

**SCHOOL-FOCUSSED STAFF DEVELOPMENT: OPPORTUNITIES  
AND CHALLENGES. A CASE STUDY**

**A Research Report Presented**

**By**

**NAEEM SULIAMAN MEER**

A Research Report submitted to the Faculty of Education,  
**University of the Witwatersrand**, Johannesburg,  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
**MASTER OF EDUCATION.**

September 1999



## **ABSTRACT**

This report sets out to establish the need for a school-focussed staff development programme within South African schools given the changing educational imperatives in teacher education. It challenges the notion that a person with a university degree or teaching certificate is equipped for lifelong service as a teacher, by addressing the role that institutions can play in promoting professional development. The study focuses on the experiences of one school to evince teacher enhancement strategies. The methodology employs observation, interviews and a questionnaire pertaining to both the success of and the need for school-focussed staff development.

The study found that the importance of staff development increases as teachers develop new rationales and create new strategies to fit their particular context and needs. It further found that giving teachers the opportunity to make instructional innovations enhanced whole school development. It stresses the need for educational authorities to devolve more autonomy to schools, by supporting initiatives which integrate staff development and problem-solving approaches. Lastly, it makes recommendations on the induction of professional development to facilitate structural and ideological evolution within schools. By locating this within the case study school, it found links between staff development and school achievement. Finally it stresses the need for schools to design programmes to suit their particular context. The study concludes by encouraging further research in the area of school-focussed staff development applicable to the South African context.

### **KEY WORDS:**

school-focussed staff development  
management of change  
collaborative teaching  
leadership  
developmental appraisal

organic organisational structure  
collegiality  
induction  
staff development policy  
reflective teaching

### **AUTHOR DECLARATION**

I declare that the Research Report is my own, unaided work and that it is submitted in part fulfilment for the Master of Education Degree. What is contained herein has been done entirely by myself, with no outside help, except where questionnaires and interviews have been used to support the findings within the Report.

Naeem S Meer

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|                                                                                            |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>                                                                     | ii        |
| <b>ABSTRACT</b>                                                                            | iii       |
| <b>AUTHOR DECLARATION</b>                                                                  | iv        |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>                                                                   | v         |
| <b>APPENDIX INDEX</b>                                                                      | vii       |
| <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>                                                               | viii      |
| <br>                                                                                       |           |
| <b>CHAPTER 1      DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY</b>                                             | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1      Introduction                                                                      | 1         |
| 1.2      Statement of the Problem                                                          | 5         |
| 1.3      Background of the Research                                                        | 7         |
| 1.4      Importance of the Research                                                        | 10        |
| 1.5      The Research Aims                                                                 | 14        |
| 1.6      Towards a Definition of Terms                                                     | 15        |
| 1.7      Limitations of the Study                                                          | 17        |
| 1.8      Rationale                                                                         | 18        |
| <br>                                                                                       |           |
| <b>CHAPTER 2      THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b>                                                | <b>20</b> |
| <br>                                                                                       |           |
| <b>CHAPTER 3      REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</b>                                             | <b>28</b> |
| 3.1      Introduction                                                                      | 28        |
| 3.2      Staff Development and School Achievement                                          | 29        |
| 3.3      Staff Development Policy: the Need for Change                                     | 31        |
| 3.4      Developing a Staff Development Policy                                             | 36        |
| 3.5      Collaborative School Interaction                                                  | 38        |
| 3.6      Identifying Development Needs: The Tension Between<br>Individual and Organisation | 39        |
| 3.7      The Challenge Facing Our Schools                                                  | 44        |
| 3.8      Evaluation                                                                        | 46        |
| 3.9      Developmental Appraisal for Educators                                             | 48        |
| 3.10     The Reflective Practitioner                                                       | 52        |

|                      |                                                     |               |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>CHAPTER 4</b>     | <b>METHODOLOGY</b>                                  | <b>54</b>     |
| 4.1                  | Introduction                                        | 54            |
| 4.2                  | Research Approach                                   | 55            |
| 4.3                  | Scope                                               | 56            |
| 4.4                  | Research Instruments                                | 56            |
| 4.5                  | Limitations                                         | 57            |
| 4.6                  | Ensuring Validity                                   | 58            |
| 4.7                  | Questionnaires                                      | 59            |
|                      | 4.7.1 <i>Use of a Questionnaire</i>                 | 59            |
|                      | 4.7.2 <i>Designing of the Questionnaire</i>         | 61            |
|                      | 4.7.3 <i>Pilot Testing of Questionnaire</i>         | 62            |
|                      | 4.7.4 <i>Administration of the Questionnaire</i>    | 62            |
|                      | 4.7.5 <i>Questionnaire Reliability</i>              | 62            |
| 4.8                  | Semi-Structured Interviews                          | 63            |
| 4.9                  | Observation                                         | 64            |
| <br><b>CHAPTER 5</b> | <br><b>RESEARCH FINDINGS: THE CASE STUDY SCHOOL</b> | <br><b>66</b> |
| 5.1                  | Introduction                                        | 66            |
| 5.2                  | The Case Study School                               | 67            |
|                      | 5.2.1 <i>The Wider Context</i>                      | 67            |
|                      | 5.2.2 <i>The Specific Context</i>                   | 67            |
|                      | 5.2.3 <i>Staff Development at the School</i>        | 70            |
| <br><b>CHAPTER 6</b> | <br><b>ANALYSIS OF DATA</b>                         | <br><b>78</b> |
| 6.1                  | Introduction                                        | 78            |
| 6.2                  | Sample Profiles                                     | 78            |
| 6.3                  | Comments on Data Analysis                           | 79            |
|                      | 6.3.1 <i>The Interviews</i>                         | 79            |
|                      | 6.3.2 <i>The Questionnaire</i>                      | 80            |
|                      | 6.3.3 <i>General Perceptions</i>                    | 86            |
| 6.4                  | Evaluation                                          | 89            |
| 6.5                  | Teacher Recommendations                             | 89            |
| 6.6                  | Conclusion                                          | 91            |

|                     |                                                                                            |            |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>CHAPTER 7</b>    | <b>PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A<br/>SCHOOL-FOCUSED STAFF DEVELOPMENT<br/>PROGRAMME</b> | <b>93</b>  |
| 7.1                 | Introduction                                                                               | 93         |
| 7.2                 | School-Based Change                                                                        | 93         |
| 7.3                 | Creating a Climate for Staff Development                                                   | 94         |
| 7.4                 | Designing Policy                                                                           | 96         |
| 7.5                 | Approaches and Responsibility to Staff Development                                         | 97         |
|                     | 7.5.1 <i>Informal Approaches to Teacher Responsibility</i>                                 | 97         |
|                     | 7.5.2 <i>Traditional Approaches and Administrative Responsibility</i>                      | 98         |
|                     | 7.5.3 <i>Intermediate Approach and Supervisory Responsibility</i>                          | 98         |
| 7.6                 | Recommendations                                                                            | 99         |
|                     | 7.6.1 <i>Adoption of a Facilitator</i>                                                     | 99         |
|                     | 7.6.2 <i>Action Learning</i>                                                               | 100        |
|                     | 7.6.3. <i>Induction</i>                                                                    | 101        |
|                     | 7.6.4. <i>Developing an Organic Organisational Structure</i>                               | 103        |
|                     | 7.6.5. <i>Collaborative School Management</i>                                              | 107        |
| 7.7                 | Conclusion                                                                                 | 108        |
| 7.8                 | Recommendations for Further Research                                                       | 110        |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> |                                                                                            | <b>113</b> |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>   |                                                                                            | <b>118</b> |
|                     | Appendix A                                                                                 | 118        |
|                     | Appendix B                                                                                 | 118        |
|                     | Appendix C                                                                                 | 119        |
|                     | Appendix D                                                                                 | 120        |
|                     | Appendix E                                                                                 | 121        |
|                     | Appendix F (Questionnaire)                                                                 | 123        |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|       |   |                                     |
|-------|---|-------------------------------------|
| ANC   | - | AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS           |
| CSM   | - | COLLABORATIVE SCHOOL MANAGEMENT     |
| DAE   | - | DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL FOR EDUCATORS |
| ELRC  | - | EDUCATION LABOUR RELATIONS COUNCIL  |
| EPU   | - | EDUCATION POLICY UNIT               |
| HMI   | - | HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE          |
| HOD   | - | HOUSE OF DELEGATES                  |
| INSET | - | INSERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING    |
| LEA   | - | LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY           |
| SD    | - | STAFF DEVELOPMENT                   |
| SFSD  | - | SCHOOL-FOCUSSED STAFF DEVELOPMENT   |
| TSM   | - | TEMPORARY SYSTEMS MODEL             |

# **CHAPTER I**

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY**

### **1.1 Introduction**

In South Africa the interest in staff development is in some ways fuelled by the realisation that effective school-focussed INSET requires authorities to devolve more autonomy to schools. Staff development requires a sound, well integrated external support structure which itself depends upon the development of new and flexible partnerships amongst all stakeholders. Within schools, careful planning and organisational arrangements are crucial. The burgeoning interest and activity in staff development means that expenditure on both research and initiatives, which in the past was minimal, has to be increased. It is hardly surprising therefore that many schools have so little systematic and reliable information regarding costs, resource use, the effectiveness of particular approaches and overall investment in staff development initiatives.

Demands for educational opportunity by the lesser privileged sectors of South African society have brought with them the concomitant need for a more competent and capable teacher. In addition, tensions in South African society have prompted educational initiatives to address questions of racism, sexism and cultural conflict. Schools need to perceive their staff development programmes in this context and move towards policies emphasising anti-racism and multiculturalism.

The main objective of this research report is to stimulate serious debate regarding the need for school-focussed staff development. This was done by examining a case study school, and seeing whether its

experiences were applicable to other institutions committed to transformation. If schools are to succeed in their many goals, then staff must continuously expand their knowledge and skills and be made aware of new challenges that encourage problem solving strategies pertaining to teaching and learner achievement. The main thrust of this report is to encourage schools to view the people in their organisation as having the capacity to work towards the resolution of *all* inherent problems. Since the enhancement of human potential is growth orientated, this report endorses the need for every teacher and administrator to become active participants in the planning and conducting of projects related to school-focussed staff development.

Staff development issues were located in the context of controversial issues nationally and related to the case study school. Next followed an examination of staff development at the said school over the last five years with emphasis on the changes thereof, and the links between staff development and school achievement. The report also looked at collaborative approaches to school development, and stakeholder participation in it. The study first detailed the importance of staff development by providing a rationale for conducting systematic, if not empirically based, programmes. The next section reinforced the need for an integrated school and staff development policy, and was followed by a consideration of strategies for need identification and its consequences on the individual. This culminated in an examination of the need of formative development, and a discussion of the role of evaluation and appraisal in maintaining the impetus for development.

Relating this to the position in South Africa, I next examined the implications of institutional autonomy for choosing staff development strategies. This relied on empirical evidence, and in

particular, teachers' perceptions regarding school-focussed staff development. The focus then moved to an examination of the challenges relating to organisational culture, the management of change and teacher professionalism. It is hoped that the findings that emerge from this report would help future attempts at conceptualising new staff development practices which emphasise ongoing school-focussed problem-solving. The underlying assumptions were that staff development needed to facilitate structural and ideological evolution within schools committed to developing characteristics which are valued by the local and national community.

The sophisticated and diverse activities of an education ministry in transition demand that all its staff be exposed to personnel development and training on a continuous basis so as to keep pace with new trends. Planned differentiated training of staff is therefore essential in enabling institutions to render a more efficient service to the public by developing in them a sense of dedication to education. Schools must at all times be capable of responding to the differentiated and varied needs of their learners by understanding the role that attitudes, functions and qualifications of their staff play. The need to maintain the internal dynamism of the teaching profession has meant that staff development and in-service training remain a high priority. Given the complexity of problems, many schools try to solve these to varying degrees within the context of their own surroundings. This implies that staff development should centre on the school and its problems by adopting a collaborative stance.

In the past, personal and professional experience of teachers, their motivations, their working environment, and their conditions of work were not sufficiently taken into consideration; they were not drawn into the decision making processes of a stagnant South African education system. Teachers

fell into complacency and moral decline which affected them negatively. According to Hewton (1988:42), such teachers:

“..cannot be relied upon, they have not kept themselves up to date in their subject, they are limited in the range of teaching approaches they call upon, they are poor in establishing a good rapport with their pupils, they take very little part in the life of the school outside the classroom and they seem to have become cynical and demotivated.”

The strive for autonomy has led to ‘school-focussed’ staff development aimed at meeting the needs of the school, of groups and individuals within the school. The starting point is that within an institution, each member of staff is provided with an opportunity for consistent, integrated, personal and professional development. Hewton (1988:37) carries this further when he says: “...the workplace is an important, often major part of a person’s life. It should, therefore, be designed to provide a humane and satisfying environment.” Teachers need to become decision makers able to choose the most important and appropriate training mechanism they think suitable to enhance learner achievement and school development. Change requires that schools adapt to the reality of curriculum innovations, reduced financial provision, new technologies, falling rolls and alternative organisation and management approaches.

They must also keep abreast of changes in the wider society and relate these to the circumstances within. The current shift in political and economic forces now forces schools to look towards internally-based staff development to prepare teachers to provide the best possible work environment. Teachers and schools are often targets for unreal expectations, and so need support in coping with the demands of both the community and education itself. The point is well made by Fitch and Kopp

(1990:3) who say:

“ The challenge is to provide ways and means to help professionals to grow on the job, as well as in gaining assistance in order to deal with the evolving curriculum. A staff development program, carefully designed to meet the pressing needs of the current era, represents the best approach to meeting the escalating challenges of modern society placed upon our schools.”

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

With the formation of a single education department in 1994, education became the mainstay of provincial departments under the leadership of district and circuit offices. This placed added responsibility on provinces and issues of policy derivation and implementation were either slowed down or put on hold until provinces could sort problems out resulting from the amalgamation and assimilation of the historically separate education departments. Previously, the national education focus permeated and encouraged discriminatory practices with the minimum of interaction or integration amongst departments. Staff development was not high on the national agenda and any school-based initiative was esoteric and well outside departmental mandate. This forced schools to advance development programmes without formal policy input or guidance from a higher level. Programmes were fairly ad-hoc with disparate results as many schools lacked resources, finance, proper staff involvement and clear strategic plans to guide staff development. Poor learner performance and teacher apathy soon led to the realisation amongst educators that there was an urgent need for a formal internally-structured development programme, and that if the education authorities were going to be silent on this, schools would themselves become the trend-setters of such initiatives.

A neglect in this area over the years had forced many schools to steer away from professional development for fear of tackling new challenges, lack of guidance and direction, educator scepticism, financial constraints, lack of proper planning and reprisal from departmental authorities who viewed any school taking an autonomous stand as 'radical'. Many schools believed that there was no real need for staff development. Whilst governing bodies, teacher unions, parents and the community at large do in fact have a vital role to play in education, teachers hold the key to educational quality and should therefore be responsible for their own development. The point is clearly made by Kremer-Hayon, Vonk and Fessler (1993) who state:

"Moreover, teachers have to develop habits and routines in order to cope and survive in the classroom; but this results in their becoming wedded to forms of practice.....that inhibits subsequent change. In spite of this routinization of many aspects, teaching is so complex that teachers still have to think a great deal about it, both proactively...and interactively. Research into teacher thinking is beginning to elucidate the nature of some of this thought, but it also confirms that the unpredictability of teaching is a disincentive to too much forward planning."

A teacher has to be dedicated and committed to unlocking the potential in learners by developing their characters and preparing them for meaningful citizenship and later economic independence and vocational competency. This distinguishes a true teacher from an indoctrinator. The former considers the needs of the learner of paramount importance, while the latter subjugates them on the basis of his own aims and objectives. A drastic orientation of the whole education system towards personal staff development is essential. The magnitude of this task is such that the state cannot shoulder the responsibility alone and so it becomes incumbent on schools to play a vital role in prioritising in-service education and training.

Current changes have had important implications for curricula content and teacher education development programmes via school-focussed staff development of which policy forms an integral part. Clearly, there needs to be a resurgence and review of school-focussed practice beginning with clear articulations in staff development policies. It needs to be stressed, however, that no initial teacher training package or tailor-made staff development programme will ever produce a fully fledged teacher. It is for this reason that induction, staff development, appraisal and evaluation be understood to constitute essential stages in whole school development. It is against this backdrop that this report is focussed.

### **1.3 Background to the Research**

Experience has shown me that schools viewed staff development differently. The priorities within each school were also different, with initiatives, if any, generally stemming from either the principal or senior management. In a number of schools, there was generally a deep desire by educators to raise the standard of their work. By highlighting some of the problems areas, it is hoped that this research stresses the need for a more goal-orientated approach to staff development and problem solving, which supports the idea of drawing in staff by providing direction, support and an enriching and satisfying work environment. The essence of this approach is that schools should be pro-active in maintaining and improving educational standards. Writing about secondary schools, Van Velzen (1979) reminds us that

“....the school is in a position to make its own educational policy, which enables it to make a conscious choice as to the sort of problem it wants to deal with. Potentially, the autonomous school has a greater problem-solving capacity.”

We must understand that unless schools provide their staff with training and support that encourage growth and change, the entire chain of educational improvement will be broken. Though school-focussed staff development is still in its infancy, due to our inexperience in this area, schools must nonetheless persevere in their efforts to better their educational standards by experimenting and drawing from the experiences of others.

At present teachers have widely different perceptions regarding staff development, its future and the way it was practised. The following are cases in point illustrated by research conducted in 1992 by the Department of Education and Culture (HOD), in Pretoria, entitled *"Report Back on Moderation and Evaluation for Promotion Purposes, Undertaken by Superintendent of Education."* The finding revealed, in effect the following:

- The purpose of staff development is explicitly perceived to improve the functioning of the school and the quality of education received by learners. Some teachers saw it as a task to be completed, while others linked it to accountability and transparency.
- In establishing staff development programmes, principals, with management, would establish a long list of areas to be considered, and then (amongst themselves) discuss in order to establish agreed priorities for investigation. The purpose of such programmes appears not to have been discussed with or discerned by the rest of the staff, who were either vague or ignorant about the whole exercise. Selected staff were then targeted for such staff developmental initiatives.
- The emphasis on staff development was largely inputs - organisation and curricular arrangements - and on the institutional arrangements of these. A few schools attempted staff development in a less formal way by placing relatively little emphasis on the analysis of organisational, curricular, staffing and resource inputs, and were more concerned with making general judgements about the effectiveness of the school.
- More emphasis was given to processes and outcomes affecting learners. In two schools, there were occasional group discussions on the effectiveness of current schemes and practices with reference to pupils' work and responses. In others the emphasis was on looking at methodology and pupils' work, enabling the school to discover, for example, difficulties in understanding specific subject issues.

- In the smaller schools, the principal was always more central in decision making and in communicating objectives to Heads of departments and the staff as a whole, either orally or by means of internal circulars. In most cases principals overestimated the extent to which their purposes were understood; communication was not always adequate and priorities were not always clearly established.
- Only one school had a clear staff development policy which was articulated clearly in its mission and strategic plan.
- While a few schools could claim some success in particular aspects of their activity, all encountered difficulties in whole-school terms. In many schools there was a failure to set priorities and targets. Some had too many projects which they tried to tackle simultaneously which resulted in chaos; some had none.
- Some schools had no idea of staff development or staff development programmes, and saw no need for such.
- Very few schools attempted an evaluation of the effectiveness of the staff development programmes. In others, evaluation seemed to consist not of reviewing present practice and making necessary changes, but choosing a particular issue and then acting on this only.

According to this, both staff development and teacher appraisal were found wanting in schools. There is a dire need for schools therefore to re-examine these and ensure better utilisation of available personnel and resources. Failure to do this would lead to increased stress amongst teachers, poor staff morale and greater cries for accountability from all stakeholders. This is consistent with the aims of the National Education Department's New Developmental Appraisal for Educators (ELRC: 1999) initiative which states:

"Within the organised teaching profession the need was felt to develop an appraisal instrument which would be acceptable to all stakeholders and would enhance the development of competency of educators and the quality of public education in South Africa."

Evaluation forms the basis of development. "Readiness to be self-critical....and to contribute to cross-curricular development all appear to grow from an awareness of the evaluative process" (Bayne-

Jardine and Holly, 1994:82). The literature on staff development is replete with case studies and evaluations to support the assertion (Fitch and Kopp1990; Dean, 1991; Orlich1989) that global changes in education have placed the responsibility of education much more with the school, its staff and the governing body. Since individual needs have to be met, teachers who've had positive experiences in this regard become strong advocates for staff development programmes. Fitch and Kopp (1990:3) sum it up as follows: "A staff development program, carefully designed to meet the pressing needs of the current era, represents the best approach to meeting the escalating challenges of modern society placed upon our schools."

#### **1.4 Importance of the Research**

The need to render quality and professional service to teachers and learners is paramount, given the legacy of the past. This begs the question: How can teachers be effectively developed within schools to ensure professional and quality service to the community? A learning organisation is organic. Development needs are identified in anticipation of change perceived as desirable, through consultation. In schools, such change is recognised as ultimately beneficial to the organisation by enhancing educational provision. Approached in a systematic way, this process forms the basis of a school development plan. Staff development is therefore central to school development, in that it exists to facilitate change by reflecting on lessons learned from prior evolution. It becomes incumbent on teachers to identify staff and school development needs by committing themselves to the notion that improvement stems from a continuous spiral of professional and organisational development, grounded in experience - a culture of learning.

1. The first step in the process of developing a new product is to identify a market need. This is often done through market research, which can involve surveys, focus groups, and other methods of gathering information from potential customers. Once a market need has been identified, the next step is to develop a concept for a product that meets that need. This is often done through brainstorming and prototyping. Once a concept has been developed, the next step is to create a business plan for the product. This plan should outline the costs of production, the pricing strategy, and the marketing strategy. Once a business plan has been created, the next step is to secure funding for the product. This can be done through a variety of methods, including venture capital, angel investors, and crowdfunding. Once funding has been secured, the next step is to develop a prototype of the product. This is often done through 3D printing or other manufacturing techniques. Once a prototype has been developed, the next step is to conduct a pilot run of the product. This is often done to test the product in a real-world setting and to gather feedback from customers. Once a pilot run has been completed, the next step is to launch the product into the market. This is often done through a combination of direct sales and marketing efforts. Finally, the last step in the process is to monitor the product's performance in the market and to make adjustments as needed. This is often done through ongoing market research and customer feedback.

In practical terms, however, *THINK* as staff development does not, and cannot be expected to, deliver knowledge to the staff of the school. The question, perhaps more apposite to work with school-based change, has whether any of the new, prolonged local, non school-based practices, now being discussed because of the failure of an imported imported system, such as school staff development and *THINK* programmes, served merely to enhance teachers' degree of protection, instead of either incrementally or helped to grow individual teachers. The real school as personal development took place with such preliminary resources. Change requires should serve to inform the staff development process, not drive it. If this is viewed as formation - a stage in a continuum of systematic adaptation, then close links between individual needs and those of the

organisation could result in staff development being implemented with greater commitment - participants (as opposed to recipients) then become actively involved in problem identification and developing strategies for solving them. Ownership of a staff development plan is then high and effective implementation is more likely.

The perception that INSET or staff development, delivered by 'experts', implied that recipients were inexperienced as professionals was very real and this combined to lower self-esteem and enthusiasm for any professional development exercise. Staff ignorance and apathy occurs when teachers are uninformed in the overall direction of the organisation, unclear of their role in the change process, and confused regarding the purpose of change to be implemented. Such an attitude, typical of role culture, is unlikely to engender participation in any change process. Organisational evolution depends on an interest in monitoring, questioning and observing change.

Evaluation within schools takes place for improvement and accountability. Learning organisations should chart their future through integrated staff and organisational development plans, and by placing maximum emphasis on individual participation and autonomy. Factors such as legislation, the need to comply with departmental guidelines and pressure from parents leads one to question the validity of an inward-looking staff development focus, and the morality of an autonomous approach. It should, however, be borne in mind that within the context of any school, individual and organisational needs and problems are not mutually exclusive.

Do such organisations in practice give balanced consideration to the rights and wrongs of their

development policies, without taking external perspectives into account? Indeed, are not development policy decisions often dictated by change generated externally to the organisation? How can the organisation claim to be anything other than reactive in these circumstances? Whilst these criticisms are justifiable, their real force lies in the fact that they highlight the complexity of factors affecting school development. No organisation is likely to be entirely 'learning' or 'non-learning'. An autonomous approach to policy formulation may be possible in certain instances while this may not be so in others. The source of the stimulus of change is an important consideration.

The strength of an organisation inclined to a culture of learning and teaching, lies in the commitment it requires of its members to continuous development and the value it places simultaneously upon the contribution individuals make in accomplishing it. Such a dynamic and self-questioning environment is likely to attract enthusiastic professionals with a developed interest in the delivery of a constantly improving educational product. In such an institution there is a possibility of forging staff development programmes which could be used as instruments by provincial and national departments in developing a standardised national staff development plan. It must be accepted as a point of departure that management within a school should be competent in handling three basic competencies, viz. functional skills, interpersonal skills and conceptual skills. These are necessary in ensuring the success of the organisation. Conceptual and interpersonal skills are important in creating, maintaining and adjusting organisational culture which Schein (1984) defines as:

"... the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems."

Any organisation, then needs to develop a culture of coherence and trust, which could serve as a basis for school effectiveness.

### **1.5 The Research Aims**

The aim of this study is to assess the impact that a process-driven school-focussed staff development programme has on school development and achievement. By reviewing the literature on staff development this report hopes to elicit, via a case study, what an individual school, with a proven track record, has done in developing its staff, and how this has impacted on the achievement of the organisation as a whole. These findings could inform future research in this area and be of use to schools, individuals and organisations who may wish to embark on future staff development programmes.

This underpins the premise that the school as an organisation can move forward by developing its own staff development policies relevant to its context, and its changing environment. Schools should set their own goals and be clear about the methods of achieving them. It is necessary to examine schools as organisations and see to what extent the various criteria which help promote their continuity and survival operate.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of a mandatory staff development policy, schools should embed within their strategic and development plan, clear guidelines aimed at developing their staff. Such development initiatives could serve as broad indicators for anyone charged with reviewing future policies on staff development.

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be stressed that well after this research had started, there now does appear to be a mandatory policy in the form of the new Developmental Appraisal for Educators.

## 1.6 Towards a Definition of Terms

Although terms such as 'in-service education', 'professional development', 'teacher development', 'INSET' and 'staff development' are often used interchangeably to describe training programmes for teachers, for the purpose of this report, the term 'staff development' is most appropriate, as it encapsulates the essence of training initiatives for experienced teachers.

"Staff development in the school setting implies a programme for promoting the professional and personal growth of staff members so they can improve the teaching-learning opportunities for students" (Pfeiffer and Dunlap:1982)

Graham Williams (1982) suggests that staff development "is the process by which individuals, groups and organisations learn to be more efficient". Cawood and Gibbons (1981) describe staff development as "an experiential involvement by a teacher in the process of growing. This process is not short term. It is a continuous, never ending development activity." Roland Morant (1981) says (of in-service education): "It is the education intended to support and assist the professional development that teachers ought to experience through their working lives." Staff development is seen by Hewton (1988) as a planned process of development which enhances the quality of pupil learning, identifying, clarifying and meeting the individual needs of the staff within the context of the institution as a whole. It assumes a need for people at work to grow and develop on the job. Dillon-Peterson (1981) views staff development as a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive and positive organisational climate.

For Griffin (1983) the term staff development refers to any systematic attempt to alter the professional practices, beliefs and understanding of educators towards an established end. He makes

the important point that staff development should involve all those persons who make up the school - administrators, supervisors, teachers, support personnel and any others who work towards the accomplishment of the mission of the school they serve. According to Rogers (1983) staff development constitutes all those activities carried out by the school to promote staff growth and renewal. Guthrie and Reed (1986) support this view and add that staff development may be defined as a formal, systematic programme designed to foster personal and professional growth. What is important is that all the writers on the subject are agreed that staff development is a continuous process of adjusting, improving and keeping professionally sound.

Morant's comment (1981): "As the institutional requirements of the school determine the reference points for staff development, the teachers should assume collective responsibility for analysing professional needs..." appropriately sums up what this report defines as school-focussed staff development. The following, advanced by Morant (1981) are necessary features of school-focussed staff development which this report deems as important:

- it should be intended for teachers actually serving at the school.
- it should be initiated and planned by members of the school staff.
- it should be led and executed by members of the school staff.
- it should utilise the school's physical resources.
- it should take place on the school premises.

Whilst this may be considered a very strict definition, it does have key ingredients which are important to school-focussed staff development. To conclude "...all staff development activities are integrally

linked to school goals, to individual staff performance goals, and to the learning process" (Snyder, K and Anderson, R:1986). This report examined a particular school to determine what school-focussed staff development programmes were in place and the impact this had on school achievement and development.

### **1.7 Limitations of the Study**

While descriptive and exploratory by intention, this report seeks to highlight pertinent issues relating to staff development by drawing from the literature on the subject, as well as from empirical evidence tested within an organisation. Since this is a case study, findings and conclusions should be judged from this perspective. The advantage of this is that it is reality based and directed at uncovering the need for school-focussed staff development programmes within the wider context of the school. Although only a few weeks were available to conduct school visits and administer the questionnaire, and even less time for discussions with staff and observation, the advantage of and scope for an effective staff development programme was conclusively borne out by the findings of this research report.

What emerged is not meant as prescriptive indicators, but is there to highlight the ongoing process by reconciling theory and practice. Neither does this report purport to present a blueprint for effective staff development nor does it claim to have uncovered what is true and workable for all schools. It merely points the way for further research and exploration by concentrating on key issues that are prevalent in many schools and which can be exploited in the interest of education. It is hoped that this would spark within schools, enquiry into staff development programmes as this study, though

supported by theory, is steeped in the reality of present day South Africa.

### 1.8 Rationale

In South Africa research on staff development, and in particular, school-focussed staff development has been wanting. The absence of a uniformly structured or process-driven staff development programme has forced many schools to neglect this aspect completely. For teachers the idea of greater control over their own programme of activities is essential especially at a time when experimentation and restructuring are prevalent. Conceptually, there has also been a marked shift in perceiving staff development as being mainly an *external* course activity which schools were forced to participate in. The ownership by schools to design, draft, implement and evaluate development programmes is gaining more support. "Teachers are better motivated if they take part in the decision-making in the school; they acquire a sense of ownership; the running of the school becomes smoother, more effective, even excellent" (Duttweiler 1986:373). The idea of pro-activity is central to this concern. Covey's (1992:70-71) ideas of pro-activity place the power for change in the hands of all concerned with that change, rather than in the hands of a few 'experts'. His paradigm debate is that within the old paradigm, people were mere recipients of stimulus, and a shift to a new paradigm would mean that within the parameters of stimulus and response people have the freedom to choose.

This report aimed to clarify issues such as the meaning of staff development, collaborative staff performance, the process of innovation, policy making and resistance to change. It is hoped that most of the ideas, lessons and experiences gleaned are applicable and transferable to different school

contexts and that insights into specific innovations and developmental initiatives may help to encourage internal functioning groups within schools to establish their own staff development policies.

“As the institutional requirements of the school determine points for staff development, the teachers should assume collective responsibility for analysing professional needs.”  
(Morant: 1981).

While the intention was not to capture staff development in its entirety, or to represent an entire system in the country, the report does highlight current issues which contribute to the reconstruction of staff development in South African schools. Since the context is a rapidly changing one, the research design attempted to reflect this, by a process of monitoring and evaluating the perceptions of learners and teachers regarding staff development. This study hopes to answer the following critical questions:

- Is a staff development programme essential to whole school development and performance?
- What can schools do to enhance their self image?
- What staff development processes were set up within the case study school to advance a school-focussed development plan?
- What are the challenges that lie ahead for South African schools?

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

When the pressure on schools regarding the curriculum, accountability, management, ownership and financial control becomes overburdening, "the need for a well thought out system for staff development is becoming recognized as of central importance" (Bradley 1991:2). What divides people on their attitude to staff development is the view they take on change. Two models of change are posited by Bradley (1991:3,4):

Firstly the 'Road to Damascus' model assumes that "what we do gradually becomes less appropriate as the world outside the school changes." In this model, so as to obviate the declining relevance of our action, a dramatic response is provoked, usually from outside the school. This forces a radical change within the institution, which is of a temporary nature and the 'gradual decline' of development is resumed. What happens in this model is that staff development

"is concentrated in periods of dramatic change. Its goal is to help staff come to terms with the need for revolution and with the demands which the change will make upon teaching. Individual objectives and the methods by which they are approached will often be decided outside the school and the teachers are cast as passive recipients of the process" (Bradley 1991:3).

The second model of change adopts a policy of continuous improvement and assumes that change takes place through a multitude of small steps, forwards and backwards. Through careful monitoring and evaluation, backward steps are identified quickly and countermeasures taken. Here there will never be a dramatic collapse, because teachers are always monitoring and always in control. This

model relies heavily upon the quality of the monitoring process and also makes substantial demands upon the professionalism of the teachers themselves (Bradley 1991:4). It can be seen that for this model to be successful, teachers must be competent in such tasks as monitoring, decision making and skills in data collection so as to be aware of movements outside and of the impact that their work has upon those in their charge. From these two models, it is evident that because of the emphasis on teacher perceptions, staff development has to take different forms. The goals of staff development in these two cases are entirely different. This means that staff development activities may also differ.

Much of the current literature on staff development supports the need to take a more holistic approach to school improvement and teacher development. "But innovations, including a more democratic model for INSET, should be seen as the starting point and catalyst for change and not something that can be implemented overnight" (Bradley, Conner and Southworth 1994:9). They further contend that "INSET is done *with* not *to* teachers and school-staff-individual development should be seen as complementary strands." With greater emphasis placed on professional development as a process and set in the context of institutional development, the broader concept of staff development has had to shift from 'bolt on' and 'ad hoc' to a task which is as essential for the schools as the education of children (1991:10).

Staff development and instructional improvement are interactive processes and not a schedule, a day so-assigned, or non-personalised intervention. The process should be a blend of personal involvement and organisational definition. To this end, either a highly 'systems' approach or a more developmental process is used. This research favoured the latter. Such an approach, in my opinion, maximises trust

and communication, minimises personal risk-taking by emphasising goal clarification and sharing and is able to use outside interventions and training as guides. Such an approach is open to clarification and feedback both from within and without. The result is a decentralisation of decision making through collaboration, (albeit school based), consensus, and role clarification. Within this, analysis and evaluation are approached as broadly-shared processes, with self-corrective mechanisms and interactions.

This research supports any theory which favours the view that staff development has to be determined and should take place internally. The school has to take ownership of the process to determine its needs and not rely on an externally imposed system. This does not mean that external assistance is not welcome. It's just that school-driven impetus helps to institutionalise more democratic, transparent and consensus-seeking participation amongst all staff. This is only possible if the organisational culture of the school does not militate against such initiatives as interaction, and collective determination of staff development and contextual needs, and the methods by which these can be realised.

Critical engagement with a variety of models and theories has shown that nothing is categoric. However, to inform the conclusions of this study I have had to consider the limitations existent within this framework. My concurrence and disagreement alike with aspects within the literature review has helped me to engage constructively with theories on school organisation. The organisation of schools favoured broadly three basic models, namely the bureaucratic model, the 'open systems' model and the model that saw schools as 'total' organisations. Most state schools under the previous

departments of education were structured according to the bureaucratic model, which leant on an administrative hierarchy with a command structure where the principal was the supreme and unquestioning authority in the school. He controlled the entire administration and management of school organisation assisted by the deputy head and secretary. Information was generally disseminated to staff members on a 'need to know' basis. This top-down approach was based on seniority, qualifications and personality. Learners were at the bottom of the command structure without a voice.

The problem with such a model, apart from its over-pedantic emphasis, is demonstrated by Burgess (1986:157) who maintains that many sociologists have observed that often there is a "mismatch" between the hierarchical position and the incumbent. This meant that a school principal could be a person who was weak and incompetent and therefore incapable of wielding the kind of authority his position demanded, resulting in organisational confusion which affected the entire school. Another problem which was endemic in schools was that the over-bureaucratic emphasis with its myriad of forms 'in duplicate' and 'in triplicate' according to prescribed rules, destroyed the autonomy of teachers. Thirdly, personal initiative and experimentation was generally frowned upon. Most importantly, this system bred a 'culture' within schools where parents, learners and teachers were generally terrified of approaching the principal's office because of a "coldness" encountered there.

The 'open system' model was characterised by a certain "looseness" in the manner in which schools were organised. Here the relationship between the school and the society it served was equally important as its internal organisation, and interaction between groups was based on "bargaining" and "negotiation". The limitation of this model was that the school was only the formal sector of the

educative process while the informal and non-formal sectors played just as important a part in moulding children.

The school as a 'total' institution meant that the institution had an independent existence with minimal contact and interaction with its larger community, and as such it was self sufficient. However, this was a "negative" and "protected" form of self sufficiency which, in the long run was bad for the image of the school. The fact that in such a model schools existed in isolation and enjoyed limited autonomy from an educational perspective made this model non-feasible.

Each of these models do have very positive aspects which can be utilised in advocating a very 'workable' system. For example, from the bureaucratic model we can adopt the need to keep accurate records and 'paperwork' though not to the extent of being over bureaucratic. A positive aspect of the "open" model is that it helps to define the parameters within which groups function and explore "the ways in which boundaries are created, developed, sustained and changed within the school, with special reference to the management of authority" (Burgess 1986:162). One advantage of the "total" institution model is that all members are treated alike and each carries out similar daily activities in the company of others. These activities are highly programmed and co-ordinated allowing the institution to realise its aims.

The models referred to are generally not applicable individually or in totality. Positive aspects from each could be used towards a more workable and democratic model. Perhaps the closest we can get to the ideal is the 'Temporary Systems Model' (TSM), which falls under the broad Transaction Model

Framework. Any staff development initiative has to rely on an evaluation model, and schools need to understand that by carefully aligning themselves to a particular model based on specific demands, one can "attain a high probability that the evaluation components will be convergent with training components" (Orlich 1989:70). To this end the evaluative model that best suits the aims of this research is the Temporary Systems Model (TSM).

The advantage of the TSM is that informality becomes the norm and staff are encouraged to explore, discuss and react without inhibitions. This has the added advantage of immediate feedback. According to Hannaford and Orlich (in Orlich 1989: 65 ) four elements of the TSM are important in conducting staff development projects: goals, design, climate, and staff utilisation. Hannaford and Orlich (in Orlich 1989:65) continue: "The Temporary Systems approach combines elements of the decision-making model, but the emphasis is on process." Within a permanent system, the establishment of temporary systems means that "...workshops, conferences, clinics, seminars, and training sessions are all part of the typical educator's yearly repertoire of activities" (Orlich 1989:63).

A school policy is needed to establish staff development as an ongoing priority. Much of the literature on staff development is based on input-output models applied to in-service and external staff development programmes. However the literature is limited in the application of such practices at the school level. Eric Hewton, describing a pilot project on school-focussed staff development, in his book *School Focussed Staff Development*, realised that while the concept was a complex one, it was necessary for school achievement and development. Researching the enhancement of a staff development programme at school level, his enquiry was riddled with a number of questions: What

is a policy and what should it contain? How wide a range of activities should a school be responsible for under its own policy? How should schemes be introduced in schools? How should needs for staff development be ascertained? What role should the County play in encouraging staff development? (Hewton, 1988:ix). In the course of this report these questions will be examined.

Collaboration at all levels is an important ingredient for staff development. Bradley, Conner and Southworth (1994:15), discussing the situation in the UK, mention that "professional collaboration has begun to develop at a number of levels and there is evidence of a move towards a more coherent approach to planning for school and staff development which actively involves teachers." This further emphasises the correlation between school development and teacher development. What form teacher development takes if it is to play a part in school development will be examined later. Much of the literature on staff development supports the idea that teachers' experiences could be enhanced by 'reflection', which is important in contributing to changes in practice and thinking. Williams (1991) endorses this viewpoint and argues that current in-service provision is largely inadequate because of its "lack of a reflective emphasis":

"It is concerned more with a basic level of coping than with a more mature, reflective stance. As such it is episodic in character, lacking any sequential structure or provision for incremental growth. It ignores arguments for progression, balance, depth, breadth and differentiation in continuing professional development of teachers ... Teachers are having their needs defined for them, not by them. These needs are rarely located in any professional development structure that has been negotiated by teachers..." (Bradley, Conner and Southworth 1994:52).

This research stresses the importance for professional self actualisation through individual introspection and enhancement strategies that teachers have to plan and initiate themselves. This theme permeates this study and all else has to be viewed against this background.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

There is an urgent need for schools to document their own staff development policies and design programmes in a meaningful and systematic manner so as to meet identifiable needs. Staff development must be viewed as a positive step towards greater professional autonomy; not as a management strategy to increase control and accountability, but as an instrument that enhances teacher performance and subsequent school achievement.

The literature review focusses on broad areas relating to staff development and school achievement. An examination of tentative working models was done within the theoretical framework as a way of interpreting the topic, with special emphasis on the relationship between school human resource development and school achievement. This was used to foreground the relevance of such models in staff development practices. Since much of the literature on staff development supports a holistic approach to school development, espoused theories relating to school policies and collaboration at all levels was the focus of this enquiry. Next the background to contemporary developments in the field of staff development was highlighted, with particular focus on the barriers to learning and development. The next section examined the implications for staff development as a precedent for change, and identified the professional challenge of schools and the need for change. This culminated in an examination of the inadequate and fragmented initiatives in human resource development and the view that institutions had to change. The research then tackled the issue of staff development

policy, collaborative interaction and the identification of development needs. With this in mind, the needs of both the organisation and the individual were examined, and also the tensions between them. This lead on to an understudy of the challenges facing our schools, together with an examination of the correlation between staff development and school achievement. Lastly, the question of evaluation, appraisal and the way forward was explored. The case study considered the planning arrangements for staff development within a school by exploring the perceptions of teachers regarding prevalent staff development initiatives. At the heart of staff development planning is the identification of training needs for individual teachers and functional groups in the school. The focus then turned to translating the proposals of a needs-based model of staff development into practice by appropriate implementation strategies. Finally the role of the reflective practitioner was examined and this highlighted need for teachers to introspect on personal enhancement.

### **3.2 Staff Development and School Achievement**

Research in this area has been wanting and staff development, as a process within schools, has been lacking significantly. Bradley (1991:1) on staff development, contends that

“...Where it has taken place it has often done so almost accidentally as a result of the persistence and determination of individual teachers or through the vision of a particular head teacher. There have been few examples until recently, of sustained, coherent and comprehensive programmes for staff development.”

The South African experience reflects that staff development has been largely unpractised as has been the case in UK, where in the 1980s, attention to INSET “.. has been largely unresearched, being more the subject for recommendation and pragmatic action than the target for incremental and

large-scale, heavily funded studies" (Williams 1991). More attention has to be paid to staff development at school level to ensure progression, differentiation, coherence and relevance to the continuing professional development of teachers.

"Without this sustained developmental professional view, the arrangements made for INSET will always appear to be *ad hoc* and reactive to the whims of the policy-makers, and the needs of teachers for continuing professional development will be relatively neglected" (Williams 1991).

There is strong support for the proposition that within a school, the teacher's job of guiding pupils' learning is a creative activity. This supports the belief that change takes place most effectively in a school when the teachers feel they have control over that process. This stems from the understanding that the development of a school and the development of its staff are related and mutually dependent. Schools have shown a remarkable inability to implement and maintain improved ways of teaching and to create productive learning environments for all learners. This was due to a number of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Reviewing school change and improvement, Wideen & Andrews (1987) maintain that "the emphasis in school improvement appears to be shifting to the people most centrally involved in that process, teachers." Bradley (1991) further contends

"... we not only recognise the centrality of the teacher in school improvement, but also the important role that staff development plays in that process. We have to concede that to accept and manage change we have to begin by changing ourselves. If this is the case, we must conclude that change has to be managed and that the implementation of change is a management problem as well as one for the individual."

Bishop has indicated, in effect that staff development is a complicated process occurring differently within different contexts. "Staff Development and in-service education bear the brunt for continuity in program quality, for responsiveness to educational needs, for the initiation of programs for change,

and for the opportunity for individuals to engage in self examination and renewal" (Bishop 1976:1). Focus must therefore be upon professionalism and the need for change and renewal. Staff development has personal, role, and institutional dimensions, all of which are critical to effective functioning, and the emphasis should be, as Nelson (1957) says, on

"those attitudes, competencies, and knowledges that enhance learning, program effectiveness, and professional adequacy. These are related to systematic efforts to improve the conditions, objectives, resources, and processes that are the responsibility of the school district."

### **3.3 Staff Development Policy: the Need for Change**

Staff development needs to be contextualised so that serious consideration is given to some of the basic propositions and approaches that can help improve school achievement and development. The best catalyst for this is a relevant, need-orientated, well conceived and organised instructional improvement programme. To this must be added the importance of personal involvement, consensus, and commitment (Bishop 1976). Regarding staff development the following should be considered: if the impact of staff development is to be examined, a balance must be sought between the form of training or development and the benefit to the individual and organisation. Bell (in Bell and Day 1991) talks of "...the appropriate relationship between need, choice and provision" being central to effective staff development planning. Training can be regarded as "developmental...only if it then enabled a teacher to make a planned contribution to the work of the school..." (Bell in Bell and Day 1991:3). What Bell (in Bell and Day 1991) describes as 'the individualistic approach' to staff development often results in a dilute relationship between course content and school development need. Individualistic training, subject-specific courses, the pursuit of higher knowledge then become

intrinsically peripheral to the work of the organisation.

This may be accounted for in many of our schools by the non-existence of evaluation criteria follow-up. Course participants risk the training being "...much less structured than, for example, the training of medical doctors, partly because the disaster criteria for school staff are not so instantly recognisable as they are in the hospital.." (Bell in Bell and Day 199:6). The lack of overall direction and planning is observable from the random nature of the selection of staff development initiatives. This reactive stance is consistent with waiting for things to happen, rather than planning to make things happen. In extreme circumstances, this results in managing crises only.

This is the feature of an organisation structured to manage the status quo, and corroborates my recommendation for transition to an organic organisational structure. When change is sought in such an organisation, it is born of a summative, once-and-for-all conception of development: training for a function, which when internalised, is reabsorbed to form part of the whole status quo. In contrast, a pro-active stance on the issue of change favours the development of a flexible, organic organisation which exists both to thrive in the here and now and to change and adapt to its future. It looks to itself rather than to the outside world for the motor which drives its survival.

The major thrust should be to make the best use of available resources in order to improve and maintain standards in education, and to see the teaching team as a major single determinant of the quality of education. For effective management of this team, accurate knowledge of teacher performance is needed: knowledge based on assessment. Therefore attempts to develop a culture for

change within institutions also entails recognising and bringing into the open the plurality of values and attitudes among its members and the wider community associated with the organisation. In this way conflicts, differences and problems are handled so as to promote institutional culture and climate.

As Torrington and Weightman (1989:152) point out:

“Whenever we interact with our colleagues in informal as well as formal situations, there can be positive or negative results in terms of the effect on the climate of the school. Clearly, cultural factors is one of the key issues in management change with a developing school. This highlights the fact that cultural variables interact closely with other organisational factors.”

In this type of organisation, Stenhouse (1975:172) maintains that “the tendency is to seek a change of organisation which institutionalises innovation in the school and opens the way to a continuous programme of betterment, rather than a leap at a sudden and radical solution to problems.” The educational environment of the past was one in which the control of staff development and school development was instrumental in underpinning policies of social engineering and racial discrimination which stunted moral and intellectual growth. A significant number of teachers have been subjected to this, and a move away from this favours the concept of an organic organisation with collaborative practices. This will be discussed later.

In order to encourage transformation of such acquired attitudes, there needs to be constant questioning, self-examination, and an internalised pursuit of systematic development. My contention is that the organisational view of professionals as almost immutable mechanisms for mass production of educated children should be discouraged. We should embrace change and prepare ourselves for the process of continuous renewal.

"A completely new approach is needed to in-service education or teacher development which is linked to the concept of *whole-school review*, to career paths and to the continuous challenges of educational transformation" (Education Department, African National Congress, January 1994:54).

Change is dynamic and so staff and school development are inextricably linked to their wider context. This interrelationship is explained by Thomas (in Bell and Day, 1991: 126) who says, "We are dealing with evolutionary processes: on the one hand with changing educational demands and on the other with the adaptability of the individuals who have to carry out the work to be done" School development must encompass staff development. This implies

"the need to devise processes for professional development which will attempt to secure the professional growth of the teacher while improving the performance of both teachers and schools" (Bell in Bell and Day, 1991:4).

Change involves the organisation and structure of schools and the informal cultural world of staff relationships, expectations and feelings. Such change occurs most satisfactorily when it is based upon school-focussed review or appraisal, as the remediation of any school problem is then related directly to its identification, and dissatisfaction with any aspect of school organisation, revealed by the review process then becomes the motivator for the change process. Therefore change must be evaluated against its impact upon the organisation of the school and its effects upon 'outcomes'. This data is essential to feed back to the participants in the change programme, so as to generate reinforcement of the change programme and to show areas where new revised change attempts are needed.

Both the individual and the organisation should share in the responsibility of staff development, and so all related personnel should be included. Every individual has the obligation to engage in

improvement programmes and staff development activities which range widely from ad hoc and individual involvement to highly organised and large group activities. Bishop (1976:15) contends:

“If staff development is to be vital to quality education, increased attention must be given to its relationship to program adoption and implementation. These should be processes by which needs become objectives and objectives become programs, facilitating the growth of those charged with meeting the various responsibilities and the learners for whom they are responsible.”

The South African experience has shown that staff development or INSET has not arisen out of the context of a cohesive plan, pre-establishing procedures for evaluation. Courses for individuals have been facilitated ‘at a whim’ in most cases, without regard for participants possibly experiencing “...problems of match, relevance and transfer and application of learning to their worksettings...” (Bell in Bell and Day 1991:3). Training often took place only when the Department fancied that certain ‘remedial’ measures were necessary. Most INSET was summative in character, consistent with the assertion that “...most INSET is not designed to provide the on-going, cumulative learning necessary to develop new concepts, skills and behaviours...” (Andrews in Bell and Day 1991:62). It must be borne in mind that this was globally recognised as well.

My contention is that staff development should be a formative process, complementary to and instrumental in school development. The suggestion is also that staff and school development must be responsive to the context of the school - to its community and stakeholders. In a number of South Africa schools the adoption of this stance is slowly transforming their culture. I next turned to the question of the establishment of integrated staff and school development policies.

### 3.4 Developing a Staff Development Policy

The intrinsic value of any policy is that it provides guidelines for action. A staff development policy should relate to and reflect the goals and aims of the organisation in conjunction with the totality of other policies. In policy formulation, leadership must be sensitive to the needs of those affected by that policy. Thus, staff development, if it is to have validity, should involve all stakeholders. Leadership is equally responsible for ensuring the continued development of the school. A school development plan formulated through consultation relevant to school development needs should be dictated collectively by individual staff development needs and the school manager or management team.

A staff development policy must recognise the need to serve school development, and should be school-focussed. However, due consideration must be given to the enriching effect staff development may have upon the work of schools, by helping teachers to be professionally fulfilled: "...the interdependent relationship of the school and the teacher is crucial: a teacher cannot improve his or her performance consistently if the organization is in poor health, and the total functioning of the school rests on the sum of the individual teacher's contributions" (Bell in Bell and Day, 1991:4).

The way forward is obviously one of compromise in order to lessen tensions between conflicting needs. Regarding a school-focussed approach to staff development planning, Bell (in Bell and Day, 1991:11), explains: "Its emphasis was upon planning INSET activities in relation to specifically identified innovations, intended development, tasks and needs in a school." This implies advance planning of the direction the organisation should take. In devising a staff development policy every

attempt should be made to reconcile individual and organisational developmental needs. This is no mechanistic formula invented to serve a production-orientated industry. It is entirely appropriate in schools that a commitment should be made to learning at the levels of the organisation, its staff and its learners. Bell (in Bell and Day 1991:21) suggests, "Development through learning is central to the purposes of everything that is done in schools in the name of education. This must be as true of the teachers as it is of the pupils, and it must be true of the organisation itself." Articulation of that commitment, specification of its implementation, and description of the necessary compromises made together, form the purpose of a staff development policy.

Beyond commitment lies the integration of staff development into a planned development of the school. "To be effective, the professional development of teachers needs to be embedded in whole-school policy in a systematic way" (Bell in Bell and Day, 1991:12). Effectiveness is dependent on the constituency of the policy adopted among those who are to execute it, or to be affected by it. A whole-school approach is appropriate, as Thomas (in Bell and Day, 1991:125) advises: "All staff, governors and the LEA have a part to play in forming the plan." Schools in South Africa, need to focus on themselves and their esoteric conditions. The African National Congress Education Department (1994:22) makes the following point:

"Governance at all levels of the integrated national system of education and training will maximise democratic participation of stakeholders, including the broader community, and will be orientated towards equity, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, and sharing of responsibility."

There is a need for institutions to embrace collaborative management practices consistent with

educational management styles prevalent perhaps internationally. A school development plan should therefore recognise those factors affecting its development. Stakeholders should be collaboratively involved in staff development policy formulation so as to be able to answer the questions: "...Where are we now? Where should we be going? What must we do to get there?" (Thomas in Bell and Day, 1991:128).

Staff development policy, formulated in the light of the school development plan, must not anticipate the easy achievement of discrete solutions to discrete problems. Rather, it should commit the organisation and its members to continued improvement.

"If we attempt to improve the situation, we cannot expect to leap for a solution to the complex of educational problems: we can aim only to embark on a line of policy development which will give promise of a fairly long process of systematic and thoughtful improvement" (Stenhouse, 1975:125).

This will be no easy achievement. Woodward (in Bell and Day, 1991:118) warns: "This type of participation [collaborative management practices] also demands management and staff time to develop the bonds of trust necessary for them to work and agree to goals and decisions."

### **3.5 Collaborative School Interaction**

To approach staff development from a position of collaborative school interaction has advantages for learners, for the organisation, and for the staff. "It is based on a coherent set of policies for school improvement and it places the development of staff in the school at the centre of those policies, as a crucial element in providing an even more worthwhile education for the children in the school"

(Bell in Bell and Day, 1991:18). Trust, democracy, development of staff, agreed goals and decisions, and an improving education for children are worthy attributes of any school. To set about planning for staff development in this spirit is not only intrinsically valuable to our schools, but also reflects South African Government policy: "The support and professional development of teachers should be a central aim of the management system...Democracy and transparency shall underpin the management system" (Education Department, ANC Congress, 1994:54).

Democracy and collaboration add validity to policy formulation especially from the perspectives of all involved - staff, students, governors, local community and, by extension, the national community. Schools should begin to have in place structures and established practices which demonstrate a commitment to facilitate staff development. Contractual time has to be reserved for this, and members of staff need to collectively assist in staff development initiatives. Now is the ideal time to begin the systematic process of implementation in a more structured and *agreed policy-driven* manner. This will be elaborated on in Chapter Six, especially the area of collaborative school management which I perceive to be one of the most important aspects for effective staff development in any organisation.

### **3.6 Identifying Development Needs - the Tension Between Individual and Organisation**

Her Majesty's Inspectorate reported as follows on the findings of an enquiry into Local Authority Training Grants Scheme in the UK (HMI 1989, 3.24 in Bell and Day:139), which was intended to promote INSET generated by school-focussed needs analysis:

"...there was substantial evidence that through devolved budget, linked to an agreed institutional staff development plan, there was emerging a strong sense of ownership of the INSET by teachers, and a view that training was far more

relevant to issues associated with them and their school or college."

The implications of raised morale through INSET, and the resultant greater enthusiasm for implementation of its outcomes, are clear in this observation. School-focussed needs identification carried out collaboratively and in response to "issues associated with their school or college" appears to provide a neat solution to the problematic marriage of organisational needs to the interests of the individuals.

Julie Moore (in Bell and Day, 1991:82) supports the contention that "For (needs) identification to be successful, it has to be a whole-school process, with everyone making a contribution being involved in decision-making, planning and evaluating." One is obliged to question how realistic it is in practice, to expect staff opinion to be so mobilised behind the needs of the school, that school needs and those of the individual can be reconciled. Japanese industry attributes much of its success to the high degree of employee identification with the goals of organisations in that country - company loyalty. John Jackson (in Morgan 1989:174) reports "The *oneness* between labour and management is credited with making Nissan the third largest vehicle manufacturer in the world auto industry." All is not as it appears, however. He goes on (in Morgan, 1989:175) to warn: "Harmony and diligence at Nissan are the product of union and managerial policies that rear conformity, punish even the mildest dissent with wage discrimination and ostracism from the work group, and - in extreme cases - contribute to ruthless persecution and violence."

In advocating collaborative development planning, am I advocating the autocracy of organisational!

ethos? Will identification with organisational goals be real, or the cosmetic result of fear of intimidation? Clearly, these are questions which must be considered, and if possible, avoided. The central issue of democracy is not the collective expression of majority opinion. Rather, it is the respect for and protection of individual rights shared by all - rights to disagree, to be different, and to contribute in one's own way to the evolution of the organisation, whatever the level of agreement among other participants. What typifies task culture organisation, is that while there is unity in carrying out the work at hand, the value-free exchange of ideas, and the appreciation of individual autonomy within consensus-seeking processes, are indispensable in achieving collaboratively established targets. Day (in Bell and Day, 1991:139) corroborates this idea in relation to promoting staff development. His observations showed that schools displaying "...combined centralised-decentralised characteristics in their culture were most likely to satisfy successfully both organisational and individual development needs."

In practice, there will always be individual development needs which are tangential to school development issues. A solution is to reserve an agreed proportion of staff development resources so as to meet those needs, and this should be evaluated in the light of whole-school achievement. However, collaborative identification of development needs should aim at harnessing the thrust for individual development behind the agreed needs for school development. Real consensus, reached through real consultation, is the likely prerequisite of real identification with organisational development goals. It is interesting to question whether management at Nissan values this process, or one that is more subservient to a centrally generated policy.

This implies that goal identification should also be a formative process, as Helen Mc Mullen (in Bell and Day, 1991:164) insists. "...staff development must be more than the identification of in-service needs. It must be part of a process of review and development." This is an emotional exercise as much as it is a rational one. Staff are autonomous human beings, and management has the responsibility to respect the humanity of employees. Mc Mullan continues (Bell and Day, 1991:165): "Effective needs analysis requires more than the systematic collection of information. It involves careful negotiation, commitment from all parties and consensus where the views of individuals and groups do not coincide." The goals of staff development cannot be set in concrete. Teamwork and collaboration are essential: "The first objective is to create the circumstances where elected members (local government), chief officers, teachers and governors will have the ability to create a climate of ownership and hence participation in the management of schools." (Derek Esp in Bell and Day, 1991:179), considering the implications of Local Management of Schools for staff development. If management is to exercise control, consensus will prove a more powerful tool than threat. Wessner (in Morgan, 1989:172) comments:

"Another essential element in team building for management control is planning. To build teamwork through planning the company must involve employees in determining both the future of the organisation and what their individual role is in achieving that future."

The vision of leadership must relate centrally to the aspirations and interests of those it leads if the planning of staff development is to harness the motivation of those who experience it.

Let us return to the issue of staff development within our schools. I have argued that though staff and school development are interdependent, it is important to guard against suppression of individual needs by organisational needs. I have also suggested that the continued existence of the organisation depends exclusively on its ability to develop, and that when perceived by members of the organisation, is motivation enough for agreeing levels of consensus where individual and organisational development needs conflict.

In order to facilitate such consensus, it is not sufficient for the organisation merely to allow opportunities for comment on development matters. Disagreement, dissent and open discussion should be explicitly welcomed by any organisation committed to development. For, in a climate where autonomy is valued, questioning and self-examination form the very dynamic of development itself. Locally, there are pressures to implement the principles of democracy in the management of schools. I have attempted to show that this local pressure does not exist in isolation from current thinking about management principles elsewhere in the world and that it offers an opportunity for - rather than posing a threat to - school development. Having demonstrated its consequence and advantages for school and staff development, I am not advocating management by ballot, nor do I favour ideological tyranny as a means of galvanising support for organisational goals. Tichy and Ulrich (in Morgan 1989:164) warn that: "The long term challenge to organisational revitalisation is not how the visions are created but the extent to which the visions correctly respond to environmental pressures and transitions within the organisation."

To inhibit participation by individuals in the development process is to eradicate a vital element in the

formula for successful vision development that Tichy and Ulrich outline. "Coercion is a recipe for disaster. South Africans know this by bitter experience, and we ignore the lessons of our educational history at our peril" (Education Dept. ANC Congress, 1994:7). I have put forward a practical and realisable formula for school and staff development - one which is consistent with a deeply-felt outlook of a newly enfranchised people, which I think, with determined and committed leadership, could potentially engender changed attitudes towards schools, without compromising education standards. Important in this is the embodiment of respect for the democratic right of each individual to contribute in the workplace, to school and staff development policy formulation and planning. "The process of policy-making in education and training must therefore be as open and participatory as possible. Policy-makers need to practise the arts of consultation, listening, reasoning and persuasion, as well as offering vision and leadership" (Ed. Dept., ANC Congress, 1994:7, 8). Given the development outlook I described, and close identification with broad national educational management guidelines, schools would be able to contribute more to the communities they serve.

### **3.7 The Challenge Facing Our Schools**

If continued autonomy becomes the norm, how should we proceed in practical terms to carry out staff development within schools? It is crucial for institutions to look at their needs in the broader context of the community. As Thomas (in Bell and Day, 1991:125) puts it: "The job to be done, and the ways in which it should change irrespective of who is doing it, has to be thought of in terms of the institution concerned and in relation to the education system as a whole." If we function in isolation (as many schools still do by choice), it is difficult to see how learners would benefit from the local environment, and from the community they serve. Thomas, citing the British experience (in Bell and

Day, 1991:130) describes the educational danger of isolation:

“...is the LEA with its broader view aware of the needs that are not apparent within a single school, such as multi-cultured education in mono-cultural schools, whether predominantly white or predominantly black, predominantly working class or predominantly middle class, predominantly urban or predominantly rural?”

Clearly we too must ensure that autonomy does not imply being excised from our context in terms of the ‘total institution model’ referred to earlier. Genuine responsiveness to community reality is essential in planning staff and school development. The community is indispensable in policy formulation. Derek Esp (in Bell and Day, 1991:179) encapsulates it as follows:

“The school will have to establish a school development plan which incorporates the development of curriculum content; teaching and learning strategies; the training and development of staff governors and marketing plans, including positive dialogue with local community interests and parents.”

This is important in changing past perceptions and helps in the continuing development of institutions by enhancing the educational process. Helen Mc Mullen says, “In my view, the school needs to ensure that staff development does not take place by chance, but with an ethos/climate in which professionals collaborate to solve problems of improving the learning that the school enables the pupils to undertake” (Helen Mc Mullen in Bell and Day, 1991:174/175).

The challenge really lies, too in the idea of

“... a market-orientated culture for schools whereby clients (parents) are empowered (via governors, open enrolment, published assessment scores and the possibility of opting out of local authority control) to choose which schools to support, and whereby schools are compelled to compete with each

other for their clients and thus, in theory, to raise their teaching and learning standards by using their financial, human and physical resources cost-effectively" (Bolan in Bell and Day 1991:138).

Here the morality of placing schools in competition with each other is progressive, if autonomy and competition does not imply schools becoming elitist and hence isolated from both the local and broader context.

### **3.8 Evaluation**

The idea of evaluation and appraisal is central to any staff development initiative. Assuming that individual and school development needs do combine to provide a thrust for organisational growth, it becomes necessary to examine how this impetus can be nurtured. A formative approach to staff development is the only way systematic growth can be achieved. Thomas (in Bell and Day 1991:136) comments: "Nor is any staff development programme the last word. The results must be fed back into the discussion of what to do next." Planning and integration are for any school the starting point of a development spiral, representing what Bell (in Bell and Day 1991:4) terms: "... a deliberate and continuous process.." of development. This is an important element in the staff development process and should identify staff needs by considering both long and short term objectives. Fitch and Kopp (1990:43) testify "If the planning phase of in-service education is being painstakingly implemented, meaningful learning will become a reality."

Measuring improvement and establishing the level to which school and staff development targets are

achieved is central to the progress of any institution. Targets set must have a time frame so that effective review of successes can precede future planning. Professor A.V. Kelly (1986:215) puts this strongly "Furthermore, without some kind of evaluation, it is difficult to see what basis might exist for any real development of the curriculum or of the teachers themselves. For a prerequisite of improvement must be some evaluation of previous performance." Such evaluation should be twofold - of school development, and of staff development. With the former, programme teams conduct programme evaluation within an agreed framework, which is considered for the overall evaluation of school development. This requires sensitive and thoughtful management to ensure that a contribution is made at all. It would also require engendering a holistic view of the work of the school on the part of individuals, who should be encouraged to look outside their job boxes, and participate in the entirety of school development.

While the issue of appraisal, and evaluation is a thorny one, for staff development review, I see no alternative. The aim is to establish what progress has been made at the individual and whole-staff level, and gain insight into what steps should be taken. Is appraisal, however, for accountability (a performance indicator of professional effectiveness, measured against a job description), or is it for development (a means of establishing individual and school development needs)? I believe that teachers should be accountable individually and collectively for the quality of their work, and that it is professional for them to co-operate in meeting set requirements.

Evaluation of school and staff development cannot be conducted in isolation, one from the other. Appraisal is pivotal in drawing together information that needs to be reviewed collaboratively and

synthesised to form a springboard for development planning. Appraisal and whole-school evaluation are components of the same improvement process, and should be carried out against a yardstick of realistic expectation, expressed in terms of agreed criteria.

### **3.9 Developmental Appraisal for Educators (DAE)**

Stenhouse (1975:83) states: "... the best means of development is not by clarifying means but criticising practice." A stance of reflectivity is required of teachers who should endeavour to apply the educational principles which inform practice, and operate as far as possible an attitude of value neutrality in making choices, whilst freely and explicitly acknowledging the inevitable influence their own values have upon their judgement. Education needs to adapt to change. Aims, principles and processes may need to be altered when new issues pertaining to morality, value systems, technologies and ethical challenges arise. Staff appraisal should in turn adapt to such change correspondingly. The new Developmental Appraisal for Educators (DAE) is the latest initiative by the National Department of Education to address this very aspect. It seems to be an attempt in the right direction, and as an appraisal instrument, it does not purport to be grounded in an extrinsic ideology there to become absolute. Change determines the direction future appraisal instruments should take.

The DAE initiative is important in that individual growth (of staff) is its prescribed goal, and as an intrinsically valuable process, is there to focus on the teachers' ability to enhance themselves, by thinking, making judgements and recognising the fact that most crucial in their educational makeup is the need for them to develop professionally *for themselves*. This places the responsibility upon

teachers to question continually and rigorously their personal enhancement. This is an appropriate stimulus for professional development, and affects the needs of both individuals and schools. The real need is a systematic programme of training in skills, knowledge, capacities and values which could help teachers grow and question their adaptability to changes in educational requirements. The fear that the DAE will lead to dismantling rather than development is unfounded. Such fears are to be expected when people feel secure with things as they are, and so approach any new initiative with caution, suspicion and scepticism. Given the relatively contented state of affairs in certain schools, DAE appears threatening in its attempts to build into education guiding principles, which in the past were vehemently opposed.

The advantage of the new DAE is all the more attractive as its objectives are organised to meet the individual needs of teachers. It thus sets out to do one thing: develop the individual. In evaluating teachers, DAE supports continuous experiential and active learning and assesses teachers not by looking at sets of test results or examination passes to ascertain the quality and success of teachers' work, but by encouraging greater autonomy, balance and the opportunity. It encourages personal independence and freedom to enhance personal initiative. This sort of development is aptly summed up by Kelly (1989:93) who sees the individual teacher as "an active being, who is entitled to have control over his or her destiny, and consequently sees education as a process by which the degree of such control available to each individual can be maximised."

Most importantly, it

"seeks to build on the strengths that educators have. Using what positively exists in educators' performance, the

'developmental approach' attempts to erode the negative aspects of an educator's performance by providing ways in which such negative aspects may be responded to in a 'developmental' way on the basis of strengths that exist. In this process, the 'developmental approach' ensures that the person being 'appraised' is part of the 'appraisal' process, and that the person is able to contribute to decisions about the person's performance and ways in which it may be improved" (Developmental Appraisal for Educators: ELRA: 1999)

Thomas (in Bell and Day 1991:125) highlights certain pitfalls to be avoided when considering this:

"...to assume that the [evaluation] process must and should be conducted by a selected individual or team sitting in detached judgement on others, is to conceive of the process as one of comparing the functioning of a real teacher to suppose that the evaluation of one teacher's development can be conducted in total isolation from that of others." He concludes: "In practice, one teacher's work may have to be shaped and shape what others in the staff team do." Evaluation, then, should be carried out against a yardstick of realistic expectations, expressed in terms of agreed criteria. This could pose a threat if it does not determine the degree to which goals and objectives of a specific development programme are not being met. For the individual effort, enhancement and the collective imperative of the organisation becomes the end goal. Bauman (1992:2) maintains that:

"Individuals can only develop complete selves to the degree that they are able to assume the attitude of the social group, of which they are members with regard to the organised activities of the group, and can construct their own action in relation to it."

Most importantly, the rigorous application of the principle of evaluation facilitates the transition from role and club culture to the organic, dynamic and essentially developmental organisational culture. This incorporates all the arrangements made for regulating interaction between groups and

individuals, defining their role-function, and allowing for continued development. Since the social organisation of schools are different, various criteria which help to promote their continuity and survival operate differently too. Since there isn't a 'theory of schools' as such, Burgess (1986:176), quotes Tyler (1982) on such a theory as stating that it

"depends on the recognition, not just of the uniqueness of the school as a subject of study, but of the deep inter-connections by which it coheres, evolves and endures. The school's technologies and structures, rituals and rules can only be appreciated properly as a complex pattern of interdependencies whose outlines are at present only barely discernible."

Chris Day (in Bell and Day 1991:153) notes that individuals in this task culture enjoy a "feeling of *having a say*, of opinions being valued, and of the locus for need identification having moved closer to the source of the action." The idea of a cultural transformation is not untried or experimental. The majority of government schools in the UK for example, have been involved in similar processes, some as pilot schools as early as the late eighties. Derek Esp (in Bell and Day 1991:182) points out that: "Behind the Education Reform Act and its recommendations is the model of the private school..." The act envisaged that free market forces applied to schools would provide the thrust to strive for better education at the institutional level. The impact that this had on school-focussed staff development was that individuals within schools bought into processes of policy formulation, staff participation and collaborative planning which stimulated new and varied staff development programmes.

The idea of learners benefiting from an unchanging, tried and tested (if somewhat unstimulating) product, than being subjected to a continuum of change, is taken up by Stenhouse(1975:125) who

says: "They would argue that ...we are experimenting with pupils and putting their education at risk. This view seems to me to be misjudged ... shortcomings do not seem to have been defined and tackled in ways which lead to a continuous process of betterment." If we view education as some kind of commercial product of which children are consumers, are we then not obliged as manufacturers to give them the benefits of product development? Is it realistic to think that product development can be achieved with validity outside the market place?

### **3.10 The Reflective Practitioner**

The idea of the 'reflective practitioner' describes teachers who develop through analysing their practice in order to make better sense of teaching and learning. (Bradley, Conner and Southworth 1994:81). The reflective practitioner within the educational context is one who "extracts meanings and understandings as they teach and as they examine others' teaching." This would "involve a process of classroom evaluation... The role of staff development becomes one of enabling teachers to establish this as a continual process." The role of the reflective practitioner is important to this research, as staff development is seen as a key to achieving changes in practice. The shift towards perceiving teachers as "reflective professionals who construct meanings" (Clark, 1986; Schon 1983), means that the function of 'reflection' is to help teachers become aware of their personal theories, and if necessary, to reconstruct them.

To approach staff development by facilitating reflective practice helps to bridge the gap between development and practice. The justification of this approach is what the literature on staff development has made clear: that this approach has contributed to changes in practice by

"encouraging schools to identify their needs by refining or modifying these through negotiation, recognising current expertise and experience, acknowledging the culture of the school and providing a flexible range of approaches to support" (Bradley, Conner and Southworth 1994:92). This supports the view that staff development and school development are interactive in nature and can only be understood within the context in which they occur. When staff and institutional development are linked within a collaborative framework, new ways of tackling old problems may occur which enhance any problem-solving initiative. Loucks-Horsley and colleagues (1987) point out that "staff development experiences should build upon collegiality, collaboration, discovery and solving real problems." In keeping with this, reflective teaching ensures that a teacher's attention is focussed both inwardly at his own practice and outwardly at the conditions within the organisation. The concern is then on how teachers' actions maintain and/or disrupt the status quo of schooling and education. The tradition of reflective teaching can then be used to interpret teacher education reform and modes of existing practice.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

The principal methods of data gathering were the semi-structured interviews, the administering of a questionnaire and general school observation. The questionnaire involved all teachers including senior management and the principal, while the interviews involved the Principal, the management team and randomly selected teachers. This was followed up by general observation.

On each of my three visits to the school, I focussed on a particular aspect. During the first visit, I concentrated on the questionnaire. This aspect took five days. The next visit dealt with the semi-structured interviews, which took a week to complete. The third and final visit focussed on general school observation and participation, and took a week. This gave me the chance to understand the mechanics of the staff development processes within the school, and triangulate with the perceptions of staff and the practice as it stood.

This chapter presents the methodology used to collect data relating to staff development and documents the perceptions of various staff members regarding school-focussed staff development.

Data was collected to examine the following research questions:

- (i) Is there a need for staff development programmes at school level in a dynamic democracy?
- (ii) How can current research on staff development activities be applied to the school situation?

- (iii) What effects can a well-developed staff development programme have on general school development?
- (iv) What are teachers' attitudes regarding school focussed staff development?
- (v) How can staff development assist in professional growth?

Questions (i) and (ii) have been dealt with in Chapters 1 and 2 which describe staff development programmes from the perspective of research findings on the subject. Question (iii) is dealt with in Chapter 3. Question (iv) and (v) are dealt with in Chapters 4 and 5 which display and analyse data collected from the questionnaire designed to elicit teacher perceptions and teacher attitudes to staff development activities.

#### **4.2 Research Approach**

The nature and complexity of the focus necessitated a qualitative enquiry to examine current trends and debates on staff development and school development. Thereafter, a case study approach seemed an appropriate way of generating information for several reasons: it allowed the nature of the subject to shape the methodology and instrument choice so that in-depth investigation into specific issues could be done. It was suitable for deriving qualitative information which was based on feelings and opinions.

One school with proven staff development success through the years was the case study. The study involved analysis, conceptualisation of problems, synthesis of data, and the postulation of a range of possible solutions to the problems identified. For as Hopkins (1989:160) states, a case study can be : "...theory building..." which "...tries to support a particular theoretical position."

Since the research was concerned with interpretation, meaning and illumination, and that within the study all literature alluded to was perspective bound and partial (to an extent), to the conceptual framework, interpretative epistemological inquiry also had to be considered. Interpretation had to take place against the backdrop of assumptions, beliefs and practices.

#### **4.3 Scope**

In order to ensure that the information obtained was correct and the rate of response acceptable, personal contact was maintained with all stakeholders within the school. As a participant or 'hands on observer', my observations had to employ tenets of 'action research', based on what Cohen and Manion (1989:223) describe as

"...essentially an on-the-spot procedure designed to deal with a concrete problem located in an immediate situation. This means that a step by step process is constantly monitored...over varying periods of time and by a variety of mechanisms (questionnaires, diaries, interviews and case studies)."

Bell (1993:6) elaborating on action research points out " an important feature of action research is that the task is not finished when the project ends. The participants continue to review, evaluate and improve practice." Within the case study the question of staff development, its impact on school achievement and the need to monitor changing paradigms was addressed.

#### **4.4 Research Instruments**

The following had to support my attempts at gathering empirical data on and insights into staff development and school achievement: interviews with semi-structured questions, general school

observation and the questionnaire. Initially I had hoped to support the findings of this report by reviewing school policy documents, minutes of staff and management meetings and general classroom observation, but was unable to do so because of time constraints.

After conceptualising the nature and scope of the project, a pilot study was done to test the conceptual framework. This consisted of a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews and carried out at another (my) school to see how staff interpreted the questionnaire. Based on the results of the pilot study, a further conceptualisation of staff development was done at the case study school. This was based on insights gained within an organisational context where distinctions could be made between the needs of the organisation and that of the individual. The following strategy was then used: description of context > interviews > identification of issues and data interpretation > piloting of questionnaires > respondent validation > data analysis > presentation.

#### **4.5 Limitations**

The first limitation was that due to time constraints and a lack of schools with solid staff development policies, the research was restricted to one school. Whilst every attempt was made to ensure accurate recording of observations, discrepancies arose, which may have influenced the data. A further limitation was that members of staff may have been reluctant to disclose hidden problems that may be prevalent in the school to an 'outside observer'. How accurate and objective observations were, may well have been tainted by staff's eagerness to 'paint a picture of the school'. The reliability of participants may have impacted on the interpretation of the data gathered.

Conclusions arrived might not be convincing enough to apply as broad-spectrum generalisations. There were also numerous time constraints placed on staff who are busy with the Rationalisation and Redeployment Programme as well as the new Developmental Appraisal initiative.

#### **4.6 Ensuring Validity**

I had previously justified the application of the case study in terms of its flexibility and suitability to the treatment of the qualitative type of data that I sought. Such 'insider' evaluation, however, would have involved me in a process of participant observation, which had inherent weaknesses. Cohen and Manion (1980: 129) point out that: "The accounts that typically emerge from participant observations are often described as subjective, biased, impressionistic, idiosyncratic and lacking in the precise, quantifiable measures that are the hallmark of survey research and experimentation." They (Cohen and Manion, 1980:129) discuss the weaknesses in external validity such approaches contain, and further make the point that: "Fears that the observer's judgement will be affected by his close involvement in the group relate to the internal validity of the method." How do we know that the results of this research report present the real facts?

The challenge, therefore, in the case of interviews, was to conduct these in a way that allowed respondents to dictate the flow of conversation. In this way my own bias was minimised and the internal validity of the instrument enhanced. Further enhancement of internal validity was possible by being explicit and truthful regarding the purpose and structure of the investigation, and by encouraging respondents to give their views.

The use of triangulation also enhanced the validity of the instrument, at several levels. Firstly, triangulation between respondents who independently expressed concern about the same issue, or had similar ideas, indicated the validity of that information in the context of the study. Secondly, there was triangulation between the researcher's conclusion and those of the respondent. Thirdly, I triangulated each section of the case study with a published theory. Fourthly, there was triangulation between my own expectations of regarding what the interviews would highlight, and that which actually emerge in the course of the interviews. Finally, there was triangulation between the interpretations I placed upon the data produced and the independently-expressed opinions and feelings of respondents: the convergence of my judgement and the data gathered involved the application of more than one perspective to problems and was essentially validating in effect.

#### 4.7 Questionnaires

##### 4.7.1 *Use of a Questionnaire*

A questionnaire was used to examine the need for a collaboratively-designed staff development programme and the effect this would have on general school improvement. A measure of respondents' attitudes towards new school tasks and staff development revealed that generally there was consensus that staff development programmes would be beneficial to whole-school development. The use of the questionnaire had both advantages and disadvantages. The advantage was that it was relatively quick and could cover large numbers of people, while simultaneously ensuring anonymity without fear of embarrassment or reprisal. This assisted in providing a more truthful and honest response from respondents. The questionnaire was designed to explore attitudes and perceptions. Structured questions enabled

each respondent to receive the same set of questions phrased in exactly the same way and so care had to be taken in its design and presentation.

Open ended questions "are less constraining on respondents and encourage a greater variety of responses" (Craft 1996:98). One advantage of the open-ended approach is "that respondents can give much more of their own experiences, hopes and perspectives" (Craft 1996:101). However, while open-ended questions might elicit both structured and semi-structured responses, Cohen and Manion (1989) warn that open-ended questions might not necessarily bring a clear response and could take up too much of the respondent's time. They could also generate too much data for analysis, and "given the individuality of each response, the job of summarising and categorising responses is far more complex" (Craft 1996:101). Closed questions on the other hand, provide responses that could be easily analysed.

The disadvantages of using this type of instrument is that questionnaires are rigid and provide no flexibility that the researcher may seek. Comments cannot be further explored or probed and the researcher has no idea of knowing exactly how the question is being interpreted by the respondent. Questionnaires leave matters incomplete as respondents, due to a lack of interaction, may not be able to justify or explain their responses. The other gamble is that questionnaires sometimes are not completed and, and to obviate this, one has to obtain random sampling.

#### 4.7.2 *Designing of the Questionnaire*

The questionnaire first utilised factual questions (Section A) to obtain demographic information about respondents. A questionnaire should begin with easy questions which are "short, unobtrusive and allow the respondent to become accustomed to completing items" (Orlich 1975:31). Therefore participants were first asked to indicate their particulars, age, qualification, position at school and years in present position. No names were asked as anonymity was preferred. The questionnaire mainly tried to elicit perceptions and attitudes and consisted of both open and closed questions.

Section B focussed on general staff development and staff's perceptions to this. In order to assess teachers' attitudes, questions about staff development had to be general and not influenced by activities taking place in school. Teachers' feelings about staff development in general centred on (i) individual perceptions to staff development, (ii) role players in staff development initiatives, (iii) the effects of staff development on both the individual and organisation, and (iv) the future of staff development in schools.

Section C targeted staff development within the context of the school. Open ended questions here sought to elicit (i) how collaboratively and democratically staff development programmes were carried out, (ii) the developmental needs of the school and ways to address these, (iii) change of work patterns, (iv) the effect of staff development on general school advancement, (v) how staff development has helped professional enhancement and whole school development. Section D dealt with school-focussed staff and professional development and

how these were being assessed at school level.

#### *4.7.3 Pilot testing of Questionnaire*

The questionnaire was administered separately to a pilot group of nine individuals, who were not part of the case study school. The pilot was useful in that it helped to uncover problems regarding question design and general phrasing of items. Discussions took place with each individual and suggestions, recommendations and improvements were noted and altered accordingly. As a result of the criticisms and feedback from the pilot group, new directions in clarity, phrasing of a task statement and other changes were made. The questionnaire was then rewritten with these changes in the hope that respondents would at least interpret the questions according to the way the researcher intended them to.

#### *4.7.4 Administration of the Questionnaire*

The questionnaire was administered to the case study school (School A) separately to each teacher and also the principal and senior management staff. This was done at a general meeting held especially for that purpose. Participants, who were present received verbal directions from the researcher. Attendance was voluntary and therefore not all teachers attended. In all eighteen teachers including the principal participated.

#### *4.7.5 Questionnaire Reliability*

Obviously completing a questionnaire is dependent on a host of variables like mood fluctuation, honesty, respondents' circumstances at the time, distractions and oversights in

giving directions, instructions and interpretations. A lack of proper understanding also has an effect on this. In order to counteract these potential difficulties the administration of the questionnaire was carefully planned and explained to provide respondents with clarity and understanding. A five day period was allowed as adequate time to complete the questionnaire.

#### **4.8 Semi-Structured Interviews**

This instrument was used because interviews "give us a deeper knowledge of attitudes, as it allows us to probe, to follow-up and to check our perceptions with the responder in a way that questionnaires cannot" (Craft 1996:103). For triangulation, the data from the questionnaire and interviews is useful, as Anderson (1990:160) mentions:

"Interviews are prime sources of case study data. Not only does one typically interview a range of respondents, but the researcher tries to identify key informants who are part of the case and have inside knowledge of what is going on. These individuals are critical to enhancing the validity of the conclusions drawn."

What I needed to know was how participants felt about staff development and current practices, and how these might be improved.

I needed to analyse those feelings and opinions so as to identify patterns, and construct policy options. Such a qualitative purpose demanded a flexibility which structured questionnaires cannot generate. I wanted the interviews to do two things - to explore opinion and to collect ideas: understanding the information. Oppenheim (1992:67) distinguishes between these purposes:

"The purpose of the exploratory interview is essentially heuristic: to develop ideas and research hypotheses ... The job of the interviewer is...not that of data collection but ideas

collection”.

To this end, the interviews I conducted were a sort of ‘oral questionnaire’ with questions being open so as to invite free responses. Oppenheim (1992:67) describes the desired style very clearly: “The primary objective is to maintain spontaneity; the ideal free-style interview would consist of a continuum monologue by the respondent on the topic of research...”. Such an aim enhanced the validity of the interview and of the data generated, and I was careful to keep my contributions to a minimum.

#### **4.9 Observation**

Observation is a valuable instrument, and according to Craft (1996: 107) “...one that is at the heart of ethnographic or illuminative studies.” In terms of the current research, it was important to tie in the perceptions of staff members to their responses on the questionnaire and the interviews to actual practices at school level. In this way I obtained a clearer understanding of the issues pertaining to professional development. The observation of a teacher provides feedback regarding the perceptions voiced by that teacher at another time. All observations were done with a clear idea as to what I was looking for. I wanted to elicit, via observations whether staff development was in fact taking place within the school and to understand what individual teachers felt about those staff development processes. What I essentially wanted to gauge was whether the perceptions advanced by teachers were real and true and whether this was discernible in practice.

The idea of the participant observer was important in generating valuable information and allowing

evaluation regarding professional development and INSET. The advantage of this was that as an observer one could "provide an extra pair of eyes, especially when their views are compared with those of participants" (Craft 1996:109). I used the 'fly on the wall' approach where the observer tries to be as unobtrusive as possible and minimise the impact of his presence. This was done in a semi-structured way as I had no formal or structured schedules which I had to adhere to. Rather, this qualitative form of observation involved writing field notes on what was being observed. This proved helpful in not prejudging responses to support my hypotheses.

These observations are discussed in Chapter 3.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **RESEARCH FINDINGS: THE CASE STUDY SCHOOL**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this report was to evaluate the effectiveness of staff development at a particular school and by looking at activities which were school-focussed, draw on areas that could provide a framework for staff development. It is hoped that this could inform future staff development programmes schools might want to experiment with. This paper has very modest aspirations and is in no way aimed at challenging teachers to revise completely their role in the classroom. In dealing with the issues within the case study, variables such as the funding, organisation, context framework, environment and culture including learner demography had to be considered. However, it must be understood that effective strategies in use in one school might not be applicable to another. It would therefore be difficult to replicate the example in its entirety.

Given the changes and uncertainties in education, attempts at any form of school improvement which purports to have all the answers would be foolish. Only by taking the initiative can schools begin to have a positive impact on education. From the case study, it was evident that much research was still needed and that the recommendations emanating from this report, might well be esoteric, and though not immediately relevant, important nevertheless. However, for research to be relevant, it has to be accessible in order to inform practice.

Schools *can* make a difference to the quality of education they offer and to the educational experience as a whole. An 'effective schools' according to Mortimore (1991:9) is defined "as one in which pupils progress further than might be expected from considerations of its intake." Such schools add more value to their learners and are perceived to have greater impact on the type of education on offer and hence are more attractive and more trusted.

## **5.2 The Case Study School**

### *5.2.1 The Wider Context:*

Potchefstroom is one of the bigger cities in the North West Province, boasting of a population of over 165700 people. It has a solid infrastructure with numerous industries and a large percentage of service businesses. Located within the city are a number of schools, a good university and an excellent teacher training college. The city's sporting infrastructure is excellent and well used by the public and institutions alike. It boasts of a multicultural environment and houses a township with over 15000 people as well.

### *5.2.2 The Specific Context*

Finding a case study school proved to be extremely difficult. The criterion for identifying such a school had to be:

- a staff development programme in place that was school-focussed (even if it was not operating optimally)
- a 'effective school' as the term is accepted by the majority of its staff
- one with a proven track record of general school achievement

- improving examination results
- innovative, stimulating and stable environment where all role players were satisfied that the work they were doing was acknowledged
- one with support and development of flexible teaching and learning
- one with good and visionary leadership

Obviously, such a school was not easily identifiable, and no school has all these qualities in that order. However, one that came close was decided upon. The Governing Body in conjunction with the Principal and staff of the school felt that whilst I could use their example, and cite for the purpose of this report, the ideas and experiences they shared, they would like to remain anonymous. Therefore the school shall be referred to as School A. This is a secondary school catering for learners from Grade 7 to Grade 12. It is situated in the Klerksdorp/Potchefstroom area in the North West Province, and was part of one of the ex-departments of education. Being in the city centre, means that the majority of pupils are middle class and used to be predominantly white. Today the school has a white learner mix of 55%, the rest being Coloured, Black and Indian. The school has approximately 650 learners and 24 teachers. The main industry around the school is mining, but the school offers a curriculum which caters for science, commerce and the arts. The school was built in the early 1950s and has a strong tradition of sport and academic achievement. The present principal was appointed in 1987, and since then the school has acquired a growing reputation for good relationships and discipline, and has an impressive academic record as well.

As there are a number of primary schools nearby, there is no particular feeder school to it.

The Senior Management Team consists of the Principal, a Deputy Principal, three Heads of Departments and Subject Heads for Science, Humanities, Economic Science and Languages. One of the subject teachers doubles up as a Guidance Counsellor. The Governing Body consists of 19 members made up as follows:

- three learner representatives
- three educator representatives
- the principal (ex-officio)
- one general assistant
- ten parents
- one alumni member (co-opted)

The school follows the traditional 47 period week, with ten periods from Monday to Thursday and seven periods on Fridays. Each day learners move from one class to another. Teachers have their own classrooms and as such enjoy the autonomy of 'making up' their classrooms the way they want to. The school has three laboratories, an auditorium, a computer room, an industrial arts centre, a home economics centre, a library, a lecture theatre, a general purpose room and one centrally situated staffroom. There are sixteen classrooms, excluding the specialist rooms, and two stock rooms, one for stationery and the other for sports equipment. Physical education facilities are good but not extensive. The major sports include soccer and cricket for the boys and netball for the girls. There is a swimming pool on the premises, but the school does not consider this to be one of its major sports.

The staff consists of nine white teachers, seven 'Indians', four 'Coloureds' and five 'Black' teachers. Full integration of staff only took place in 1993. The Governing Body is progressive and pro transformation. Teachers and parents have fully bought into the transformation

process but uphold very strongly the view that the school has to provide students with a competitive and efficient education. The principal and staff concur that their responsibility is to provide a model of good practice, based upon principles of democracy, non racialism, and collaboration. Being a semi-autonomous unit, the perception is that if the education on offer and the management processes which facilitate its delivery, are exemplary, the school would attract learners. With this in mind staff development at the school is geared not only to conform to the norms and standards of local, regional and national practice, but also to exemplify at personal and organisational levels, rigorous and continuous self-improvement.

The organisation of the school is firmly embedded and there is a devolution of authority, thus fostering a collegiate atmosphere. The principal is directly involved in the day to day activities of the school which constitute, amongst other duties, general school administration, supervision of the various phases via the deputy and heads of department, community liaison and liaising with the Governing Body and their sub committees. He also deals with staffing, finance and the Education Department. The deputy is responsible for the curriculum (including time table and cover), and other aspects of school administration including checking on the General Assistants. The various heads of department are responsible for the respective domains, viz. the Secondary Phase, Primary Phase, Academic and Financial Matters and Staff and Pupil Affairs.

### *5.2.3 Staff Development at the School*

It was difficult to elaborate on every little initiatives or programme relating to staff

development within the school as this is well beyond the scope of this study. However, general and broad areas needed to be identified so as to create an understanding of the manner in which the school progressed. To recap, the term 'staff development' refers to the processes by which those who work within the school can improve their professional performance and the quality of education they hope to deliver. Within the school the following have been observed:

**i Time and Money:**

Annually, a fair proportion (18%) of the budget is allocated to staff development programmes, funding research visits to other institutions so as to enhance expertise in new techniques and assessment initiatives both locally and nationally. Money is also allocated for staff to substitute specific members who are granted leave to attend courses outside the institution, including costs of travel and accommodation.

**ii Scheduled Meetings:**

Contractual training days are used for whole-staff training, evaluation of learner achievement, and for general school 'ethos training'. Staff meetings are also scheduled for discussions relating to strategic planning, curriculum matters, teaching methodologies, familiarisation with new techniques and procedures, collective involvement, collaborative planning, and leadership seminars. INSET meetings are about one hour sessions and could include visiting speakers, but normally focus on one school issue or need at a time.

### iii Staff conferences /Bosberaad

These are held twice a year when learners are on holiday. These conferences or 'bosberaads' are devoted to a specific theme relating to school life as determined by staff collectively. Independent facilitators are employed who lead the proceedings, and this is followed by discussion groups, workshops and plenary sessions.

### iv Short Courses:

Specific short courses are offered on a weekly basis, mostly presented by different staff members. Once every month, staff development is facilitated by a member of senior management, in response to specific needs, or to a need generated by a decision at that level. Unlike the old system, where most staff development was open only to selected staff and at the discretion of the principal, at this particular school, anyone is welcome to present any programme whenever they wish. This is quite a step, given the fact that in the past, at most schools under different education departments, the extent to which such training had benefitted individuals and schools, was unknown because of a lack of accountability and transparency. Such training was seen as a mechanism for 'promotability' only and the lack of an evaluative instrument meant that teachers seldom if ever, ploughed back what they had learned into the classroom. Whereas our past experience has shown that most INSET had not arisen out of the context of a cohesive plan, preestablishing procedures for evaluation, in this particular school this is not the case.

**v Management Training:**

The management team has a monthly INSET meeting which occasionally consists of seminars by visiting speakers or management personnel. Most management development is based on perceived needs relating to the school as a whole and many sessions are used to help analyse and improve performance. Management also has a half-termly needs analysis and review meeting.

**vi Departmental in-service day**

Once a term, each department is allowed a whole day (being released from teaching) to organise in-service training activities. These may include workshops, visiting speakers, visits to other schools, or any other activity depending on the needs as identified by that department.

**vii Departmental Work Sessions**

Time is set aside for meetings among colleagues in a particular department. This is facilitated either by departmental heads or an appointed leader. There is a pre set agenda set and determined by all departmental members. These sessions allow departmental members to collaborate in teams or work independently on curricular and instructional concerns.

**viii Classroom Enhancement**

Working individually or in pairs, departments use lesson observation and analysis,

peer observation, and other innovative teaching strategies to identify and develop effective teaching techniques.

#### **ix      General Feedback Sessions**

These are normally held at the beginning of every staff briefing, where staff members make brief presentations and share creative ideas they have developed in response to whole-school concerns.

#### **x       Available Resources:**

Most of the physical resources have been dutifully updated through the years, with the result that a staff library has been set up in the staff room which presently has over two hundred resource books across all subjects. These include teaching manuals, text books, professional journals, the staff handbook, policy documents, conference reports and other relevant documents. INSET activities and programmes that have taken place in the past are also carefully minuted and documented here. The school also has an array of audio visual aids available to teachers, and these are housed in a staff stock room. Each member of staff has access to these resources, only signing them out when needed.

#### **xi      Organisation of Staff Development**

Whilst there isn't a formal Staff Development Committee, one teacher acts as Co-ordinator of staff development initiatives. Her function mainly is to ensure that any

staff who is presenting a workshop or programme, is given whatever is needed for the said programme. The co-ordinator is also responsible for the general organisation of workshops ensuring that the venue, notice, attendance, and so forth are properly taken care of.

#### **xii Standing Committees**

There are basically four standing committees in school, each to see to the well-being of a particular aspect, namely Curriculum, Staff Affairs, Pupil Affairs and Community Relations. Members of staff are free to join one or more of these. Committees engage in discussions and policy-related issues within the ambit of their brief. They provide valuable recommendations and ensure that school development occurs constructively. These committees provide in-service training by giving participants a better and broader perspective of school life and insights into pertinent educational issues that might otherwise not be disseminated to them. They are therefore an integral part of the school's general staff development practice.

#### **xiii Learner Enhancement Opportunities**

Facilities such as the Computer Centre, the Library and Audio Visual room are accessible to learners during normal lessons, before and after school hours and during lunch time. Here learners are afforded the opportunity to do independent research using whatever resources are available. Many continue to use these facilities during holidays as well.

#### **xiv     Extended Classes**

Most departments arrange for sessions to be held after school. These are run by teachers (without additional pay) who mainly use these sessions as reinforcement activities, enrichment classes and homework guidance sessions. As a lot of time here is spent in learner evaluation, these sessions are normally attended by learners. For second language English speakers, these sessions are used as 'literacy' sessions, encouraging reading and oral activities.

#### **xv     Improving School Infrastructure**

So as to improve the learning environment, much attention is placed on the improvement of facilities such as toilets, classrooms, school grounds and the library. Budget allocations are made towards this and the Maintenance Committee of the Governing Body is responsible for this. It is felt that this is important in improving pupil motivation and self esteem. Not only does a proper infrastructure help to raise morale, but it has a direct bearing on general learner performance as well.

From this it was evident that there was a regular staff development programme in place which seemed very much school-focussed and school driven. In addition to this teachers were given support in a wide range of activities and hence have a fuller programme over and above their teaching. By teachers' own admissions, they felt that whilst the staff development programme at their school might fall well short of general expectations, it was nonetheless a step in the right direction and a 'prelude to future refinement in a school-focussed staff development programme'. Though professional

development in School A is taking place, it is always open to constant refinement and revisiting.

**Author** Meer N S

**Name of thesis** School-Focussed Staff Development: Opportunities And Challenges. A Case Study Meer N S 1999

***PUBLISHER:***

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

©2013

***LEGAL NOTICES:***

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.