:

Major problems encountered in the evaluation system in general

Direction: Please respond to the following questions by putting "/" or "X" in the box provided.

5.1. What are the major problems encountered in the evaluation system in general?

1. Lack of necessary knowledge of the evaluator

    a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

2. Lack of adequate skills on the part of the evaluator

    a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

3. Poor administration of the overall evaluation process

    a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

4 . Lack of pre- evaluation discussion between you and your evaluator

    a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

5.2 . Which of the following errors have you observed in the current performance evaluation system of your school?

S.Nº	Items: Which of the following errors have you observed in the current performance evaluation system of your school :	SA	A	N	DA	SD
		Responses				
5.2.1	Including evaluation dimensions (example personality of the teacher) that is irrelevant to the performance evaluated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.2	Taking only one factor of a teacher (as positive or negative) and giving an overall rating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.3	Tendency of giving relatively high or low rating to everyone virtually	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.4	Rating all or most teachers average	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.5	Focusing on the behavior of teachers just before the evaluation and ignoring behaviors which are more distant past	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.6	Evaluators' tendency of rating high a person who is similar to them in attitude, interest, race, sex, etc and rating low those who are not	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5.3. Please mention other problems of teachers' performance evaluation.

_____

_____

_____

5.4. Please recommend (possible solution to the problems) to improve the current teaches performance evaluation system in your school.

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX 3

St. Mary's University

School of Graduate Studies

Faculty of Business

. **Questionnaire to be filled by teachers.**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for the thesis entitled "The key aspects of teachers' performance evaluation in selected private primary schools in Sebeta, Oromia". In addition to the researcher's endeavor and other related factors. The success of the study also depends upon your genuine responses. Thus, the student researcher kindly requests your sincere responses to each of the items provided in the questionnaire and acknowledges your cooperation to a great extent.

In responding to the questions, please note the following:

 1. You are not required to write your name

2. All the questions raised here are equally important to attain the objectives of the study. Failure to complete any of them will adversely affect the overall study.

3. Provide your response by putting "/" or "X" mark in the spaces provided for questions with options and by writing your opinion briefly to the open ended questions.

 4. Please know that all your responses will be kept confidential, and will be used only in the analysis of the data to reach on the findings.

PART ONE: 1.

    1. Background Information (Teachers')

        1.1. Name of the school _____

        1.2. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

        1.3. Age: 20 and below ☐   21 - 30 ☐   31 – 40 ☐   41 – 50 ☐   51 and above ☐

1.4. Service years (in teaching): 5 years and below ☐   6 - 10 years ☐   11 - 15 years ☐

16 - 20 years ☐   21 - 25 years ☐   26 - 30 years ☐   31 and above ☐

1.5. Educational Qualification: PhD ☐   MA/MSc ☐   BA/BSc ☐   Others _____

PART TWO:

2. **Purposes of Teachers Performance Evaluation**

Direction: Read each item separately and indicate your degree of agreement by putting a tick mark "/" or "X" under one of the indicated rating scales: (Very High - VH, High - H, Moderate - Mod, Minimal – Min , and Very Minimal - VMin)

S.Nº	Items As you see in practice, what is the primary purpose of the current system of teachers performance evaluation	Responses				
		VH	H	Mod	Min	VMin
2.1	To improve teachers' professional competence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.2	To identify teachers' professional training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.3	To motivate teachers' to their job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.4	To improve quality of education (training)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.5	To decide on teachers' salary increment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.6	To decide on teachers' promotion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.7	To decide on teachers' transfer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.8	To reward outstandingly competent teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.9	To select teachers' for higher education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART THREE:

4. Participation in the discussion of the evaluation criteria and the objectivity, clarity and relevance of the criteria

5. **Direction**: Please respond to the following items. Use the rating scales. (Strongly Agreed - SA, Agree - A, Neutral - N, Disagree - DA, and Strongly Disagree – SD) by putting "/" or "X" under your choice.

S.Nº	Items	Responses				
3.1	**In the current teachers performance evaluation system**	SA	A	N	DA	SD
	3. 1. 1. There is a high participation of teachers in the development and formulation of criteria	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.1.2. The criteria used are clear	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3 .1.3 . The criteria used are relevant to the purpose of teachers performance evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.14. The criteria used are better in promoting teachers' professional responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		Responses				
3.2	**The current evaluation criteria objectivity:**	SA	A	N	DA	SD
	3 .2.1. Measure teachers professional competence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.2.2. promote teachers motivation to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.2.3. strengthen teacher - student relationship	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3 .2.4. strengthen teacher - administration relationship	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART FOUR:

The process of teachers' performance evaluation

Direction: The following is a procedure to be followed in the successful operation of the current teachers' performance evaluation. Indicate your response if this is currently working in your school. Please show your degree of agreement by putting "./" or "X" mark in the space provided.

S.Nº	Items **What is the process of the current system of teachers' performance evaluation?**	Responses				
		SA	A	N	DA	SD
4.1	Prior to any action, both the evaluator and the evaluatee meet and establish agreed upon objectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.2	Evaluators and their evaluatee develop action plans from the already set objectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3	Prior to the evaluation process orientation about the evaluation is given for both the evaluators and evaluatee	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.4	Evaluation of performance is made against the previously established objective	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.5	Providing feedback to the evaluatee	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

PART FIVE:

Major problems encountered in the evaluation system in general

Direction: Please respond to the following questions by putting "/" or "X" in the box provided.

5.1. What are the major problems encountered in the evaluation system in general?

1. Lack of necessary knowledge of the evaluators

       a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

2. Lack of adequate skills on the part of the evaluators

       a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

3. Poor administration of the overall evaluation process

       a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

4 . Lack of pre-evaluation discussion between you and your evaluators

       a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

5. Lack of post evaluation discussion between you and your evaluators

       a) Ye s ☐   b) No ☐

5.2 . **Which of the following errors have you observed in the current performance evaluation system of your school?**

S.Nº	Items Which of the following errors have you observed in the current performance evaluation system of your school:	Responses				
		SA	A	N	DA	SD
5.2.1	Including evaluation dimensions (example personality of the teacher) that is irrelevant to the performance evaluated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.2	Taking only one factor of a teacher (as positive or negative) and giving an overall rating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.3	Tendency of giving relatively high or low rating to virtually everyone	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.4	Rating all or most teachers average	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.5	Focusing on the behavior of teachers just before the evaluation and ignoring behaviors which are more distant past	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2.6	Evaluators' tendency of rating high a person who is similar to them in attitude, interest, race, sex, etc and rating low those who are not	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5.3. Please mention other problems of teachers' performance evaluation.

_____

_____

7.4. Please recommend (possible solution to the problems) to improve the current teaches' performance evaluation system in your school.

_____

_____

ADIROT SCHOOL SYSTEMS
TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORMAT(Formal)

Teacher's Name ……………………………………………… Subject ………………………………
Grade & Section ………………………………… Date of Observation …………………………………
Period ……………………………… Length of period ………………………. No of students ………….

V = very good	G = Good	I = Improvement Desired	U = Unsatisfactory	N = Not Observed

No	1. Effective planning	U	I	G	V	N
1.1	Quality of daily lesson plan					
1.2	Displays evidence of teacher preparation					
1.3	Directions to students are clearly thought out and well stated					
1.4	Materials for class are organized and available					
1.5	Provides enrichment where needed					
1.6	Is aware of adequate pacing					
1.7	Carefully plans students assignment					
1.8	Prepares note relevant to the topic					
1.9	Consistency of annual and daily lesson plan					
No	**2. Teaching Techniques**					
2.1	Revising the previous lesson					
2.2	Introducing the lesson properly					
2.3	Presents the main body of the lesson in an attractive and understandable manner					
2.4	Gives adequate examples					
2.5	Presents the points coherently step by step from simple to complex					
2.6	Relates the lesson to the real life situation					
2.7	Gives relevant class and homework and checks regularly					
2.8	Utilizes notebook and / or other guides effectively					
2.9	Demonstrates sufficient mastery of content					
2.10	Makes effective use of variety of available materials					
2.11	Makes clear and practical demonstration					
2.12	Provides for students participation					
2.13	Uses logical, purposeful and thought-provoking questions					
2.14	Provides interesting and adequate reinforcement					
2.15	Varies procedures in working with pupils of varying abilities					
2.16	Provides motivation					
2.17	Assess students' understanding with relevant questions					
2.18	Summarizes and concludes the lesson					
No	**3. Classroom Management Techniques**					
3.1	Checks students' seating arrangement					
3.2	Gesture and seating arrangement					

3.3	Listens to the questions of students and answers politely					
3.4	Teacher's self confidence					
3.5	Follows student's attention and feeling					
3.6	Identifies students with varying behavior and approaches them accordingly					
3.7	Treats students according to their learning ability					
3.8	Sound intensity					
3.9	Eye contact					

No	1. Student – Teacher relationship	U	I	G	V	N
4.1	Maintains students' interest and attention					
4.2	Works constructively with individual or group					
4.3	Manages routine so as to avoid confusion					
4.4	Uses positive statements to students					
4.5	Graciously accommodates any responses of the students with varying ability					
4.6	Makes supportive statements to students					
4.7	Maintains a friendly and respectful teacher student relationship					
No	2. Time Management					
5.1	Punctual to class					
5.2	Using class time properly for relevant classroom activities					
5.3	Proportional distribution of time among major classroom activities					
5.4	Leaving the class on time					
No	3. Other					
6.1	Having teachers' folder					
6.2	Teacher's dressing style and neatness of gown					
6.3	Handwriting of the teacher					
6.4	Writing of the date and character count trait of the month					
6.5	Follows and checks students' handwriting					
6.6	Relationship with assistant teacher					

....

....

B. Suggestions for improvement

....

....

C. Teacher's comment

....

....

<u>Supervisor 1</u>

Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

<u>Supervisor 2</u>

Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

<u>Teacher</u>

Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____