Result Oriented Teacher's Performance Appraisal System in Joint Military Staff College

BY

GASHAW DESIE BULI

ADDIS ABABA

JUNE, 2016

Result Oriented Teacher's Performance Appraisal System in Joint Military Staff College

Gashaw Desie Buli

A Thesis Submitted to

The Department of Educational Planning and Management

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (Educational Leadership and Management)

Addis Ababa

June, 2016

Result Oriented Teacher's Performance Appraisal System in Joint Military Staff College

Approved by board of examiners

_____	_____	_____
Chairman, Department, Graduate Committee	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Internal examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
External examiner	Signature	Date

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled *Result Oriented teacher's Performance Appraisal System in Joint Military Staff College* is my original work, has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all source of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Gashaw Desie Buli

Signature _____

Date _____

Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

Date of Submission: June 2016

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a University adviser.

Name Jeilu Oumer (PhD)

Signature _____

Date_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to express my genuine gratitude to my advisor Dr. Jeilu Oumer whose unreserved professional and technical guidance has brought about the realization of this thesis. I would also like to acknowledge him for his encouragement, which has had a lot to do with the success of my study.

I am also indebted to Ethiopian National Defense,who facilitated my MA program; I convey my heartfelt thanks to Command and Staff College Commandants and stuff members who heartily assisted me to accomplish my MA program.

I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to my Lovely wife Genet G/kidan and my son Robel Gashaw who was encouraging me in many ways to complete my thesis. Also I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to my family and my friends, Buzayehu Getachew, Abera Abdeta and Daba Leta who was encouraging me in many ways to complete my thesis.

Finally, I extend my grateful thanks to Defense Education and Training Main Department commandants and Joint military staff college commandants and all staff members, who either directly or indirectly assisted me during the course of the study.

Table of ContentsPages

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LIST of Tables v

Acronyms/Abbreviations/ viii

ABSTRACT ix

CHAPTER ONE 1

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING 1

1.1.Background of the Study.....1

1.2.Statement of the Problem 3

1.3. Objectives of the Study……6

1.3.1.General Objective……..6

1.3.1.Specific Objectives;.....6

1.4.Significance of the Study 6

1.5.Delimitation of the study.....7

1.6.Limitations of the Study.....7

1.7.Operational Definition 8

CHAPTER TWO 9

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....9

2.1.Profile of Joint Military Staff College 9

2.2.Definition and Concepts of Performance Appraisal. 10

2.3.Purpose of Performance Appraisal 12

2.4.Approaches of Performance Evaluation.....17

2.5.Evaluation of Teaching Performance.....19

2.6.Methods of performance appraisal.....24

2.7.The Criteria of ROTPA.....28

2.8.The role of human resource manager.....28

2.8.1. Turning motivation in to performance…….....30

2.8.2. Organizational control process…….....31

2.8.3.Concepts and functions of control…….31

2.9.Challenges/Problems and Errors/to Effective Appraisal……..33

CHAPTER THREE **36**
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY **36**
3.1.Research Design 36
3.2.Source of Data 36
3.3.Instrument and procedure of data collection 38
3.3.1.Instrument of data collection tools 38
3.3.2.Procedure of data collection 39
3.4.Method of Data Analysis 40
3.5.Ethical consideration 40
CHAPTER FOUR **41**
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION **41**
4.1. Demographic characteristics of respondent 42
4.2. Analysis and interpretation of data 43
4.2.1. Perception of teachers on ROPAS 43
4.2.2.Perception of teachers towards the criteria of ROTPA 45
4.2.3.Teachers' Perception of the Training and Competence of their Appraisers 49
4.2.4.Teachers' Perception of the ROPAS process 52
4.2.5.Teachers' Perception of Problems of ROTPA 58
4.2.6.Responses of students regarding to the purpose and relevance of the criteria 60
4.2.7.Students perception regarding common errors in appraisal 61
CHAPTER FIVE **65**
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS **65**
5.1.Summary of findings 65
5.2.Conclusion 68
5.3.Recommendation 69
References 72
Apendices

LIST of Tables

Table1. Purpose of appraisal……12
Table2. Participant type ……...37
Table3. Characteristics of respondent……..40
Table4. The degree of achievement of ROPAS as perceived by teachers……....42
Table5. Teachers response on ROPAS criteria……46
Table6. Teachers view on their appraisers……49
Table7. Teachers response regarding to monitoring and evaluation……....54
Table8. Teachers perception on their PA feedback……..59
Table9. Problems of ROPAS as perceived by teachers……61
Table10. Students response regarding to purpose and relevance……..62
Table11. PA errors perceived by students ……64

Acronyms/Abbreviations/

ETMD	Education and Training Main Department
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
HR	Human resource
JMSC	Joint Military Staff College
MBO	Management by Objectives
MoND	Ministry of National Defense
MoE	Ministry of Education
PA	Performance Appraisal
ROTPA	Result Oriented Teachers Performance Appraisal
ROPAS	Result Oriented Performance Appraisal System
SNNPR	South Nation Nationalities Peoples Region
UNESCO	United Nations Educational and Social Cultural Organization

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine perception of instructors,implementation, monitoring and evaluation system and challenges encountered in the implementation of ROTPA in the Ministry of National Defense/Education and Training Main Department/ College of Joint Military Staff College towards the Result oriented performance appraisal system. This was with intent to find out the overall implementation, weakness and strength of the ROTPA system and recommend possible ways of alleviating the problems. To this end, basic questions addressing the issues related to ROTPA such as purposes and criteria of ROTPA, performance appraisal feedback, competence and objectivity of appraisal and the process and problems (errors) of performance appraisal were all raised. The study employed descriptive survey method. To address the research questions raised, the investigator reviewed the relevant literature, prepared a questionnaire for teachers, and interview guides on the basis of the reviewed literature to collect data from the subjects at JMSC. The questionaries' was checked by the advisor. After having been evaluated and checked by the thesis advisor, Based on comments secured, necessary corrections and modifications were made before distribution. Concerning the subjects of the study, 40 teachers of the college, 12 department heads, 45 students and 2 deans of the college were included. Among the findings, the major ones include: Teachers did not participate in the formulation of ROTPA criteria; those who were engaged in appraising teachers had no adequate training regarding ROTPA; the process of ROTPA involves establishment of objectives; development of action plans; evaluation of performance; and provision of feedback; which is the joint activity of the appraiser and the appraisees. However, this process was not properly followed by the college and teachers were force to prepare action plans from the objectives already established by the upper bodies of the colleges; The performance appraisal feedback system was perceived to be characterized by criticism, lack of rewards, and delay to give feedback to teachers; There were no adequate pre and post appraisal discussions between teachers and appraisers. The following are some of the recommendation The college need to leave the criteria open to teachers for discussion before implementing them, or let teachers and other members of the college formulate the criteria and get the approval of the colleges' upper body. The colleges' deans, in collaboration with their respective college and with the ETMD higher institution coordination office, need to arrange training programs for appraisers. In addition, the ETMD need to assign graduates of management and education or at least those who have knowledge and skills of ROTPA to run the institutions.

CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Introduction

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, operational definition of key terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Educational institutions including schools the world over are currently facing the greatest challenge in providing quality education and to be accountable to their clients and communities (Darling-Hammond and Richardson 2009). Most educational planners and policy makers have therefore made the management of teachers' performance and their professional development their critical core business. A popular justification for focusing on the management of the performance and professional development of teachers is that teaching quality is regarded as the largest in-school factor that affects student learning. Therefore, managing teachers' performance is critical as it helps them continuously improve their skills, which in turn impact positively on student achievements.

According to the United Nations Educational and Social Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2008), quality of education is the heart of education. The teacher is a critical player in ensuring quality education. Teacher performance appraisals are a parameter used to evaluate teachers' performance against set standards (Dessler, 2003). Performance appraisal reports are used to design the in-service training courses for professional development, deployment of teachers and providing feedback to teachers on their actual work performance in relation to the set standards. It is also referred as merit rating especially when used to award salary or wage increments to teachers based on their performance (Graham, 1998).

Performance appraisal was introduced in the United States of America in the 1940s during the Second World War as a method of justifying employees' wages (Moorhead &Graffin, 1992). It was then known as merit rating. The merit rating was based on material outcome where higher output was rewarded with higher pay and vice-versa. By 1950s performance appraisal

was recognized as a potential tool for managing employee rewards through pay increases. Based on its results, employees were also counseled, demoted or identified for lay off.

Modern management is a recent phenomenon in Ethiopia. It was in the nineteenth century that Emperor Menelik (1889 - 1913), introduced the modern administrative system. Later, Emperor Haile Selassie (1930 - 1974) augmented his predecessor's initiative both in qualitative and quantitative aspect (Asmelash, 2000).

Today, performance appraisal is one of the key elements of any organizations drive towards competitive advantage through continuous performance improvement (Bratton & Gold, 2003). A regular review of each individual employee's performance provides information about his or her competence and aspirations. This is essential for planning. It can also serve a wide range of specific uses for the manager including identifying employees' training needs, potentials for higher responsibilities, determining pay and redeployment (Hacket, 1998).

The purpose of Performance Management differs from organization to organization depending on the objective to be achieved. However, most authors do agree that it can serve two main purposes in an organization, i.e., developmental and administrative. The developmental purpose includes identifying readiness of the employee to undertake the job, career planning, training, discussion and clarification (facilitate two-way communication), identifying needs in management changes (style, system, strategy, structural etc.) motivational and goal directing activities. On the other hand the administrative purpose includes pay based on performance, for promotion decisions, motivating employees, making transfer decisions, making layoff or termination decisions etc. (Milkovich and Boudreau, 1991).

Armstrong and Baron (2002) explained the main aims of performance management include achieve sustainable improvements in organizational performance, act as a leverage for change in developing a more performance oriented culture, increase the motivation and commitment of employees, enable individuals to develop their abilities, enhance the development of team work and better performance, develop constructive, contentious and open relationships between individuals and their managers, and provide opportunities for employees to express their aspirations and expectations about their work.

Different evaluation criteria processes are employed in different institutions. According to Webb and Norton (1999: 384) there are four types of evaluation criteria, these are trait or attribute criteria, outcome criteria, process criteria and performance based criteria. The fourth type of evaluation criteria is the most commonly used form of evaluation to appraise teachers. According to Mathis and Jackson (1997) classified appraisal criteria in to three forms .They are trait- based criteria, behavior based criteria, and result based criteria. The trait-based criterion identifies subjective characters of traits such as personality, initiative or creativity and has little to do with the specific job. According to Yilma (2007) before 2004, in Ethiopia teacher's performance appraisal had its own limitations it was highly subjective and the criteria were not valid and reliable to appraise teacher performance objectively. Because of this and other reasons the Ministry of Education (MoE) introduced new Result-oriented teacher performance appraisal criteria. The appraisers of teachers' performance in Joint military staff college are superior appraisals, peer/colleagues/ appraisals, and student appraisals. These appraisals rate the teachers according to the criteria set by academic deans and department heads of the college.

The more teachers perceive evaluations of their performance to be sound, the more legitimate they will deem the evaluation system and the more effort they will devote to tasks upon which they are evaluated (Millman and Linda 1990:40). Hence, for teachers to respect their job and use their efforts to the fullest extent, they have to view their performance evaluation positively and get motivated by it.

To achieve the above vision and mission the college had faced many problems because of lack of clear criteria set up and complex nature of the evaluation system, both teachers department heads and administrative personnel have faced problems in practicing it. Therefore, conducting a study that focused on assessing how result – oriented teacher performance is practiced and implemented in the joint military staff college is important to solve the existing current problems.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The most important variable to be considered in line with the performance appraisal system or practice of an organization is the perception of employees. Perception as defined in Oxford advanced dictionary is: "understanding or thinking something or somebody in a particular

way". Perceptions of employees about the targets, outcomes and uses of performance appraisal results would be beneficial depending on a number of factors. For example, employees are more likely to be receptive and supportive of a given performance appraisal program if they perceive the process as a useful source of feedback which helps to improve their performance (Mullins, 2007, p. 43).

Ethiopia is one of the countries that showed sharp increase in educational expansion. But this expansion in the education system has resulted in lack of quality. This quality problem in the education system in general is also a series problem in the Ethiopian Defense Higher Institutions. Having recognized this problem, the Ministry of National Defense is working to improve the quality of education in its higher institutions through over-all institutional transformation with major emphasis to curriculum revision. But, curriculum revision without effective performance appraisal system will not bring the desired outcomes of quality of education. Without developing and maintaining an effective and efficient performance appraisal system, it will be difficult to achieve high performance; retained, developed and promoted the right people; identify weaker performers either for the training and development they need or to counsel into more appropriate roles; provide feedback for employee development and motivation, or present a legally defensible basis for personnel decisions (Bernardin& Beatty, 1984).

As has already been mentioned teachers should not simply be appraised for the sake of appraising them. The purpose of the appraisal has to be clearly understood and implemented by both the appraisers and the appraisees. Whether the result of the appraisal is for the purpose of rewarding, promotion, providing training and others or not, teachers have to get their performance feedback so that it could be easier for them to identify their areas of strengths and weaknesses and take a proper remedy on time.

Major problem in the implementation of ROPAS is failure to link individual performance management with institutional strategy and performance, none participatory approach in the development process of the system, taking job description as the basis of performance evaluation, the rating were not based on concrete evidence and development of the system was not based on strategic plan of the institution and it does not include organizational and team performance measurement system.

The performance appraisal system that is conducted in these colleges is not as of the principles and practices which are defined in different literatures. The teachers are not made involved in the development of the performance criteria. The purpose of appraising their performance is only for the sake of following the regulation of appraising two times a year. There is no timely feedback provided to them in order to enable them improve their weaknesses and strengthen their outstanding performance.

In some cases, the appraisal is not conducted regularly as of the schedule. Although it is done regularly, nothing is done to recognize good performers from that of poor once. There is no corrective measure taken to improve the weak performers, either through training, capacity building or experience sharing.

Nevertheless, if the objectives that are expected from teachers and what teachers are seeking are unclear, if the criteria for measuring those objectives are vague, and there is no adequate communication of the feedback between the appraisers and the appraisees, teachers are likely to develop negative attitude toward the appraisal and tend to perform their tasks below capacity. This in turn can result in the poor performance of the organization as a whole.

There is no research based evidence concerning teacher's perception towards result oriented performance appraisal system about the overall human resource element of joint military staff college. Thus whether the performance evaluation practice in the college is being used for the betterment/improvement/towards the college's objective /goal/ mission is not well explained based on evidence. Besides the actual evaluation practice is unclear. This study is intended to fill these gaps and give feedback about the implementation and awareness of the teachers towards result oriented performance evaluation practice being employed in joint military staff college. As a result, the information that will be obtained from this study is expected to enable the teaching staff of the college to be geared towards the intended out come and be competitive.

Having this in mind the researcher believed that assessing the performance appraisal system of teachers towards result oriented performance appraisal system in joint military staff college is a vital role in addressing the college's mission and objectives as well as the transformation and development goal of the country and it also critical for management to know how the teaching staff perceive the result oriented performance appraisal system.

Specifically this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the perception of teacher towards the objectives of ROPAS in Joint military staff college?
2. What preparation and readiness is made to implement ROPAS in joint military staff college?
3. To what extent is the ROPAS implemented in joint military staff college?
4. What is the system of monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of ROPAS?
5. What are the problems encountered in the implementation of ROPAS?

1.3. Objectives of the study

1.3.1. General Objective;

The overall objective of this study is to explore teacher's perception on result oriented performance appraisal system in joint military staff college.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives;

1. To assess the perception of teacher's towards the objectives of performance appraisal system in joint military staff college.
2. To assess the preparation and readiness of ROPAS made by joint military staff college.
3. To assess the extent of implementation of ROPAS in joint military staff college.
4. To identify the system for monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of ROPAS in joint military staff college.
5. To describe the challenge encountered in the implementation of ROPAS in joint military staff college.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The finding of this study might help the following concerned bodies;

- The major beneficiaries of this study include, FDRE MOND in general, specifically Defense teaching and training main department.
- This study can give feedback to the joint military staff college in the objective of result oriented performance appraisal system perceived by its teaching staff in order to improve the delivery of services to its respective constituents.

- This study also aims to enrich or improve the performance appraisal system for the teachers at joint military staff college, which could help in their effective administration, in consonance with the policies of the Civil Service minster of FDRE.
- The findings of this study could likewise benefit the client or stake holders who are performing a common mission with the joint military staff college.
- The study may also initiate or serve as a bench mark for other researcher who wants to conduct further study in the field.

1.5. Delimitation of the study

This study was delimited to assess result oriented teachers performance appraisal system in Joint military staff college. It is one of colleges established under education and training main departments in the Ministry of National Defense, Training Main Department, there are four (4) colleges which are located: one college in Awash, two colleges in Addis Ababa Area, and JMSC is settled in Mekelle.

The investigator confined his study to the issues related to the result oriented teachers performance appraisal system, the competence of appraisers, the degree of communication in providing feedback and actions taken according to the performance and other issues related to it are involved in the study. In addition, although the study is more valid and reliable if all colleges are considered under the study; but, because of budget and time constraint, the study were delimited to only four selected faculties in JMSC.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

The researcher has faced with some problems during the study. Some of them were shortage of time and finance, delay in returning the questionnaires, and failure to provide the required information in some questionnaires. The researcher solve those problems by assigning personnel to assist me in giving awareness for the participant of the study and the college under study also cover my cost in order to solve the financial and shortage of time.

1.7. Operational Definition

Appraiser: refers to the superior, subordinate, or peer that appraise (evaluate) an employee's performance.

Appraisee: refers to an individual employee whose performance is subject to appraisal

Perception: refers to the views, and opinion that employees have towards their performance appraisal system.

Performance Result: The actual condition of performance level for each measure.

Quality: A degree to which a product or service meets customer requirement and expectation. (MoE, 2003:21)

Result Oriented Performance Appraisal: Appraisal method that is used to appraise the employee's performance based on the result achieved not on performance activities or process. (MoE, 2004:29)

1.8. Organization of the Study

The study is organized in to five chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction, the second chapter presents review of related literature, the third chapter is concerned with research design and methodology, the fourth chapter deals with data presentation, analysis and interpretation and finally the fifth chapter presents the summary of major findings, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with different review related literature topics such as definition and concept of performance appraisal, purpose of performance appraisal, approaches of performance evaluation, methods of performance appraisal, the role of human resource manager, types and functions of control in an organization, measuring, actual performance, the balanced score lard, principles of staff performance appraisal and performance appraisal are discussed briefly below.

2.1.Profile of Joint Military Staff College

There are different training centers and colleges which are going on strengthening Ethiopia's defense force. These colleges and training centers have a great role in producing skilled man power in different fields. On top of this, these centers and colleges teach theories and military doctrines which enable the militaries to be more qualified leaders and professionals. Besides, these colleges conduct researches to help in producing modern and skilled man power.

Since the establishment of JMSC as college, following the fall of the Derg regime, the college has been teaching and training organized in four faculties. These are Intelligence, Information and communication, Logistics, and Combat Engineering. These faculties graduated students from 1991-2006 in certificates. In 2007, when the ministry of defense approved that training centers had to be upgraded into higher educational institutions, a new curriculum designed that modified the training centers. As a result, under the name of Communication College, Intelligence College, Combat engineering Academy and Logistics academy, they started graduating in degree program.

In 2009 , these four training fields had to be organized together in order to administer by one command because it was believed that it could create a strong potential if they were organized together in faculties under a college named JMSC.

Integrating with the national defense mission and military capacity building, the college has designed a new curriculum. As a result, it is going to graduate for the second time. Besides,

the college has done different activities related with co-curricular, legislations, and supplying materials based on trainees' interest assimilating with their academic fields.

Similarly, in order to give a qualified and fulfilled service, the college has organized its own rules and regulations, offices, and students' accommodations in Mekelle town, around Mekelle University Arid Campus which is built by defense infrastructure and construction sector. Therefore, since 2014 the college has been giving service fully.

JMSC, vision andmission

Vision

- The collage envisions a primer learning, training and research center of excellence, educating professional leaders and specialists in the fields of logistics, combat engineering, communication and information, military intelligence for higher competences.

Mission

- Providing quality trainings and thereby producing professional leaders, who can effectively lead combat support and combat service support tasks of the armed forces in both war and peace time.
- Leading the faculties under it into higher standards (facilitating the smooth transition of the faculties under in into standardized colleges).
- Conducting and disseminating relevant researches that upgrade intelligence, communication and information, logistics and combat engineering. Experiences applicable to military needs and training and curriculum development.
- Actively participating in the society social, economic and security issues.
- Organizing and conducting timely, relevant and related short term trainings, workshops, seminars and panels for various units of the armed forces and the public.

2.2.Definition and Concepts of Performance Appraisal.

Different organizations have different ways of performance appraisals to measure the performance of their employees based on the stated objectives of the organizations. The term performance appraisal is applied in personnel management to a formal and systematic evaluation made in prescribed and uniform manner at a certain time. According to Pennington

and Edwards (2000:163) presented the following definitions of performance appraisal. It is systematic review of the performance of staff on a written basis at regular time intervals and holds appraisal interviews at which staffs have the opportunities to discuss performance issues, past, present and future, on one to one basis, with their immediate line manager. Mathis and Jackson (1997:343) also defined performance appraisal as "The process of evaluating how well employees do their job compared to a set of standards and the communication of that information to those employees." Employees need feed - back on their performance as a guide to know their strong side and weak side for their future performance behavior.

Different scholars give different names to performance appraisal; it is also called employees rating, employee evaluation performance review, performance evaluation and result appraisal. As most scholars agree that the term appraisal in this sense means the evaluation of the performance or potential of employees. Performance appraisal is an integral part of management function. In other words employees performance appraisal is part had parcel of any organizational management activates. Other scholars like Werther and Davis (1982:233) define performance appraisal as "The process by which an organization evaluate employees' job performance." Systematic and accurate performance evaluation can clearly indicate where the weakness or the short comings of the employee's performance are the result of the performance appraisal is useful to make compensation, placement, training development and career guidance decisions to be more effective. In short performance appraisal serves as a quality control check on employees and personal development performance. As described by William (1993:388) when performance appraisal is done properly, it can give a benefit to employees, supervisors, the human resource development and finally the organization itself in this regard, as noted by Werther and Davis (1982) without an effective appraisal system decisions regarding to subordinate promotion, transfers, salary increment and lay off will be subject to trial and error. Performance appraisal can be conducted both informally and formally. Informal appraisal tends to take place an ongoing basis like formative evaluation within the organization. But systematic and formal appraisal of an individual employee is likely to occur at certain intervals throughout that person's history of employment just as summative evaluation. In general performance appraisal is both periodic (summative) and

ongoing process (Formative). In this sense appraisal process as it applies to an individual subordinate is cyclical in that it tends to repeat itself again and again on regular intervals.

A more comprehensive definition is:

> *Performance appraisal is a formal, structural system of measuring and evaluating an employee's Job related behavior and outcomes to discover how and why the employee is presently performing on the Job and how the employee can perform more effectively in the future so that the employee, organization and society all benefit (Randall, 1981).*

2.3.Purpose of Performance Appraisal

The purpose of performance appraisal differs from organization to organization depending on the objective to be achieved. However, most authors do agree that it can serve two main purposes in an organization, i.e., developmental and administrative. The developmental purpose includes identifying readiness of the employee to undertake the job, career planning, training, discussion and clarification (facilitate two-way communication), identifying needs in management changes (style, system, strategy, structural etc.) motivational and goal directing activities. On the other hand the administrative purpose includes pay based on performance, for promotion decisions, motivating employees, making transfer decisions, making layoff or termination decisions etc. (Malkovich and Boudreau, 1991).

Armstrong and Baron (2002) explained the main aims of performance management include achieve sustainable improvements in organizational performance, act as a leverage for change in developing a more performance oriented culture, increase the motivation and commitment of employees, enable individuals to develop their abilities, enhance the development of team work and better performance, develop constructive, contentious and open relationships between individuals and their managers, and provide opportunities for employees to express their aspirations and expectations about their work.

They have explained that the benefits of performance management can also be viewed from: the point of organizational, administrative, individual and controlling are clearly explained in the following table.

Table1. Some Purpose of Appraisal

Organizational	**Administrative**
• Set and Measure Goals • Measure Individual Performance • Give Feedback • Get Performance improvement	• Award Pay Increases • Promotion Screening/Decisions • Career Advancement • Downsize/Layoff Decision • Legal Documentation
Individual	Control
• Motivate/ Provide Recognition • Coaching and Mentoring • Counsel problem performer • Development/Training Needs	• Management Direction • Employee Compliance

Source: Grubb (2007)

In addition, Grubb (2007) states that there are at least four reasons offered in support of performance appraisal: first, it promotes the organizational efficiency and effectiveness; second, it enhances individual employee‘s performance and satisfaction; third, it simplifies administrative proceedings; and lastly, it ensures that management retains control of its employee behavior and attitudes. Stated in another way, Grubb (2007) expressed that, performance appraisal is done because at first, it fits direct approach to management. Secondly, people are suited into the system. He argued that, employees are organized to fit into the “production machine.” Employees are viewed as an accessory to the organizational structure and machinery of producing goods and services. Additionally, performance appraisal is needed to control performance. Performance appraisal is present because management has to set a performance standard for its employees.Moreover, performance appraisal exists in organizations because every organization does it (Ikramullah et al., 2012). It has been a tradition and a scientific management (Vallance, 1999). Lastly, performance appraisal is there because people have been conditioned to believe it works. If people are confident that an appraisal system is working effectively, it motivates them to perform better for the reason that people themselves trust that a good result at the end of the evaluation

process will provide them with good rewards or incentives. Thus, performance appraisal is the best way to manage people.

The main purpose of PA is to measure and improve the performance of employees and increase their future potential and value to the organization. Other objectives include providing feedback, improving communication, understanding training needs, clarifying roles and responsibilities and determining how to allocate rewards. Providing feedback is the most common justification for an organization to have a performance appraisal system. Through its PA process the individual learns exactly how well he/she did during the last six months and can then use that information to improve his/her performance for the future. In this regard in JMSC the PA had taken place twice a year, some faculties give feedback on time for teachers some are not at all. The other thing is the consistency if giving feedback is also poor.

2.3.1. Effectiveness of PA systems

To meet the vision, mission, objective, goals and targets of an organization or an institution, everyone should set clear and precise methods of PA system objectivity. If so, effective output of PA system leads an organization to prosper specially, in the environment where formal learning and other similar activities are held. As a result of, every employee's awareness leads to set and control how to implement effective PA system. Nelson and et.al (1997 pp. 390) discusses that an effective PA system has about five main characteristics.

Validity: Comes from capturing multiple dimensions of person" job performance.

Reliability: comes from capturing evaluation from multiple sources and at different times over the course of the evaluation period.

Responsiveness: allows the person being evaluated some input in to the final outcome.

Flexibility: it opens to modification based on new information such as federal requirements.

Equitableness: results in fair evaluations against established performance criteria, regardless of individual differences.

Again clear and very important statements, about the effectiveness of PA system are expressed by Mathis and Jackson (1997 pp. 3364-365) as follows. An understanding what an appraisal is supposed to do is very critical whichever of the method is used. It usually works if PA is used to develop employees as a source. When management uses appraisal as a punishment or when raters fail to understand its limitations is fails.

What and whichever the appraisal method is used, the main point is that managers and employees must understand the purposes of PA system. So, consistent with the strategic mission of the organization, useful as an administrative tool, legal as development tool, as documentation of employees‟ performance are points of chances to be obtained if and only if PA is practiced properly. More over an effective performance appraisal requires considerable time and effort of managers and gathering of information and receiving feedback from the employee. Some managers do not take the task seriously or do not have the skills needed to do a good job of evaluating performance and providing feedback (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, &Cardy, 2010). For instance, some employees do not calmly accept the feedback, and others may become frustrated with an ineffective performance appraisal system and end-up believing that the system is unfair and does not matter (Jackson & Schuler, 2006).

There exists a strong desire for a frequent performance feedback and evaluation by employees, though there are many difficulties and disapproval against performance appraisal systems. For example, employees prefer an appraisal of more than once in a year. There are many good points of conducting a frequent appraisal, but Gomez-Mejia, et al. (2010) observe that informal appraisal, including feedback and discussion with workers, should occur on a continuous basis. On the other hand, Grubb (2007) views performance appraisal as a deficient process because it is costly, widespread and counterproductive activity. Performance appraisal according to him is a useless activity even though it is administered with the intention to oversee and make better the performance of individual employees and to improve overall efficiency, effectiveness and productivity of an organization.

Grubb (1999) mentions that supervisors and employees seem to dislike performance appraisal, as they probably know that it is just a game of make believe but still it goes on as a practice. Some are of the opinion that performance appraisal should not be practiced anymore even if it is a process to know how they perform individually, how they can improve their work performance and contribute to the performance of the organization. The practice of performance appraisal is constantly resisted as a hopeless method of attempting to improve performance because it is erroneous and degrading. This argument is supported by Gomez-Mejia, et al. (2010) maintaining that, a performance not measured accurately and a feedback that is poorly given; its costs may exceed its potential benefits in conducting the appraisal.

Arguably, performance appraisal has aroused more controversy than most human resource management practices. Although regarded by its advocates as a pivotal tool to a successful human resource strategy, its critics on the other hand, view it as unnecessary and potentially destructive to workplace harmony (Vallance, 1999). Performance appraisal is used despite evidence that it is counterproductive. Gomez-Mejia et al. (2010) observed that some people perceived that performance appraisal should be eliminated as a practice in organizations because of the problems and errors in evaluating performance. Bohlander and Snell (2007) posit that, some argue that performance appraisal discourages teamwork because it frequently focuses on individual achievement and produces a self-focus rather than team focus. Yet, performance appraisal practices in the public sector remains rooted in the personnel agencies around the world because it created the impression that governments are concerned about the performance of their employees and that they are keen to detect poor performance and reward excellence. Vallance (1999) maintains that the symbolic benefits of appraisal should not be underestimated.

2.3.2. Time to Conduct Performance Appraisal

In any administration activity of an organization, PA also has its own time to be conducted. Everyone in the organization has his/her own time to conduct PA depending on their own philosophy of time period (Mullins 1996 pp. 501):

With the majority of schemes, staff receives an annual appraisal and for many organizations this may be sufficient. Also more frequent appraisals may be appropriate for new members of staff, those recently promoted or appointed to a new position or for those whose past performance has not been up to the required standard. And also Mathis and Jackson (1997 pp 345-346) broadly explained as follows: First an informal appraisal is conducted whenever the supervisor feels it is necessary. The day-to-day working relationships between a manager and an employee performance have to be judged. This judgment is communicated through conversation on the job or over coffee or by on-the-sport examination of a particular piece of work. Informal appraisal is especially appropriate when time is an issue. The longer feedback is delayed the less likely it is motivating behavior change. Frequent information feedback of employee can also avoid surprises (and therefore problems) later when the formal evaluation is communicated. Second, a systematic appraisal is used when the contact between manager and employee is formalized and a system is established to report managerial impressions and

observations on employee performance. Although informal appraisal is useful, it should not take the place of formal appraisal. When a formalized or systematic appraisal is used, the interface between the HR unit and the appraising manager becomes more important.

Therefore, systematic appraisals typically are conducted once or twice a year. Appraisals most often are conducted once a year, usually near the employee's anniversary date. For new employees, an appraisal for 90 days after employment, again at six months, and annually these after is common timing. This regular time interval is a feature of formal appraisals and distinguishes them from informal appraisals. Both employees and managers are aware that performance will be reviewed on a regular basis, and they can plan for performance discussions. In addition, informal appraisals should be conducted whenever a manager feels they are desirable. In JMSC performance appraisal had taken place regularly twice a year but sometimes the department heads with supervisor conduct informal appraisal for the sake supervision only.

2.4.Approaches of Performance Evaluation

Performance appraisal is one of the manager's most important tasks, but most managers freely admit it gives them difficulty. It is not always easy to judge a subordinate's performance accurately, and often it is even harder to convey that judgment to the subordinate should be in a constructive and painless manner. This applies to both formal and informal appraisals (James 1991:395).

2.4.1. Formal Appraisal

Formal appraisal usually occurs semiannually or annually. Formal appraisal has four major processes. (i) To let subordinates know formally now their current performance is being rated. (ii) To identify subordinates who deserve merit raise, (iii) To locate subordinates who need additional training (iv) To identify candidates for promotion. It is important for managers to differentiate between the current performance and the promo ability (potential performance) of subordinates. Managers in many organizations fail to make this distinction because they assume that a person with the skills and ability to perform well in one job will automatically perform well in a different or more responsible position. This is why people are after promoted to positions in which they cannot perform adequately (James 1991).

2.4.2. Informal Appraisal

According to James and Edward (1992) the term informal performance appraisal to mean the continual process of feeding back to subordinates information about how well they are doing their work for the organization. Informal appraisal is conducted on a day –to –day basis. The manager spontaneously mentions that a particular piece of work was performed well or poorly or the subordinate stops by the manager's office to find out how a particular piece of work was received. Because of the close connection between the behavior and the feedback on it, Informal appraisals quickly encourage desirable performance and discourage undesirable performance before it becomes ingrained. An organization's employees must perceive informal appraisal not merely as a causal occurrence but as an important activity, an integral part of the organization's culture. In some organizations evaluation conducted once a year and in other it is conducted twice or less a year. In this regard Lewis (1982) Webb and Norton (1992) and

Duke (1995) describes two approaches of evaluation. The first one is formative evaluation while the second one is summative evaluation.

2.4.3. Formative Evaluation

According to Duke (1995:46) "The formative aspect of the evaluation cycle occurred when judgment in the form of narratives were reported to teachers during the course of conference scheduled with a few days of class room observations." As discussed by Webb and Norton (1992) the formative evaluation is an ongoing evaluation designed to provide feedback to the person being evaluated for the purpose of self-improvement. Formative evaluation helps to develop communication skill between the subordinates and the supervisor and thereby take corrective action and recommendations on the short comings revealed in the performance process. During formative evaluation process no managerial decision is taken on the employee rather than the employee take decision of how to improve his or her performance better.

2.4.4. Summative Evaluation

According to Duke (1995:45) stated that "the summative evaluation system was intended to allow organizational decision such as promotion, tenure, contract renewal, and staff development programs to be made on the basis of observed conditions of practice.'' Lewis

(1982:9) also proposed "summative evaluation is used to collect abroad sample of information about a teachers' overall performance in order to make administrative decision, such as salary increment, promotion or dismissal.'' Summative evaluation conducted with specific time interval. Its objectives is not to improve or take remedial action to the short comings seen during ongoing performance, rather it is more used for managerial decision on employee promotion or layoff. In similar way, Webb and Norton (1992:379) stated that "summative evaluation is designed to assess the terminal behavior or overall performance." Summative evaluation is formal somewhat in frequent and focuses only on the person being does not participate in judging his behavior face to face with the supervisor as the case of formative evaluation.

There are at least three reasons why managers are reluctant to conduct evaluation of performance. First, they are generally uncomfortable discussing performance weaknesses with subordinates. Second, many teachers tend to become defensive when their weaknesses are pointed out. Instead of accepting feedback as constructive and a basis for improving performance, employees challenge the evaluation by criticizing the manager of redirecting the blame on someone else. Finally, teachers tend to have overstated assessment of their own performance.

2.5.Evaluation of Teaching Performance

There are many comprehensive systems for the evaluation of teaching performance and guidelines for the development of such systems; each includes a substantial component devoted to evaluating teaching performance (Arreola, 2000; Cashin, 1996; Centra, 1993; Seldin, 1999; Theall and Franklin, 1990). Multiple sources and types of data should be used to evaluate teaching. The most common sources of data are students, peers, and teachers themselves (Centra, 1993); (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995); (Theall& Franklin, 1990).

2.5.1. Student Ratings

Student evaluations of teaching performance have been used since the 1920s, yet their validity, the techniques used to administer them, and the purposes for which they are used remain controversial (Marsh, 1987); (Spencer &Flyr, 1992); (Wachtel, 1998). In the early years, individual instructors usually made the decision whether or not to use student evaluations, designed their own evaluation instruments, and were the only ones who saw the

results. During the 1970s, however, many universities began requiring student evaluations, standardizing evaluation instruments, and scoring the evaluation results for performance appraisal purposes (Centra, 1993). Student feedback is now a component in the formal faculty performance appraisal systems of most universities (Adams, 1997); (Lersch& Greek, 2001); (Trout, 2000).

Faculty opinions on the use of student evaluations range widely, but a considerable proportion of researchers conclude that the evaluations provide a valid and reliable method for judging teaching effectiveness (Centra, 1993); (Koon & Murray, 1995); (Marsh & Dunkin, 1997); (Seldin, 1993). Further, (Marsh, 1997) asserts that student evaluations are the only indicator of teaching effectiveness whose validity has been rigorously and thoroughly established.

Despite the research that supports the validity of student evaluations, many individuals express reservations about their use in faculty performance appraisal systems (Adams, 1997); (Goldman, 1993); (Tata, 1999); (Zoller, 1992). A common concern is the possibility that factors other than teaching effectiveness influence the evaluation scores. These include the procedures used to administer the evaluations (Seldin, 1993) the anonymity of the evaluators (Blunt, 1991); (Feldman, 1997), whether the course is required or elective (Scherr&Scierr, 1990), the class meeting time (Centra, 1993) whether or not the course requires quantitative reasoning (Cashin, 1992) the course workload (Ryan, Anderson, &Birchler, 1990) the personal characteristics of the instructor (Marsh & Dunkin, 1992); (Radmacher& Martin, 2001), and the students' prior interest in the course subject area (Parve&Baril, 1993). There is evidence that a positive correlation exists between a student's anticipated course grade and the student's overall evaluation of the instructor. Lersch& Greek, (2001), conclude that instructors with lenient grading standards receive higher overall ratings, and Chacko (1983) suggests that strict grading standards also lead students to rank the instructor lower on evaluation components (such as self-reliance and attitude toward students) that are unrelated to judgments about grading fairness.

Relatively little research has been conducted on student reactions to the evaluation process and their potential effect on the assigned ratings. (Abbott et al., 1990) observe that students often complain about the frequency with which they are asked to complete evaluation forms, a phenomenon noted earlier by Brandenburg et al. (1979), who also questioned whether

students take the evaluations seriously. (Marlin, 1987) states that students tend to view the evaluations as a chance to "let off steam" and Jacobs (1987) reports that 40 percent of her student respondents said they were aware of other students plotting to "get back at" an instructor by collectively assigning low ratings. (Trout, 2000) provides anecdotal evidence of students rewarding easy-grading instructors with high evaluation scores and notes the devastating effect that even a few disengaged students can have on quantitative evaluation scores simply by giving an instructor the lowest possible scores on all evaluated dimensions.

In addition to validity and reliability issues, some researchers question the importance assigned to student evaluations in faculty performance appraisal systems. Although (Rice, Stewart, &Hujber, 2000) accept student evaluations as a valuable tool for assessing and improving classroom teaching, they argue that these evaluations do not capture information about long-term instructor and course effectiveness. With (Adams, 1997) and (Ruben 1997), they conclude that any assessment of teaching effectiveness should rely on multiple perspectives collected from various university stakeholders.

The results of several studies provide a general consensus about some apparent dimensions of teaching effectiveness. (Feldman, 1997; Marsh & Dunkin, 1997; Solomon et al., 1994) These include the teacher's (1) knowledge of the subject matter, (2) preparation and organization of the course, (3) sensitivity to and concern for students, (4) fairness in grading, (5) helpfulness, (7) elocutionary skills, and (8) class management, as well as (9) the effectiveness of instructional aids (textbook, etc.), and (10) the clarity of course objectives.

From the experience of the researcher, it is observed that in JMSC student rating is characterized by a positive correlation which means teachers who gave higher score for the students get excellent performance appraisal result. On the other hand a teacher who gave lower grade for students get poor performance appraisal result.

2.5.2. Peer Review of Teaching

Although many experts agree that students are qualified to assess many aspects of classroom teaching (for example, clarity of presentation, interpersonal rapport with students, concern for students' progress), they also assert that for some aspects of teaching (mastery of content, course goals, course organization and materials), only peers have the substantive expertise

required for meaningful evaluation (Cashin, 1992); (Chism, 1999); (Hutchings, 1999). In short, peer review brings content-based contextually to evaluation of teaching.

Proponents of peer review of teaching acknowledge a set of key issues and concerns, including privacy of the reviewed, needs of the reviewer, and reliability and validity of the ratings. What goes on in the classroom has traditionally been between teachers and their students, not between teachers and their peers. Peer review challenges norms of privacy by opening doors to classrooms and making teaching a public act (Chism, 1999); (Hutchings, 1999). Ending "pedagogical solitude" may be uncomfortable for many Instructors (Shulman, 1993). Yet faculty are sharing many stories of successful experiments with peer collaboration and peer review (Hutchings, 1999); (Langsam& Dubois, 1996); (Nordstrom, 1995). These changes bring increasing opportunities for new faculty to be mentored in ways that socialize them to peer collaboration and review (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999), and they may promote a culture of collaboration and community surrounding teaching (Cavanagh, 1996); (Hutchings, 1999).

Reviewers' concerns must also be considered (Cavanagh, 1996); (Chism, 1999); (Hutchings, 1999); (Seldin, 1993). Without careful planning, peer reviewers could be placed in awkward situations when asked to judge a colleague, wrestle with issues of confidentiality, risk lack of anonymity, assess the strengths or weaknesses of a senior colleague, worry about potential ambiguous legal issues, and devote time and energy to matters that they may not perceive to be part of their job (Centra, 1993); (Chism, 1999);
(Hutching, 1999). The reliability and validity of peer ratings of teaching are not as well established as they are for student ratings. Classroom observations of teaching have been used in a growing number of institutions (Seldin, 1993).

Research has indicated that, in the absence of either sound training or adequate numbers of observers, peer ratings based solely on classroom observation are not generally reliable (Centra, 1993). Questions of validity arise about whether the presence of an obtrusive observer might alter classroom behavior (Cohen &McKeachie, 1980). But there is general consensus that training in the observation of classroom teaching and that increasing the number of observers and the number of visits they make to each class would, in combination, increase the reliability of peer classroom observation to acceptable levels (Centra, 1993);

(Chism, 1999); (DeZure, 1999). Departments using peer observation to evaluate classroom teaching should follow sound procedures in selecting and training observers; identifying the number of observers and number and length of classroom visits; collecting data to use in assessing the reliability and validity of observers and observations; establishing guidelines, criteria, and standards for observation; developing forms and methods for making observations; and preparing the report of the observations (Chism, 1999); (DeZure, 1999).

What are peer reviewers best qualified to evaluate? Peer review should be used to provide data on aspects of teaching effectiveness for which faculty peers are the best available source of information (Arreola, 2000); (French- Lazovik, 1981), including expertise in the subject matter and discipline specific aspects of instructional design and pedagogy (Arreola, 2000); (Chism,1999); (Shulman, 1993). Five areas appropriate for peer review are subject matter mastery, curriculum development, course design, delivery of instruction, and assessment of instruction. (Cashin, 1992) Only peers can evaluate the first three, whereas both peers and students can evaluate the last two

Several steps can enhance the reliability and validity of peer ratings of teaching portfolios in summative evaluation (Centra, 1993) (Root, 1987).First, portfolios should include a broad range of work samples and related information to document various aspects of teaching performance. Second, peer reviewers should receive training that includes opportunities to discuss methods, criteria, and standards for assessment using portfolios that have previously been rated high or low. Third, peers' objectivity as reviewers will be enhanced if they are not being currently evaluated and if they are selected by the unit head, randomly selected, or elected to a peer committee on teaching. Fourth, a minimum of three and a maximum of six peer reviewers should be used.

Reliability of peer ratings of portfolios would also be enhanced if a set of mandated items were included in every portfolio. Seldin (1993) recommends the following items: a reflective statement about the instructor's teaching approach, three years' of summaries of student ratings, three years' of syllabi for all courses taught, innovative course materials, and evidence of activities to improve one's teaching. Chism's sourcebook on peer review provides other models and detailed guidance (Chism, 1999).

Regarding to the systematic peer review mentioned above by the scholars are also a matter of rumors in many educational institution due to many reason, for instance from the experience of this study peer evaluators evaluate their colleagues according to their interaction between them rather than their actual performance, this might lead to ambiguity.

2.5.3. Self-Evaluation or Report

Although self-evaluations by teachers lack the validity and objectivity necessary for summative evaluation (Centra, 1993), support is growing for the use of teaching portfolios with data supplied by the instructor (Arreola, 2000); (Centra, 1993); (Chism, 1999); (Seldin, 1993). "Course syllabi and exams" and "self-evaluation or report" were among the fastest-growing sources of data used in evaluating teaching performance (Seldin, 1993). The expanding use of these data sources is consistent with the increase in the use of peer review of portfolios to evaluate faculty teaching performance**.**

2.5.4. Immediate Supervisor Evaluation

Determining who will appraise employee is critical in designing the appraisal program. It is conceded that appraisal by the immediate supervisor is necessary and the most effective method. Supervisor is a common alternative for appraising job performance. Moreover, since the supervisor is in a better position, he can link effective performance with rewards such as pay and promotion.

2.6.Methods of performance appraisal

There are a number of performance appraisal methods available and care must be taken to choose a method which is most suitable and objective for a given candidate for appraisal. Some of these methods are more suitable for blue collar workers, others for white collar workers and still others for executives. Besides, the raters/appraisers must be competent in administering the tests and techniques. There are different evaluation forms most of which represent an attempt to objectify or quantify observed and interpretations of employee performance.

Management by objective (MBO)

According to Thomas and Carl (1993:139) Management by objective, which is a process to establish goals for an employee who has been agreed up on by both the employee and their supervisors Mathis and Jackson (1997:358) called MBO type of appraisal as "appraisal by

result, targeting coaching, review performance objective and mutual goal setting.'' According to Byars and Rue (1987:246) MBO type of appraisal has the following process; Objectives should be clearly and precisely stated for the work to be done by employees. Developing an action plan to indicate how these objectives are to be achieved, allowing the employee to implement, taking corrective action when necessary and establishing new objectives for the future. In MBO type of appraisal is to be effective or successful. Several requirements must be met. As described by Byars and Rue (1987:247) objectives should be quantifiable and measurable objectives whose attainment cannot be measured or at least verified, should not also be challenged it should be also be achievable and should be written in concise way and clear language. Mathis and Jackson (1997:358) proposed very important idea for mob. The authors stated three key assumptions underlining mob appraisal system.

1. When employees are taking part in planning and setting the objectives and determine them to high level commitment and performance may be higher.
2. Whenever objectives are identified and described precisely the employees will have a better job to achieve the desired results. By allowing employees set objectives the individual can get an accurate understanding of what is expected.
3. The objectives of performance should be measurable and define results. Vague generalities such as "cooperation" and "initiatives'' which are common in many superior-based appraisals should be avoided. Since objectives are composed of specific action to be taken or work to be accomplished.

Other writers such as Glueck and Ivancevich (1989) also pointed out that, mbo is seen as a philosophy of managerial practice or a method by which managers and subordinates plan, organize, control, communicate and debate. MBO has its own systematic process. Regarding this Glueck and Ivancevich (1989) and French (1990) listed the following systematic process of MBO are (i) Regular meeting should be conducted between superior and subordinate to define key tasks of the subordinate and to set a limited number of objectives or goals. (ii) The objectives should be specific, that are realistic, challenging, clear and comprehensive. (iii) The superior should consult with the subordinates establishing the accomplishment of the objectives. (iv) Setting intermediate review time table. (v) The superior and the subordinate should make any required modification in the designing of the objectives. (vi) Meeting should

be available for final evaluation by the superior to help subordinate their performance and for encouragement session. And (vii) Objectives for next cycle are set by the subordinate after consulting with the superior keeping in minds the previous cycle and adjusting with future expectation. According to Mathis and Jackson (1997:358) concluded the following steps for mbo evaluation. "Job review and agreement, development of performance standards, guided objective setting and continuing performance discussion.'' This clearly shows failure in designing and implementation, results poor performance of MBO. According to Jobn and John (1992:600) management by objective (MBO) involves a formal agreement between a superior and subordinates concerning the subordinates performance objectives for a given time period, subordinates plan, through which they accomplish tasks, standards for measuring whether or not they have been accomplished and procedures for reviewing results.

Performance objectives in MBO

Establishing performance objectives is an essential part of the mob process. The nature of an objective and the way in which it is established can have a major impact on how well mob works. According to Jobn and John (1992:601) the authors added the following points that "in a good MBO program, performance objectives are written. They are also formally agreed by both supervisor and subordinate and they meet the test established by these criteria for a good performance objectives.'' The following steps should be considered when MBO is employed. (i) Targets a key result to be accomplished. (ii) Identifies a date for achieving results. (iii) Offers a realistic and attainable challenge. (iv) Is specific and as quantitative as possible.

Essay type of appraisal

This is a written narrative form of appraisal conducted by the rater who describes the performance of an individual. Instructions are often provided to the rater as to the topic that should be covered. A typical essay appraisal question according to Byars and Rue (1987:248) explained that the employees' performance including quantity, quality of work, job knowledge, and ability to get with other employees. What are the employee's strengths and weaknesses? In the essay techniques of evaluation the rater is asked to describe the strong and weak side of employ behavior.

Critical incident appraisal

According to Byars and Rue (1987) the critical -incident appraisal requires the rater to keep written record of incidents as they occur. The record is about job behavior that illustrates both satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance of the person being rated. The recorded incidents will be a base for performance evaluation and for providing timely feedback to the employees. When critical incident method is employed, the supervisor keeps a record of the positive and negative behaviors of each subordinate over a period of time, such as weekly monthly, quarterly and yearly.

Graphic rating scale

According Gary (1985:224) Graphic rating scales are probably the most widely used performance appraisal tools since they are relatively easy to develop and use. The graphic scale can be developed on a chart with a number of traits (such as quality and quantity) as well as arrangement of performance (from unsatisfactory to exceptional for each. Each subordinate is rated by circling or checking the score that best describe his/her level of performance for each trait. The assigned value for each trait is then totaled.

The alternation ranking method

This used for evaluating employees is to rank them from best to worst on some trait. Since it is usually easier to distinguish between the worst cad best employees than to simply rank them, an alternation ranking method is most popular. First, list all subordinates to be rated and then cross out the names of any not known well enough to rank. Then, on a form such as that indicate the employee who is the highest on the characteristic being measured and also the one who is the lowest. Then choose the next highest and the next lowest alternating between highest and lowest until all the employees to be rated have been ranked. (Gary 1985).

Behavioral anchored rating scale: According to Stephen (1988:550) stated that, performance appraisal technique in which an evaluator rates employees on specific job behaviors combine major elements form the critical incident and graphic rating scale appraiser the appraise rates an employee according to items along a continuum but the points are examples of actual behavior rather than general descriptions or traits.

Multi person comparison: Compare one individual's performance to those of one or more others it is a relative, not an absolute, measuring device. The three most popular uses of this method are group order ranking, individual ranking, and paired comparisons.

Group order ranking: A performance appraisal approach that group employees in to ordered classification by the evaluator.

Individual ranking: A performance appraisal approach that ranks employees in order from highest to lowest based on their performance accumulated. The evaluator ranks all individual employees in relation to their performance task.

Paired Comparisons: A performance appraisal approach in which each employee and rated either by the superior or weaker member of the pair.

2.7.The Criteria of ROTPA

Webb and Norton (1992:381) define criteria as "the job related behaviors expected of the teacher an administrator or other staff member." Accordingly they describe the following three types of criteria's for evaluation plans.

I. Performance -based criteria

This is the most commonly used performance criteria. According to these criteria, teachers and administrators behavior to do specific tasks should be evaluated or assessed.

II. Trait or attribute criteria

The trait criterion describes what the employee is, rather than what the employee does. Such traits are aggressiveness, tolerance of stress, creativity, self-confidence, adaptability, and so on. Those criteria's may affect the quality of a person to perform activities positively or negatively. There are also other personal qualities which affect the teaching learning process. As Webb and

Norton (1999:383) described that "although most schools do not rely heavily on trait criteria, today strait criteria such as dependability and personal appearance are still found in many evaluation systems."

III. Result-based criteria

The rational for this approach is that, teachers and administrators should achieve certain objectives and that their performance can be meaningfully assessed by examining the extent to which those objectives have been accomplished.

2.8.The role of human resource manager

According to Warner (2009:273) the human resource manager should mind that organizational change is a kind of chaos that the member of variables changing at the same

time, the magnitude of environmental change, and the frequent resistance of human systems create a whole confluence of processes that are extremely difficult to predict and almost impossible to control. Describing the cause of organizational performance and change, we must explore important lines of thinking first. The manager must understand more thoroughly how organizations function (i.e. what leads to what) second; the manager must understand how organizations might be deliberately changed. According to Mathis and Jackson (1997:212) the human resource manager is expected to play an important role in the effort to make an organization effective and efficient in achieving its goals and objectives. It must be noted that the human resource manager's role must be seen in relation to other managers and not as an 'outsider.' The human resource manager, like his colleagues in the designing and engineering of tasks of the organization, should work hand in hand with the employees. The manager is in important position in that he/she interacts with all heads of departments, so that he offers the necessary leadership, which is vital in the achievement of organizational goals. In order to deal effectively with other specialists, the human resource manager himself must have a high degree of educational attainment. James (1970:466) stated that one of the most important roles of the human resources manager is controlling organizational activities. Controlling is an important means of coordinating diverse activity toward objective accomplishment.

The control function regulates system output by measuring actual with expected performance. The control function is also concerned with means as well as ends continual feedback concerning how organizational activity is carried out is important for long-run stability. The control system can be defined as that phase of the managerial process which maintains organizational activities within allow able limits as measured from expectations just as there is a hierarchy of plans on a continuum of comprehensiveness, there are comparable control procedures appropriate at different levels. On the other hand, there are processes for making innovative decisions (adaptive system) with move the organization along its life cycle in response to external and internal stimuli (James, 1970).

2.8.1. Turning motivation in to performance

According to James (1991:522) managers are not concerned only with motivation. They must ensure that motivated effort results in performance effective and efficient accomplishment of

objectives. This involves making sure each individual knows the objectives that must be achieved; knows the tasks necessarily to achieve them; and has the abilities, skills, and tools to accomplish the necessary tasks. Managers should help employees motivate in their organization because motivation influences performance to accomplish objectives successfully. According to Thomas and Carl (1993:139) in order to make effective control managers should utilize effective interview techniques when providing an employee with performance feedback. Compensation of employee involves the development of reward systems organizations must choose a compensation plan that achieves the goals of the organization. Hence functions of compensation plans are: Individual incentive plans are designed to pay employee's based on the employees performance as measured against organizations defined standard, group incentive plans should be designed to pay employees based on their group's performance, and merit pay should be /is designed to provide individuals with pay raises and bonuses based on the judgmental merit rating they receive from their boss or organizational.

2.8.2. Organizational control process

According to Glueck and Ivancevich (1989) performance appraisal is the process by which organizations evaluate job performance when done correctly, their supervisors, the human resource department and ultimately the organization all benefit. Managers see performance evaluation is the human resource management activity that is used to determine the extent to which an employee is performing the job effectively. According to James (1970:469) described two types of control process of human resource manager:

Cybernetics approach: is an important concept for the control function of a manager.

Cybernetics involves communication and control. It is concerned with information flow in complex systems. Cybernetics's the most important and useful connotation of the control function –making a course toward a goal.

Feedback approach: is an essential ingredient in any control process. It provides the information for decision which adjusts the system over time. As plans are implemented, the system is tracked or monitored in order to ascertain whether objectives are being met. Feedback is usually obtained with reference to both the ends sought and the means designed to archive them. Organizational control is that phase of the managerial decision system that

monitors performance and provides feedback information which can be used in adjusting both ends and menses.

2.8.3. Concepts and functions of control

According to James and Fremonte (1970:466) the concept of control can be quite general and can be used as a focal point for managerial system. For example planning can be thought of as a means to allow control of individual or organizational behavior. The task of organizing can be used for providing a means of controlling activities. Control is more a state of mind than any specific amalgam of mathematical, scientific or technological method. The word "Control" has several meanings such as to check or verify, to regulate, and to compare with standards to exercise authority over (direct or command), or to curb or restrain. All are significant for organizational theory and management practice. Checking or verifying is one of the most important aspects of control that implies some means of measurement and some standard which can serve as a frame of reference in the control process. Managers concerned with control In relation to matching performance with necessary or required conditions to obtain a purpose or objectives. The Essence here is direction and integration of effort required accomplishment of tasks control is concerned not only with the events directly related to the accomplishment of major purposes, but also with maintaining the organization in a condition in which it can function adequately to achieve these major purposes.

The fundamental elements in any control system become the control process when linked sequentially in a cycle that is to determine goals or objectives, plan programs, determine work load, determine required resources, acquire authority to use resources, perform work, compare performance with plan, compare program achieved with planned program and compare goals achieved with goals wanted. According to Mathes and Jackson (1997:239) stated that "the human resource manager co-ordinates and controls the implementation of the organization's human resource policies and practices to ensure uniformity of action, justice and fairness." The human resources manager has so many duties and functions and carries out tasks towards organizational achievement effectively and efficiently.

The roles and duties of the manager in planning systems and procedures for recruitment, selection, promotion, transfer, job description and job evaluation. The manager also initiate chances aimed at improving the effectiveness of the organizational and individual goals.

Establishing training programs to all employees based on their current performance capacity. The human resource manager should consider up on the factors that cause low morale and commitment among employees and, hence, the managers have to take corrective actions.

According to French (1990:311) described that "educational systems should undertake some training and development programs such as: increased productivity, heightened moral, reduced supervision, increased organizational stability and organizational training needs." Therefore, the educational manager should consider the following important points in detail in his/her leadership.

Increased productivity: an increase in skill and training, it is obvious that can result maximum productivity in terms of quantity and quality output. To the contrary, human resource in general teachers in particular can only contribute limited out puts towards the achievement of educational or school objectives.

Heightened moral: There are indications when employees are with required moral and satisfaction such as willingness to co-operate with other staff members to achieve common objectives, voluntary involvement to accomplish educational policies. Staff members shall be satisfied on the job, it is likely that satisfaction is evidenced by moral and commitment and translated to high performance of assignments with required knowledge and skill.

Reduced supervision: a trained and well educated teacher can supervise him/her self. This implies that the supervisor can go in increasing the span of control over the teachers. Hence, the education system can save too much time and cost on supervision.

Increased organizational stability: Organizational stability is mandatory to perform tasks and to achieve organizational objectives adequately. When staff members are acquired with necessary skill and knowledge through training and development programs can have the opportunity that the organization would ran smoothly. This in turn, gives staff members a sense of job satisfaction and become loyal to the education system, ensuring it with a sustained development towards goal achievement. The manager should select training needs for its employees not merely for the sake of training but for meaning full development and it must meet the objectives of particular organization**.**

2.9.Challenges/Problems and Errors/to Effective Appraisal

There are a number of barriers that supervisors confront while exercising performance appraisal. These could be in the area of establishing the scheme, the perception of appraiser and appraise.

A. Challenges/Errors of the Scheme

Martin (2000:131), listed the following missing key points for successful appraisal schemes: Senior managers are not fully committed to the ideas of appraisals, Lack of pre-appraisal training to supervisors that helps to make fair and objective assessments and to carry out effective appraisal interview, Ambiguity on the job description, goals, traits, poor criteria and cumbersome techniques, In effective rating instrument and more forms than substance, Fall to consult with managers, employees, and associations about the design and implementation of appraisals before they are introduced, Absence of regular monitoring of the schemes, Systems are not generic/tailor-made to the specific organization rather passed from other organization/company, and Unable to keep the scheme as simple and straight forward as possible.

B. Challenges/Errors of the Rater/Appraiser

a. Halo error/effect-occurs when a rater allows a single prominent characteristic of an employee to influence his or her judgment on each separate item in the performance appraisal. (Byars, p: 259) It is said that "the first impression is the last impression". In other words, a high rating in one trait leads to automatically to high ratings on all other traits and the reverse is also true. As it is vividly explained by (Mejia Gomez, 1995:267) there are two causes of halo error:

A supervisor may make an overall judgment about a worker and then confirm all dimensional ratings to that judgment and/or, a supervisor may make all ratings consistent with the worker's performance level on a dimension that is important to the superior. One way of minimizing this effect might be apprising all the employees by one trait before going to rate on the basis of another trait.

b. Constant error/Leniency and strictness- The leniency bias crops when some raters have a tendency to be liberal in their rating by assigning higher rates consistently(Rao,1990:239)Such ratings do not serve any purpose. Equally damaging one is assigning consistently low rates.

c. **Recency effect-** tendency of a manager to evaluate employees on work performed most recently, usually one or two months prior to evaluation rather than the whole activity (Byars, 1992:259).

d. Central Tendency: tendency of a manager to rate most employees' performance near the middle of the performance scales (Byars, 1992:259). In other words, some managers follow" play safe policy" by avoiding rating employees at both the extremes of the scale. (Rao, 1990:247) the reason behind is answerability to management or lack of knowledge about the job and person he/she is rating or least interest in his job.

e. Personal prejudice/bias: If the rater dislikes any employee or any group, he may rate them at the lower end, which may distort the rating purpose and affect the career of these employees. (Rao, 1990:247)

f. Same-to-me/Similar to me Error: this is favoring the performance of employees, who are similar in their behavior to one self/rater (Mejia Gomez, 1995:268).

g. Contrast Error: Sequencing of ratings or when the performance of an appraisee taken as referent to rate that of others. In other words, if superior appraised first then average performers will be rated low. On the contrary, if poor performers are appraised first, average performers will be rated high (Mejia Gomez, 1995:268).

C. Challenges/Errors of Ratee/Appraisee

Most employees believe that they are doing a good job so that negative appraisal and feedback can be highly morale deteriorating, and as a result it can cause them to perform worse. In addition, lose of trust and confidence on the appraisers.

1. Ingratiating Behavior or 'upward influence styles': refers to

Subordinates gain credit for pushing ahead with management plans that are absurdly wrong. In pursuit of aims which are completely pointless. Stifling criticism, which emanate from either of purpose or method with cries of 'commitment and loyalty, creating unnecessary impression.

Three Types of appraise errors can be:

a) Job-focused ingratiation: Claiming credit for things you have done and not done, Claiming credit for what the group has done. This can be shown by Arriving at work early to look good, and working late to look good

b) Supervisor focused ingratiation: are taking an interest in the supervisor's private life praising the supervisor. Doing favor for the supervisor, volunteering to help the supervisor and complementing the supervisor on his/her appearance and dress and Agreeing with the supervisor idea.

c) **Self-focused ingratiation:** Presenting self to the supervisor as a polite and friendly person, working hard when results will be seen by the supervisor, letting the supervisor know that you are trying to do a good job. All these contaminate appraisal ratings and make them less accurate reflections of true worth to the organization. This tends to be bad for staff morale and motivation when staff observe persons whose true performance is poor but are good at ingratiating themselves, get merit awards, or promotion, or other marks of favor.

In this chapter attempts have been made to show how performance appraisal developed from trait (individual) appraisal to comprehensive Performance appraisal system. Different scholars at different times forwarded different definitions; but PA is recognized as a systematic, strategic, and integrated approach. Ownership by management, participatory in nature, specific to organization's needs, availability of required skills are basic principles of the system. Its purpose, in general is developmental and administrative while purposes of measurement is to see achievements of objectives and take remedial actions on deviations. As regards to model development it must be tailored to specific conditions of organizations, because there is no one best way of doing PA. Contributing factors for its success are leadership, commitment, organizational culture, customer identification and involvement, development and fulfillment of resources etc.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents about the research design, sample and sampling techniques, instrument of data collection, method of data analysis, and ethical considerations are briefly discussed below.

3.1. Research Design

In this study descriptive survey research design was used by using both qualitative and quantitative method. Descriptive survey research design is particularly important for the study because it helps to describe and interpret the actual events that exist now and existed in the past and that have influences on the present performance appraisal system of JMSC. Moreover, Greene and Nagy (2010) argued that while using mixed methods researcher should consider triangulation, complementarily, development, initiation and expansion.

According to Cohen, Anion & Morrison (2005), descriptive research design is used to collect numerical data from large population. In addition to this by using descriptive research method it is easy to use various forms of data as well as incorporating human experience which enabled the researcher to look the study in so many various aspects and can provide bigger overview about the subject matter. It also gives room to use both quantitative and qualitative data in order to find solution to the specific study. This in turn can help to describe and give an answer to certain life experiences.

The researcher believed that for a better understanding of the issue covered in the study, this type of method is appropriate. Because this method enables to assess, describe, and interpret the perception of teachers towards result oriented performance appraisal system at Joint military staff college.

3.2.Source of Data

In this study both primary and secondary source of data were used. The primary sources of data was collected from senior students, instructors, department heads and administrative personnel at Joint Military Staff College and other stake holders from education and training main department. Secondary data source were collected through assessing performance

appraisal document, monitoring and evaluation report. These documents were used largely for the purpose of triangulation.

3.3.Population, Sample size and Sampling Technique

The population for this study consists of all teaching staff of JMSC, senior students and other stakeholders. JMSC structured with four faculties consist of four departments each, with a total number of 124 teachers, 100 senior students which means 3rd year students and 55 supporting staff. From these 279 total populations more than 30% are included in the sample.

The sampling technique used for this study is simple random sampling by taking teaching staff the college, senior students, and department head. This method is used to give equal chance to the population to make sure the representativeness of the data and also to ensure the representative of all characteristics of the population which it is not considered by the researcher. In addition purposive sampling technique was implemented for those who are directly responsible with performance management system. It is the researcher belief that using this method was enables to have in-depth knowledge from those who are in a position to give about the practice of performance management system at JMSC and other stake holders.

Through these sampling techniques the researcher wasconduct the study in four faculties of Joint military Staff College, in sixteen departments and six selected staff from the colleges' administration. The instructors, and department heads are among the people who directly involved in the implementation of the performance appraisal system of the college. By purposive sampling technique, the researcher was selected these subjects who are believed to be part of the preparation and implementation of result oriented performance appraisal system in Joint Military Staff College.

Table2. Participant type

No.	Participant type	Combat engineering faculty	Communication faculty	Intelligence faculty	Logistic faculty	Total
	Senior students	05	10	10	15	40
	Teachers	10	10	10	10	40
	Department heads	04	04	04	04	16
	Administrative staff	-	-	-	-	4
	Stake holders	-	-	-	-	3
Total		19	24	24	19	97

3.4.Instrument and procedure of data collection

3.4.1. Instrument of data collection tools

The main instruments for data collection were used sequentially. Thus the following instrument was develop and employed. Questionnaire for the teachers, students and department heads, top administrative staff and selected department heads, Interview for document analysis the colleges' performance appraisal documents, monitoring and evaluation reports were used.

Questionnaire: - Regarding to the questionnaire it was designed for 97 teachers, department heads and senior students. A cover page was prepared which explains the purpose of the study and instruction to be followed by the respondents. The questionnaire was included both close and open ended for in-depth information. In the case of close ended questions, items were rated by use of Likert scale, rating scale based on the scale from " strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" or three part rating scale(agree, disagree, uncertain). Regarding open ended questions the purpose is to get additional and supportive information about the study under consideration and to get background of information.

Interview: - Another important tool was implemented to collect the primary data was Semi structured interview. In terms of the interview design 4 department heads, 2 academic deans, 1 human resource officer of the college and 3 stake holders from education and training main department were collected for additional information. The issue is about the idea of ROPAS based on its purpose and implementation, what do you think if you agree why? Or if you don't agree why? And other WH questions were asked. The informants were collected purposefully by asking information about the respondent's knowledge of the ROPAS practice and challenges. The medium the instruction used is mostly Amharic to enable the informants to express freely without language barrier and 20-25 minutes was taken to interview each informant due to this substantial information was gathered.

Document Analysis: - The data collection technique used by this instrument were mainly focus on the assessment of performance appraisal documents and monitoring and evaluation reports taken during the preparation and implementation of result oriented performance appraisal. Furthermore annual reports and performance management system procedure of Joint Military Staff College was assessed for better understand how the college practically implements the performance management system. How they understood the system, how it is customized to JMSC, what challenges they faced with all the process and how they planned to manage the challenges in the future to enhance individual, unit and organization's performance for successful implementation of organizational vision and mission.

3.4.2. Procedure of data collection

The researcher was get full permission from the college management to dispatch the questionnaire, conduct interview and made document analysis from the available and useful documents for the study. Accordingly, the researcher met the selected participants and administered the questionnaire by orienting the purpose of the study, how they fill it out, where and when to submit the papers after they filled it. eventually**,** two sets of questionnaires composed of open ended and close ended question items is prepared then the questioners was distributed to senior students, teachers, and department heads. The researcher was gave the questionnaires by hand. The respondents were filled the questionnaires and the researcher was collect the questionnaires from the respondents. For the Interview, guiding semi structured questions was prepared in Amharic for clarity of information and it makes easy to

communicate between the researcher and the respondents. By the same procedure all the papers were deliver to the researcher and the returned papers hopefully well done. The document analysis and interviews were also conducted simultaneously.

3.5.Method of Data Analysis

Data analysis begins with a report on the number of returns and non-returns of the questionnaire instrument. After capturing this information about questionnaire response, the data gathered through questionnaire has two parts, the first part is questionnaire related to background information that is about the demographic characteristics of the informants. The second part of the questionnaire is related to the basic research question. The data gathered from questionnaire was summarized and analyzed by using descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage and mean. Then the data was described using tables for more clarification and the data were coded using scientific statistical data analysis software such as SPSS version 20. The data gained from interview and document review is analyzed contextually as per the research basic questions.

3.6.Ethical consideration

The researcher ensured that the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants was maintained through the removal of any identified characteristics before widespread dissemination of information. The researcher made it clear that the participants name would not be used for any other purpose, nor were information shared that to bear their identity in any way.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter discusses the findings of the study regarding to perception, implementation and problems/challenges/ encountered in teachers result oriented performance appraisal system at joint military staff college. The analysis of this chapter consists of two parts, the first part is the characteristics of the respondents and the second part deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of findings.

4.1. Demographic characteristics of the respondents

The sample size of the subjects that were included in the study was 52 teachers and department heads, 40 students and 5 stake holders. Out of these 52 teachers and department heads, 40 students and 5 stakeholders filled the questionnaires and returned. The characteristics of these respondents are described in terms of sex, work experience andeducational qualification.

Table 3; characteristics of respondents

Variables	Choice items	Respondents			
		Department heads and teachers		Students and stake holders	
		No	%	No	%
Sex	Male	49	94.2	36	80
	Female	3	5.8	9	20
	Total	52	100	45	100
Age	26-30	5	9.6	18	40
	31-35	11	21.2	21	46.7
	36-40	25	48.1	-	-
	Above 41	11	21.2	6	13.3
	Total	52	100	45	100
Teaching experience /service year in the army	≤5 years	29	55.5	1	2.2
	6-10	13	25	4	8.9
	11-15	8	15.4	27	60
	16-20	1	1.9	13	28
	≥ 21 years	1	1.9	-	-
	Total	52	100	45	100
Qualification	BA/BSC	39	75	-	-
	MA/MSC	13	25	-	-
	Total	52	100	-	-

According to table 3 out of the total population, 12(25.8%) of them were female who filled and returned the questionnaire. Regarding to respondents years of work experience,29 (55.5%) teachers and department heads and 1(2.2%) students and stakeholders had below 5 years work experience, 13(25%) teachers and department heads and 4(8%) students and stake holders had 6-10 years, 8(15.4%) teachers and department heads and 27(60%) students and stakeholders had 11-15 years, 1(1.9%) teachers and department heads and 13(28%) students and stake holders had 16-20 years and 1(1.9%) teachers and department heads had above 21 years of work experience.in case of respondents qualification, 39(75%) teachers and department heads were BA/BSC degree holders, 13(25%) teachers and department heads were MA/MSC degree holders. This show that large numbers of teachers and department heads were less experience in teaching, the number of MA/MSC degree holders and female teachers is very small, therefore there would be a quality problem in the implementation of result oriented performance appraisal system.

4.2. Analysis and Interpretations of Data

4.2.1. Perception of Teachers on ROPAS

Some of the purposes of ROPAS were listed and teachers were asked to respond if these purposes were achieved in their colleges. Accordingly, to analyze the data the five point Likert scale of very high (5), high (4), moderate (3), low (2), and very low (1) was used.

Teachers were asked to identify the major purposes that they think ROPAS served in their colleges. To this end, eight purposes were presented. The mean value, and average mean score values were interpreted as very low (0.5 – 1.49), low (1.5 – 2.49), moderate (2.5 – 3.49), high (3.5 – 4.49) and very high for 4.5 and above.

Basically, one of the purposes of ROPAS is providing opportunities for teachers to develop their professional knowledge, skills and attitudes. That is giving further education or training to teachers. However, it seemed that the attainment of this objective was moderate as revealed by the respondents.

Item 1 of table 4 indicates the role of ROPAS in providing information to promotion, transfer and termination decisions. This was rated to be at an intermediate level with mean score of 3.25. Responses from the interview and open ended questions revealed that teachers were evaluated to identify incompetent or inefficient teachers from the efficient ones. As they said,

If a teacher isfound to be incompetent based on the information obtained from the efficiency oriented appraisal, he/she will be terminated or suspended.

Table4. The degree of achievements of ROPAS as perceived by teachers

No	Purpose of evaluation items	Respondents rating scale Teachers & department heads (N=52)					
		Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	Mean value
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	To provide information to promotion, transfer and termination decisions	1	10	20	17	4	3.25
2	To insure the selection and development Programs for teachers	1	10	23	17	4	3.13
3	To provide feedback to teachers	3	11	19	15	4	3.11
4	To serve as basis for reward and punishment	5	16	21	9	1	2.71
5	To counsel Teachers	3	20	23	3	3	2.67
6	To arrange in-service training for incompetent teachers.	3	16	28	5	-	2.67
7.	To promote college improvement.	5	16	23	8	-	2.65
8	To decide on teacher's salary improvement	10	19	17	5	1	2.38
Average mean score							2.82

***0.05 – 1.49 very low; 1.5 – 2.49 low; 2.5 – 3.49 moderate; 3.5 – 4.49 high; and above 4.5 very high**

The information obtained from the document analysis and evaluation report revealed that a teacher was transferred to translation section because of his in competency in teaching based on the information gathered from students. But the teacher has obtained high performance result and has got the academic rank of Assistant lecturer before two months of his transfer. That was an indicator for the respondents rating of item 1 to be moderate.

Achievements of purpose of ROPAS in providing performance feedback to teachers and in arranging in-service training for incompetent teachers were moderate as can be observed from the mean scores of 2.67 and 3.11 respectively. According to the responses of some teachers to the open –ended item, the ROPAS has almost not served as a basis for in-service

training. If a teacher has obtained poor performance result the measure taken upon him/her is mostly termination or suspension than focusing on providing training and experience sharing. Accordingly, the main reason is that the criteria, in most cases, do not focus on the major duties and responsibilities of the teacher rather they focus on the secondary tasks that do not have direct relationship with the teaching learning process. Regarding to providing feedback to teachers, the teachers responded that they are appraise simply to fulfill the formality because their appraisers are there to blame poor performance in case there were initiate some rumors or accusation on their appraisal feedback. This implies that teachers develop negative attitude towards their performance appraisal. They perceive it as fault finding rather than being an opportunity to improve their competence.

In addition, it seems that incompetent teachers were not properly identified through the appraisal. Regarding to achievements of ROPAS purposes in serving as a basis for reward allocation, to counsel teachers, to promote college improvements and to decide on teacher's salary improvements were moderate as we observe from the mean scores of 2.71, 2.67, 2.65 and 2.38 respectively. This implies that the teachers are appraised for the sake of appraising them without providing them with reward and counseling. If teachers are not provided with salary increments or rewards, this will lead them to lower performance because of the fact that denying recognition and failure to praise the good performance is praising poor performers. Whether they perform better or not, no rewards or salary advancements will come as a result of the appraisal. The information obtained from the documents of all the sample departments in the college no teacher has failed to get academic promotion and salary advancement as far as he/she has covered the duration that he/she should stay in the previous rank stay in the previous rank.

In general, as can be seen from the table 4 the respondents put it clearly that the result oriented performance appraisal system in their colleges had been moderate in achieving the above listed. The ROPAS purpose as it can be seen from the average mean score of 2.82, inclined to the moderate values of the average scale.

According to the data collected through open ended questions and interview conducted with department heads responded that they perceived that the purpose of teachers performance appraisal were met to some extent the purpose intended for it. But when we come to the

teachers and the students they have not agreed on the purpose of the teachers' performance appraisal intended for it. They justified on the open ended questions that they understood the main purpose of ROTPA is to improve the performance of the teachers on their teaching learning process, but this purpose was ignored and the PA is filled only to full fill the formality.

4.2.2. Perception of teachers towards the criteria of ROTPA

Regarding the purposes of ROPAS, teachers were asked to respond if the criteria were developed according to the purposes in their college. Accordingly, to analyze the data the five point Likert scale of strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1) were used. As it could be understood from item 1 of table 4, the teachers strongly opposed the idea that teachers participated in the formulation of the ROTPA criteria in their colleges. Accordingly, to analyze the data the five point Likert scale of strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1) were used. As it could be understood from item 1 of table 4, the teachers strongly opposed the idea that teachers participated in the formulation of the ROPAS criteria in their department.

The mean scores of teachers' responses for the table 3 item 1 were 3.21, which is moderate. This indicates that teachers are strange to the criteria set by the college upper body in collaboration with the academic dean, and only called upon to implement the already established criteria. As to the responses of some teachers, the ROPAS criteria have got two problems. First, the criteria's themselves are formulated with no involvement of teachers in their establishment. Second, those criteria focus the behaviors and level of relationship of teachers that have little to do with the day –to-day teaching – learning process. The responses to interview conducted with the college commandants and the academic dean indicated that the criteria were developed from the information and performance appraisal formats of different colleges and discussed with very few teachers and department heads.

In the responses to interview questions conducted with the higher institutions coordinator of the Training Main Department, the reason why the mandate has given to the colleges is due to the reason that the criteria should take into consideration the objective reality of the college. Accordingly, there has been an attempt to develop general framework of the format to be used by all the college with minimum mandate to its adjustment.

According to the interview conducted with deans department heads and a few stake holders, regarding to the criteria of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system they reported that there was no participation and no clear understanding on the formulation of the criteria. They justified that due to lack of experience in higher education performance appraisal system and the newness of the college, Although College commandant and academic deans had a little participation on the formulation of the criteria. The criteria was formulated by the Defense Education and Teaching Main department and sent to the colleges without adequate discussion on it.

Generally, according to some literatures in any organization including educational institutions, the front line actors or implementers were highly required to take part in the establishment of criteria if proper acceptance and implementation of those criteria was required on the part of the appraises. In addition, as these criteria were only set by those individuals who do not comprise the majority of teachers, their validity and reliability were also questionable.

Table5. Teacher's Response on ROPAS Criteria.

NO	Adequacy and appropriateness of the evaluation criteria	Respondents rating scale Teachers & department heads (N=52)					
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean value
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	In the result oriented teachers Performance appraisal system There is a high participation of teachers and stake holders in the development and formulation of criteria.	2	15	7	26	2	3.21
2	Adequate training is given to the formulators of the criteria.	1	14	19	18	-	3.03
3	physical and psychological preparation is made during the formulation of criteria	3	8	22	18	1	3.11
4	The criteria used are clear	1	7	20	22	2	3.32
5	the criteria used are relevant to the purposes of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system	2	8	17	24	1	3.32
6	The criteria employed are better in promoting teachers professional development	1	8	17	24	2	3.34
7.	The current appraisal system objectively; Measures teachers' professional competence	2	10	20	14	3	3.15
8	Promote teachers motivation to work	6	9	20	14	3	2.98
9	Strengthen student-teachers r/n ship	3	8	22	18	1	3.11
10	Strengthen teachers-Administrative relationship	4	6	22	18	2	3.15
11	The preparation of teachers' appraisal system has been exhaustive	2	8	18	23	1	3.25
Average mean score							3.17

***0.05 – 1.49 very low; 1.5 – 2.49 low; 2.5 – 3.49 medium; 3.5 – 4.49 high; and above 4.5 very high.**

Item 2 of table 5 also reflects the clarity of the ROPAS as perceived by the respondents, the mean value for this item is 3.038. This implies that the respondents perceived the ROPAS criteria as moderately vague. The department head also disclosed in the interview made with the investigator that the ROPAS criteria were to some extent vague because of the reason that they were adopted from different colleges and the majority of the teachers and other staff members have not been involved in their formulation.

Item regarding to the relevance of the criteria to the purposes of ROPAS was moderate with the mean value of 2.63. This indicates that the criteria were not developed based on the purposes intended to bring about the quality of education through training and development provision for teachers. In the same way, Item 1.4 of table 5 also indicates that the criteria employed in promoting teachers' professional responsibilities were perceived as low with the mean value of 3.32. In relation with this, the information obtained from the interviews conducted with department heads indicates that, the teachers were not made to focus on their professional responsibilities, because most of the elements in the criteria were concerned with the relationship of the teacher with his peers and his supervisors. In addition to this, teachers were also evaluated based on their performance of the additional non-teaching duties.

In respect to the above information, teachers tend to concentrate on the behavioral factors such as punctuality, respect to the people, and participation in meeting and so on. These and other factors of the criteria influence the teachers to have less concern to their professional responsibilities and better concern for the behavioral factors in order to acquire better performance appraisal result that lead to promotion and other benefits.

Table 5 item5 and 8 also illustrates that the role played by the ROPAS criteria in measuring teachers' professional competence, and the objectivity of the criteria in strengthening the teacher- administrator were moderate inclined to its lower boundary with mean values of 3.32 and 2.980 respectively. This also implies that, the criteria developed are more of subjective in measuring the performance of teachers; this in turn led to loose relationship between the teacher and administrator. In addition the behavioral aspects of the criteria were failed to measure the professional competence of teachers in respect to the teaching-learning process.

According to the data collected from the open ended questions the criteria were clear to some extent and focus more on the altitudinal aspect of the teachers rather than focusing on teaching learning process. Their justification for this was the profession which means the military profession needs strong discipline and commitment with performance competence.

Generally, as observed from table 3, the ROPAS criteria were perceived to be moderate that is inclined to low, in achieving their objectives as rated by college teachers with average mean score of 3.21.

4.2.3. Teachers' Perception of the Training and Competence of their Appraisers

Before embarking in to teachers' performance evaluation, the appraisers themselves need to pass considerably appropriate knowledge and skills of teacher evaluation. In this regard, this study is also intended to identify the perception of teachers concerning the competence, training and experience of the appraisers. As illustrated in table 4 below, some four factors were listed and teachers were asked to rate their appraisers against the factors using the five point Likert scale

Table6. Teachers view on their Appraisers.

No	Behaviors of appraisers	Appraisers	Respondent's rating scale Teachers (N=52)					
			SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean value
			1	2	3	4	5	
1	Have competence and fitness	Dean	4	10	13	23	2	3.17
		Department head	2	14	12	21	3	3.17
		Student	3	14	11	20	4	3.15
2	Have adequate training on teachers result oriented performance appraisal system	Dean	2	15	15	17	3	3.07
		Department head	4	18	14	13	3	2.86
		Student	3	25	16	5	3	2.61
3	Use reliable and clear criteria	Dean	2	10	14	22	4	3.30
		Department head	1	16	16	19	4	3.11
		Student	5	13	18	13	3	2.92
4	Have adequate experience on teachers result oriented performance appraisal system	Dean	3	12	16	19	2	3.09
		Department head	3	15	17	12	5	3.01
		Student	3	16	20	11	2	2.86
5	Show favoritism or bias	Dean	5	13	20	8	6	2.94
		Department head	4	15	16	13	6	2.80
		Student	2	15	16	14	6	3.11
6	Much focus on criticism	Dean	2	16	14	14	6	3.11
		Department head	3	20	13	11	4	2.90
		Student	7	20	10	11	4	2.71
	Average Mean score for Items 1-6	Dean						3.21
		Department head						2.98
		Student						2.89
	Weighted Mean Score for Items 1-6							3.03

With regard to the adequacy of training of appraisers, the respondents agreed that all the three groups of appraisers (deans, department heads, and students) have moderate level of adequacy of training. This was indicated by the mean scores of 3.07, 2.86 and 2.61respectively. The

department heads also revealed the fact that they did not have the required level of training to the teachers' appraisal disclosed in the interview.

The interview conducted with the commandants and college deans also indicated that department heads and students have not provided with adequate training concerning the teachers' appraisal system rather than short orientation, let alone receiving adequate training in the area of ROPAS. In addition, the deans were recruited by the Defense education and training main department on the basis of their academic qualification, which are MA/MSC holders, than the specific field of study they have in relation to school administration or educational management. The department heads, in the interview also disclosed that the deans do not have the qualification of college management because they are graduates military science, leadership and other type of education not related to educational leadership. Moreover, they responded that they themselves are not graduated from education related fields nor had the required training on how ROTPA should be handled and conducted. These were probably the reason why the respondents rated the appraisers moderate inclined to low in this item.

As regards to experience of the appraisers, item 4 of table 6, the respondents indicated that department heads and deans have moderate level of experience in appraising teachers' performance as shown by mean scores of 3.096 and 3.01 respectively. The respondents, with regard to the experience of deans on ROTPA, rated as low with the mean score 2.86. These mean scores indicated that the deans and department heads were rated as moderate because of the dean and department heads evaluated the performance of teachers relatively regular in some intervals, at every week month or end of the semester or term whereas the students evaluate the teacher's performance once in a semester or a year.

Generally, teachers rated the level of competence, training and experience on their appraiser to be moderate inclined to low, with average mean scores of 3.21, 2.98 and 2.89 for deans, department heads and students respectively. Accordingly, these scores indicated that all the three groups of appraisers did not have the required level of competence, training and experience in regard to the appraisal of teachers' performance. The weighted mean 3.03 also implies the fact that enough has not been done on the area.

Responses were also gathered to identify the perception of teaches concerning the objectivity of their appraisers. Hence, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreements based on rating scales.

As depicted in item 5 of table 6, teachers indicated that college deans are not objective enough in appraising their performance. This was expressed by the mean score of 2.94, which is high inclined moderate. The teachers also indicated that department heads and students were not also objective in appraising their performance. The mean scores 2.80 and 3.11 respectively indicated that the department heads and students are subject to favoritism and bias in evaluating the performance of the teachers. As indicated in the responses of open ended questions, the reason why teachers regarded their appraisers to be subjective to some extent was probably be to do with the ROTPA criteria the appraisers were employing currently. These criteria were said to be trait or behavior based rather than performance oriented, which perhaps lead to subjectivity.

One of the points raised as a ROTPA problem by teachers in their responses to the open-ended question was that teachers have not been fairly evaluated by deans. They reported that they are not classified not in terms of their qualification or performance directly related to the teaching- learning process rather in terms of their views or relationship and respect to their appraisers and supervisors. They said, “even though the name implies performance appraisal, teachers are not exactly evaluated by their achievement.”

The interview discussion made also indicated that students who were dissatisfied with grades seem to take revenge on some teachers during evaluation. That is, if the teacher being appraised has good rapport with students and fair to them in grading, he/ she is likely to be rated high by the student-appraisers while the reverse well be done to those teachers who were not. According to the responses of the deans, “there is a tit-for-tat relationship between some students and teachers.” According to the department heads’ response to the interview, students sometimes showed bias in their evaluation because the term or semester evaluation has been made after the exam had completed. This also contributed the students to show favoritism on their evaluation of teachers’ performance depending on the result they expected from the exam.

As indicated by table 6 item 4, the teacher-respondents agreed that college deans focus much on criticism during the appraisal of teachers' performance than that of department heads and students with mean values of 3.11, 2.90 and 2.71 respectively. This implies that deans as part on the type evaluation conducted to upgrade or measure the efficiency of teachers are likely to raise each point from the list and criticize teachers. It was that they were rated by teacher-respondents moderate, inclined to high with mean value of 3.11. In addition to the above, respondents indicated to problems of TPA that, the appraisers' focal point during the appraisal was the behavior or traits of teachers and not their strengths achievements. Since the department heads also take part in such an evaluation, they play role to some extent. That is why the teachers rated department heads medium next to deans concerning criticism as we observe from the table. Compared to department heads and deans, students were rated low by the group or respondents as indicated by the mean score of 2.71. Students did not participate in the selection of teachers for upgrading or academic promotion, this could be the reason for them to be rated low.

According to the data collected through open ended and interview regarding to the competence in appraising teachers, reported that the majority of the students filled the appraisal without any bias but few students are biased in filling the teachers' appraisal in seeking high score without their performance result, thus lead to deteriorate the students-teacher relationship. Also in peer evaluation have a problem due to few teachers filled the appraisal by intimacy with each other.

In general, the appraisees' perception regarding objectivity and criticism during TPA was found to be moderate, not good or not bad, as indicated with the average mean scores of 3.20, 2.77 and 2.77 for deans, department heads and students respectively. The weighted mean score of 2.91 also reveals the fact. In addition to the above, the respondents indicated that the appraisers showed relatively high favoritism or bias than focusing on criticism with average mean scores of 3.0 and 2.83 respectively.

4.2.4. Teachers' Perception of the ROPAS process

As stated previously, appraising the performance of teachers needs certain logical steps. One of the major purposes of this study, therefore, was to know the perception of teachers towards the implementation of the process of ROPAS in Joint Military Staff College Thus, a process

of ROPAS that needs to be followed was listed in the table 5 below. Then teaches were asked to respond if this has currently been working in their institutions. The rating scales very high, high, medium, low, and very low was used, while the results from the table were interpreted in the same way as table 5.

The primary action in any performance appraisal system is the formulation of objectives, which is the joint activity of the appraisee and his/her immediate supervision. A closer look at table 3 indicates that this primary duty of the appraiser and the appraisee was seem to be neglected. This could be seen from the mean score of 2.92.

Literatures in this field suggest that by participating employees in establishing their own goals, they are encouraged to think about their work, to capitalize experiences, and to believe in the objectives (Terry and Stephen, 1999:128). As it could be observed from the responses of the respondents, this first step is almost in existent in the colleges under study. The reason was that, according to the interview with the department heads, objectives pertinent to the teaching learning process are formulated by the upper body of the colleges, with minimum participation of few teachers and department heads, and distributed to each department heads through the academic dean. The department heads, then distribute these list of objectives to teachers. Then teachers read the already established objectives and prepare their own action plans with the minimum orientation they receive from department heads. In addition, the responsibilities and duties of teachers and department heads were not clearly identified, as observed from the document. As mentioned by the teachers on the problems of ROPAS, in some cases they were not made aware of the duties and responsibilities they should carry out.

Table 7, Teachers' Response regarding to the process of monitoring and evaluation system of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system.

No	Items regarding implementation process actions.	Respondents rating scale Teachers & department heads (N=52)					
		Very low	low	Moderate	High	Very high	Mean value
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Prior to any action, both the appraiser and the appraise meet and establish and agree upon objectives	2	15	22	11	2	2.92
2	Appraiser and their appraisees develop action plans from the already set objectives.	4	17	23	7	1	2.69
3	Evaluation of performance is made against the previously established objectives.	3	14	21	11	3	2.94
4	Providing feedback to the appraisee	5	12	21	12	2	2.88
5	Deans and department heads have a good follow up in monitoring and evaluation during the appraisal time	5	16	23	6	2	2.69
Average mean score							2.82

In general, when referring to table 7 teachers rated the two items (item 3 and 4) moderate with the mean scores of 2.94 and 2.88 respectively, also item 1 and 2 were perceived to be moderate by the respondents, as indicated by the mean scores of 2.92 and 2.69, respectively. As depicted by table 5 item 2, the respondents rated the preparation of action plans moderate inclined to be low, with the mean score 2.69. This shows that even though teachers did not take part in the formulation of objectives, they prepared action plans independent of their appraisers (supervisors) for the attainment of the objectives. Item 3 and 4 of table 6 also indicate that the two steps were achieved at intermediate level in the institutions. That is, evaluation of performance against the formulated objectives and provision of feed back to the appraisee were made practical moderately (inclined to low), as indicated by the mean scores of 2.94 and 2.88 respectively. Regarding to follow up in monitoring and evaluation during the appraisal time respondents replied mean score of 2.69 which is moderately inclined to be low it shows there is a problem in follow up and monitoring the evaluation process it is also seen in the open ended questions.Generally regarding to the last yes or no question about the

college deans and your immediate supervisors/department heads/ orient you about the teachers result oriented performance appraisal system prior to the appraisal process the respondent replied 15(28.84%) yes, 37(71.15%) no it shows there is a little orientation take place with teachers about the appraisal process and there is a failure in monitoring and evaluation process during the appraisal time.

Table 8: Teachers' perception of their Performance Appraisal Feedback

No	Item regarding to appraisal feedback	Respondents Teachers (No=52)	
		No	%
1	Frequency of performance appraisal feedback provided by appraisers		
	• Once in a semester	**36**	**69.23**
	• Twice in a semester	**5**	**9.61**
	• More than twice in a semester	**1**	**1.92**
	• Once in a year	**4**	**7.69**
	• Not at all	**6**	**11.58**
2	Opinion regarding the timeliness of the performance feed back		
	• Well timed	**19**	**36.53**
	• Late	**27**	**51.92**
	• Too late	**3**	**5.76**
	• Not at all	**3**	**5.76**
3	Discussions on the result of performance Appraisal		
	• Yes	**20**	**38.46**
	• No	**32**	**61.54**
4	The right to appeal and challenge against your performance feed back		
	• Yes	**16**	**30.77**
	• No	**27**	**51.92**
	• To some extent	**9**	**17.31**
5	Sources of TPA in the college		
	• College deans	**3**	**5.76**
	• Peer	**19**	**36.54**
	• Students	**29**	**55.77**
	• Department head	**22**	**42.31**
	• Other	**2**	**3.85**
6	Problems Related to Appraisal Process		
	• Lack of adequate training given to deans, department heads and teachers.	**19**	**36.54**
	• Using deans or department heads alone as appraisers.		
	• Low participation of teachers in developing appraisal criteria.	**5**	**9.62**
	• Poor communication between the appraiser and the appraisee during ongoing Performance review	**24**	**46.15**
	• Absence of students' involvement to appraise teachers' class room performance	**22**	**42.31**
	• Poor follow up and remedial approach of the appraiser.	**5**	**9.62**
		23	**44.23**

As item 1 of table 8 shows majority of the respondent 36(69.23%) replied their feedback provided once in a semester Those respondents 5(9.61 %) who responded as twice in a semester probably are the new hires who were confused between the appraisal feedback which is provided every six months and the monthly follow up and performance meeting made by department heads. Similarly, teachers were also asked to express their perception regarding the timeliness of the performance feedback, table 8 item 2 depicts that the majority 27(51.92 %) of the respondents got their performance appraisal feedback late after the appraisal. That is they are not provided with the feedback soon. The remaining19 (36.53%) of the teachers responded that they got their feedback on time; while 3(5.76%) replied too late and 3(5.76%) replied not at all. This shows that some new hire teachers are not aware of about their appraisal feedback time.

This implies that most of the teachers 27(51.92%) were not provided with their performance feedback on time. Provision of feedback late and too late after the appraisal can cause the teachers fail to improve their weakness and maintain their strength in the teaching – learning process. As can be seen in table 8 item 3, 32(61.54%) of the teachers' respondents agreed that their appraisers do not discuss with them on the result of their performance appraisal. The teachers' response to the open ended questions and the interview conducted with the department heads, appraisers did not discuss their teachers on the result of their performance appraisal. According to the teachers, the reason why a discussion was not conducted is that the deans used the appraisal not for formative purpose rather for some administrative (summative) purpose. The rest 20(38.46%) of the respondents expressed their perception as there was discussions with their appraisers concerning their performance appraisal result. The teachers' respond to the open ended questions said that the discussion was not initiated by their appraisers rather when there is a demand from the teachers.

Similarly, teachers were also asked to express their feelings regarding the right to appeal and challenge against their performance feedback. Accordingly, 16(30.77%) of the teachers responded that they have the right to appeal and challenge against their performance feedback; 27(51.92 %) of the respondents responded they did not have the right to challenge and appeal to their performance appraisal result, while 9(17.31 %) responded that the right to appeal is not always practical. Sometimes the office of the dean is open to accommodate the

feeling of the teachers to appeal against their appraisal result where as some times it did not. According to the open- ended questions, the teachers said that there is no clear procedure to apple if challenges exist in the appraisal result, even though there is the right to appeal or challenge against their performance appraisal result, it is not to alter the result rather than expressing the their feelings.

As depicted in table 8 item 5, teachers were asked to express their perception regarding the sources of their ROTPA. Accordingly, a considerable number 29(55.77%) and 22(42.31%) of the respondents respectively responded that the sources of ROTPA were students and department heads. Similarly, 19 (36.54%) and 3 (5.76%) choose peers and college deans respectively as sources of their performance appraisal, in addition to the above sources. According to the interview conducted with the department heads, the reason why most of the teachers chose department heads as the main source of ROTPA next to students was probably due to the role played by department heads the day-to-day contact and follow up they had with teachers. The interview also conducted with the commandants and deans of the four colleges indicated that the TPA objectives which were established by the colleges were exposed and put into practice through department heads. The department heads also follow up teachers monthly to see if the objectives are properly being implemented. In addition to this, department heads also sit together with college deans and students to appraise teachers. Students were rated high who take part in teachers' evaluation.

According to the evaluation report analysis, three students are selected from each class based on their academic performance and military rank. Then, they were given minimum orientation concerning the evaluation of teachers and allowed to sit for monthly meeting concerning the teaching- learning process and performance of teachers. Besides this, students evaluate the teaching learning process at the end of every week or two weeks, although not regular, and fill the format provided to them at the end of every semester (term) concerning performance of teachers. This could by the reason why teachers rated students high as a source of ROTPA. The deans also participated in the efficiency oriented ROTPA systems and the evaluation that took place at the end of every semester. That could be a reason for them to be rated relatively low compared with the other sources of ROTPA.

In general, even though the multi- appraisal system which is being practiced in those colleges seemed to be fair, the role played by peers and college deans was inadequate as indicates by table 8 item 5.Regarding to the problems related to the appraisal process, majority of the respondent replied 24(46.15%), 23(44.23%), 22(42.31%) and 19(36.54%) for the factors stated in table 6 item 6 which were low participation of teachers in developing appraiser criteria, poor follow up and remedial approach of the appraisers, poor communication between the appraisers and appraise during ongoing performance review and lack of adequate training given to deans, department heads and teachers respectively. The other responded 5(9.62%) and 5(9.62%) for the factors stated in table 6 item 6 which were using deans and department heads as appraisers and absence of students' involvement to appraise teachers in classroom respectively.

According to the open- ended questions, the teachers said that there is no clear procedure to apple if challenges exist in the appraisal result, even though there is the right to appeal or challenge against their performance appraisal result, it is not to alter the result rather than expressing the their feelings. Also regarding to returning the feedback to teachers are different from department to department according to the data collected from the interview some department didn't see their feedback at all.

Generally, in practical as the researcher observed from document analysis and interview with commandant and deans the main appraisers in ROTPA are department heads, students and peers.

4.2.5. Teachers' Perception of Problems of ROTPA

In this section, an attempt was made to discuss the problems of the ROTPA in the college. As it was dealt in chapter two, most of the performance appraisal problems are the problems of validity and reliability. The performance appraisal lacking these properties is likely to be regarded as worthless by employee themselves. On this ground, certain problems of ROTPA were expressed to teachers to find out their views on those matters.

As can be seen from item 1 of table 9, the majority36 (69.2%) of the respondents confirmed that one of the problems of ROTPA in their institutions is lack of necessary knowledge and skill of the appraisers. The other respondents 9(17.4%) are in sharp contrast with the problem

indicated and 7(13.5%) were uncertain about the problem. Regarding experience and skills of the appraisers, majority of the teacher respondents 36(69.2%) replied that their appraisers lack adequate experience and skills in appraising them and the others 10(19.2%) in contrast to problem indicated and 6(11.5%) was uncertain about the problem stated in table 7 item 2. It could be recalled from the previous discussion that the college deans did not have adequate managerial or enough training on the area of ROTPA. This was what directly responded by the department heads during the interview made with them. In addition, it was also mentioned that the department heads and students were assigned to evaluate teachers without having enough training in this area. In short let alone the deans arrange college based training program as how to evaluate teachers, they themselves do not have sufficient knowledge about ROTPA techniques. As to the responses of some teachers in the open ended questions, the college deans were recruited and selected not on the basis of their related disciplines in education or management, but on the basis of their level of education being had a second degree and based on seniority in their military rank. That is why majority of the respondent agreed up on poor administration in the appraisal process which replied 38(73.1%) yes and 11(21.2) no and the rest 3(5.85) uncertain. Responses to item 1 and 2 of table 7 indicate this. That is, the majority of teachers disclosed that their appraisers lack adequate knowledge and experience of ROTPA.

Items 4 and 5 of table 9 depict that there was no adequate pre and post appraisal discussions between teachers and their appraisers, as pointed out by 37(71.2%)and 35(67.3 %)of the respondents respectively. It was mentioned earlier that the discussion in which teachers and their immediate supervisors come together and discuss on objectives to be achieved was at its minimal level in the college under study. As to the responses of the interviewee, monthly sessions have been conducted between teachers and, department heads and deans. But this cannot substitute to the pre-appraisal discussion. In addition, it was also mentioned that the post-appraisal discussions were not adequate as to improve the teachers' performance rather being used for administrative purpose. These three elements; knowledge, skill, and pre and post appraisal discussions, are some of the points in ROTPA process that need consideration to improve the current poor administration of the appraisal process, which is rated by 70.73 %of the respondents.

Table.9 Problems of the System of ROTPA as Perceived by Teachers

NO	problems encountered in the ROTPA system	Respondents Teachers (N=52)						
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No	%	
1	Lack of necessary knowledge and skill of the appraisers.	36	69.2	9	17.4	7	13.5	100
2	Lack of adequate experience on the part of the appraisers	36	69.2	10	19.2	6	11.5	100
3	Poor administration of the overall appraisal process.	38	73.1	11	21.2	3	5.8	100
4	Lack of pre-appraisal discussion between you and your appraisers.	37	71.2	12	23.1	3	5.8	100
5	Lack of post appraisal discussion between you and your appraisers	35	67.3	13	25	4	7.7	100

4.2.6. Responses of students regarding to the purpose and relevance of the criteria set for the teachers' performance appraisal system at joint military staff college.

Regarding to the purposes of ROPAS, students were asked to respond if the criteria were developed according to the purposes in their college. Accordingly, to analyze the data the five point Likert scale of strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1) were used. As it could be understood from item 1 of table 8, the students moderately agreed up the idea that the criteria can meet the objective intended for it by replied 3.46 mean score.

Table10.Students' response regarding to the purpose and relevance of the criteria set for the teachers' performance appraisal system

NO	Items regarding the relevance of the criteria.	Respondents rating scale Students (N=45)					
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean value
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	The criteria of ROTPA is meet with the purpose intended for it	1	5	12	26	1	3.46
2	The current appraisal system objectively measure teachers professional competence	-	14	10	21	-	3.15
3	Result oriented teachers performance appraisal can better appraise teachers performance	3	11	13	17	1	3.04
4	Result oriented teachers' performance appraisal objectives, criteria and standards are clear to students	1	13	11	19	2	3.22
5	Teachers' performance appraisal systems are designed and operated based on teachers development and level of experience.	2	12	14	15	2	3.06
6	The current appraisal system is strengthening teacher-student relationship.	6	6	31	2	-	3.64
7.	The appraisal system is worsens teacher-student relationship	-	30	7	8	-	2.51
Average mean score							2.72

For item 2 and 3 the respondent replied 3.15 and 3.04 respectively which were moderately inclined to high. The other items 4, 5, and 6 responded 3.22, 3.06 and 3.64 respectively, it showed the students were moderately agreed up on objectivity of the criteria and strengthens the student teachers relationship of the appraisal system except item 5 which were the ROTPA was not used for the teachers professional development rather than administrative purpose as many students indicated that in the open ended questions. For the last item of table 8 the student respondent replied 2.51 which were moderate inclined to low, it showed that in reality the ROTPA system does not deteriorate the teachers student relation but in practical it happen in case of the college under study.

4.2.7. Students perception regarding common errors in appraisal

Students were also asked regarding their perception towards the common errors which were actually faced during their performance appraisal. Basedon the responses, the data were analyzed based on their degree of agreement ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

In addition to the ROTPA problems, students were asked to respond to some common performance appraisal errors; if the errors were currently observed among the appraisers in their institutions. The interpretation is made in the same way as table 8, ranging from strongly disagree (SD) to strongly agree (SA). Even though these terms seem to be vague, an attempt was made by the researcher to explain to the respondents beforehand.

As it could be observed in table 9 item 1, the group of respondents agreed that one of the common appraisal errors that were observed in their institutions was the contamination error. Thus, it seems that the appraisers included the dimensions that are extraneous to job success in the performance evaluated. The student-respondents showed their agreement with this idea as rated by the mean score 3.24.

As it has been discussed in the previous sections, teachers have been complaining that their appraisers are demoralizing them in the name of "efficiency". They also reported that the ROTPA system focuses on the behaviors or traits of teachers that have little to do with their day-to-day activities. That is probably the reason why the students' respondent showed their agreement on item 1 of table10. For the general question regarding to the students awareness about the implementation of ROTPA system in the college theyreplied 30(66.66%) no and 15(33.33%) yes, it show that there is no enough aware ness in filling the teachers appraisal in the college.

Table 11 performance appraisal errors as perceived by students

NO	Items regarding appraisal errors	Respondents rating scale Students (N=45)					
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean value
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Including appraisal dimension (example, personality of teachers) that is irrelevant to the performance appraisal.	2	10	9	23	1	3.24
2	Taking only one factor of a teacher (as positive or negative) and giving good or bad overall rating.	1	7	5	29	3	3.57
3	Tendency of giving relatively high or low rating to virtually every one	1	8	4	28	4	3.57
4	Rating all or most teachers' average	1	9	9	26	-	3.33
5	Focusing on the behavior of teachers just before the appraisal and ignoring which are more distant past.	-	13	8	22	2	3.28
6	A tendency of rating high a person who is similar to you in attitude, interest, race, sex etc. and rating low those who are not.	1	15	8	21	-	3.08
7.	A tendency of rating high for a teachers who give high score to students and rating low for those who are gives low score.	-	17	10	18	-	3.02
	Average mean score						3.29

All the items are rated medium, which are inclined to high, by the respondents with mean scores ranging from 3.24 for item 1, 3.57(for item 2 and 3), 3.33 and 3.28(for item 4 and 5). The other items, item 6 and 7 were rated by the respondents with mean scores of 3.08 and 3.02 respectively. Responses to the open-ended item questions also indicated that teachers complain their appraisers for evaluating them based on their relationship with students and their participation (stand) in meetings in support of their idea rather than on the basis of the results they exhibited in the teaching-learning process. In other words, if the appraisers think that the views or outlook of a teacher corresponds with their interests or outlook, they rate him/her better than others. The other thing observed from the document analysis in the annual evaluation report which was taken from meeting with student stated that some student evaluate their teachers based on the score given to them rather than seeing the teaching learning process. The response to item 7 seems to emanate from the above concept.

According to the interview conducted with deans and department heads, they prevail that most of the time all the appraisers have a tendency to give an average score for all teachers

instead of giving them in accordance to their performance result. This was happened due to less attention were given to the teachers performance appraisal practice in the college. The other thing most department heads reported that the performance appraisal practice of the college is a one-time issue which were during the time of promotion was taken place in the college.

In general, although they were rated with moderate mean value, the prominent errors that were commonly observed in the college under study were found to be leniency/constant error, central tendency error, and similarity error with mean values of 3.33, 3.08, and 3.02 respectively. Overall, the common errors occurred in the colleges indicated that there needs to work more on the issues that can be observed from the average mean score of 3.29 according to the data obtained from table 11.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary of Major findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the perception of instructors in the Ministry of National Defense/education and Training Main Department/ college of joint military staff college towards the result oriented Teachers' Performance Appraisal system. This was with intent to find out the weakness and strength of the ROTPA system and recommend possible ways of alleviating the problems. To this end, basic questions addressing the issues related to ROTPA such as purposes and criteria of ROTPA and its implementation, performance appraisal feedback, competence and objectivity of appraisal and the process of monitoring and evaluation and, problems and errors of performance appraisal were all raised.

The study employed descriptive survey method to address the following basic questions.

1. What is the perception of teacher towards the objectives of ROPAS in Joint military staff college?
2. What preparation and readiness is made to implement ROPAS in joint military staff college?
3. To what extent is the ROPAS implemented in joint military staff college?
4. What is the system of monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of ROPAS?
5. What are the problems encountered in the implementation of ROPAS?

To address the research questions raised, the investigator reviewed the relevant literature, prepared a questionnaire for teachers and students, and also interview guide questions on the basis of the reviewed literature to collect data from the subjects at sampled joint military staff college. Concerning the subjects of the study, 40 teachers of the college, 12 department heads and 2 deans of the college were included.

Questionnaire, interviews discussion with selected groups, and relevant documents were used to collect the required data. The questionnaire included close-ended and few open-ended questions. The data obtained were analyzed and interpreted by using percentageand mean scores. Based on this, the following major findings were drawn from the analysis.

Characteristics of respondents

The respondent of the survey were composed of different stakeholders in the Joint military Staff College. Administrative staff, deans, department heads, teachers and students were the participants who were responded for different tools used in the study.

With regard to gender majority of the participant were male. Concerning to educational background of participants, except the senior students all participant had Degree and above the students were also senior student who participated in evaluating teachers' performance appraisal for more than two years. Regarding to teaching experience, majority of the teachers had an experience of five years and below. The educational background and teaching experience of the teachers may have its own contribution on the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal system. However finding out the disparity is not the purpose of this study.

The researcher used questionnaire, semi-structured interview, and document analysis and to investigate and explore result oriented teachers' performance appraisal system at JMSC According to the survey, document analysis, and personal interview, the major findings are presented as follows;

5.1.1.1. The perception of teachers towards the objectives of ROPAS

The majority of the teachers did not have favorable attitudes towards the result oriented performance appraisal system in the College under study. They perceive that the appraisal system as a fault finding means.

The study revealed that the purpose of ROTPA in providing performance feedback and inarranging in-service training to teachers, were found to be almost non-existent as perceived by the respondents with mean scores of 3.11 and 2.67 respectively. The other purposes were also found to be not to the required level. In other words the appraisal system of the institutions less moderately served both administrative and developmental purposes and teachers were simply appraised to fulfill the formality.

5.1.1.2.Preparation and readiness made in formulation of ROTPA

Teachers did not participate in adequate manner on the formulation of the current ROTPA criteria as indicated by the respondents with the mean score of 3.21. The criteria were set by the deans and upper body of the colleges, and implemented on teachers.

In short, teachers have been evaluated by the already established criteria in which they did not take part. The respondents also perceived that some of these criteria were vague and had no relationship with the activities of teachers. It was also put clearly that the ROTPA criteria do not properly promote teachers' professional responsibility and motivation to work and rather bring about dependency on their appraisers.

5.1.1.3.The extent of implementation of the performance appraisal system

It was identified that majority of the teachers (51.92%) had no right to appeal and challenge against their performance feedback even though a few respondent replied there is a right to appeal but not had a clear procedure, and 69.23% of the respondents get their performance feedback every semester. However, 51.92 % of the teachers were not provided with the appraisal feedback on time. In addition, there was no discussion with the teachers concerning their performance result as indicated by 61.54 % of the respondents.

It was found out by the study that the major sources of ROTPA for the college under study were department heads and students. However, the role played by peers and deans in ROTPA were found to be minimal. There were also no peer-teaching practices and experience sharing among teachers.

Teachers showed that the deans, department heads, and students had moderate level of knowledge and skills in appraising teachers while department heads were rated relatively better by teachers with the mean score of 3.17. In addition, deans had no adequate experience on ROTPA as rated by the mean score of 3.09.

As perceived by the respondents, teachers did not take part in the formulation of the current TPA objectives, which is the first step in the TPA process. From the already established objectives, teachers prepare their own action plans based on the minimum orientation they

receive from department heads. Hence, it would be possible to conclude that the TPA process was not participatory and has not been properly implemented in the way it was expected to be.

5.1.1.4.System of monitoring and evaluation

Basically, TPA is an aspect of educational administration (Melaku, 1992:185). As it was disclosed by this study, however, all the college deans were neither graduates of EDPM, nor did they have required level of experience on TPA. The information obtained through the study also indicated that college-Deans are graduates of Military Science and physics departments, and are assigned not on the basis of their relevant qualification but on the basis of their educational status: MA/MSC and also assigned in their seniority in military rank therefore there is no clear procedure of evaluation and monitoring mechanism in the college

5.1.1.5.The challenges encountered the implementation of the performance appraisal system

The Deans and the department heads were found to be subjective in assessing the efficiency of teachers. They relied on the behaviors or traits of teachers that have little to do with the teaching- learning process. The reliability of the criteria employed by the deans and department heads in the colleges are rated with mean scores of 3.30 and 3.11 respectively.

There were no adequate pre and post appraisal discussions between teachers and the appraisers as revealed by the majority (61.54%), it leads to rumor between teachers and their appraisers.

Due to improper practice of ROTPA appraisers committed appraisal errors such as halloeffect, central tendency error, first time impression and the like.

5.2. Conclusion

The current ROTPA in the institution has not almost served both the administrative and developmental purposes. It seems simply a matter of fulfilling formality and providing feedback to teachers. As a result, teachers attach no value to their performance appraisal, and rather see it as a demoralizing and fault-finding activity. It would, therefore, be possible to expect teachers to perform below their potential in creating tomorrow’s research oriented citizens.

Teachers were not acting as decision makers to change or modify the objectives set. As described in the literature when an employee is involved in planning and setting the objectives and determining the measure, a high level of commitment and performance may result. Result-oriented performance appraisals discussed in different literature and training manuals is participatory type of appraisal criteria. But in practice this could not be implemented because of inadequate training given to deans, department heads and teachers, it has impact on the implementation of ROPAS. Also the practice and the implementation of result-oriented performance appraisal system in the college under study were very weak.

Experience sharing and peer-teaching practices were reported to be nonexistent in the college under study. Hence, teachers were not benefiting from such practices. Department heads and students play the major role in appraising teachers' performance. As a result, the role played by peers was perceived to be minimal and also in effective due to giving the result by intimacy.

Teachers were not provided with rewards for their good performance, while low achievers were identified through the ROTPA and criticized or punished. It was also found out that the rewards to teachers were sometimes verbal and no other means of remuneration in the college under study, this might lead to dissatisfaction on their performance appraisal result.

The appraisers have never been exposed to any kind of training regarding ROTPA. No organized orientation program on ROTPA has been practiced in the colleges. In addition, thedeans have had no adequate managerial skill or experience in appraising teachers' performance. These might have resulted in incompetence, lack of objectivity, and bias on the part of the college deans and department heads to implement the ROTPA.

5.3. Recommendation

On the basis of the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made:

1. As the study revealed, the ROTPA scheme of the college have almost not served both administrative and developmental purposes. In order to make ROTPA a source for teachers' motivation and obtain the commitment and enthusiasm of the frontline actors (teachers), the result of ROTPA needs to be valued. This could be practiced by college

deans by forming rewarding committee at college level and providing those who performed better with financial or material rewards at the end of each semester or every academic year. In addition, it is good if special sessions in which teachers share experience and good works are cited as examples and praised are practice at college level. Further, it would be wise for the college deans if they write letters of recognition for better performance.

2. According to the interview discussed with deans they revealedthat Appraisal form filled by peers had biased to some extent,due to filling the appraisal form by intimacy, so that there should be a clear awareness must be facilitate for teachers to fill the form correctly.

3. It was indicated that the ROTPA criteria were subjective and some of them were irrelevant to teachers' actual work. There was also no participation of teachers in the establishment of the criteria. To alleviate these problems, the investigator recommends that the college should either: give the responsibility to college teachers, deans and department heads to develop college-based criteria and get revised and approved by the colleges, or develop the draft of ROTPA criteria and leave it open to discussions, criticisms, and modifications by teachers, deans, and department heads at college level before putting into practice.

4. The appraisal form which filled by students must be taken place before the teachers gave them their grade point to reduce the bias created by some students who focused on their result rather than teachers' performance.

5. Since peers' assessment could provide valid and reliable information to ROTPA, mechanisms should be designed by college Deans and department heads to promote peers' role in ROTPA For example, arranging classroom observation programs and developing peer-teaching practices might improve their contributions to ROTPA.

6. In order to improve the objectivity and competence of appraisers, a training program on ROTPA ought to be designed by the Defense education and training main department higher institutions office; in which, not only the appraisers alone, but also teachers, students, and all who are engaged in the teaching-learning process could take part.

7. Further, consideration should be given to the assignment of deans by the Defense education and training main department based not on their academic status solely. But on their competence to that particular position. For instance, it would be wise if graduates of Educational leadership who have experience in leading higher educational institution or those who have at least skill and knowledge of teachers performance appraisal system or a person who have human resource managerial skill are assigned to run the college.

8. The performance appraisal result must be used for the teachers' development purpose rather than using only for promotion purpose in order to address the objectives of performance appraisal intended for it.

References

Adams, J. V. (1997). *Student evaluations: The ratings game Inquiry. Boston: Anker publishing*

Armstrong and Baron. (1998 republished in 2002). *Performance Management: The new realities.*London:kogan page

Armstrong, M. (2006).*A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: kogan page.

Arreola.R. (2000).*Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Handbook for college faculty and Administrators on Designing and Operating a comprehensiveFaculty Evaluation System.*Boston: Anker.

Asmelash.B. (2000) Civil Service Reform in Ethiopia. Merit, Vol.5, No.2, Addis Ababa

BerhanuMoyata (2006). Implementation of Result-oriented teachers' performance appraisal, as perceived by principals and teachers. (unpublished masters' thesis) Addis Ababa Universty.

Bernardin,H. J.,& Beatty, R. W. (1984) *Performance Appraisal*. Bosten: Kent

Blunt, A. (1991). The effects of anonymity and manipulated grades on student ratings of instructors.*Community college Review,* v.9; 48-54.

Bohlander, G., &Snel, S. (2007). *Managing Human Resource*.(4th Ed.).Masion, Ohio; Thomson.

Bratton, J.& Gold, J. (2003). *Human Resource Mangement* (6th Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Byars, L. L. & Rule, L. W. (1987*).Human Resourse Management*. Home Wood: Richard D. Irwin.Inc.

Cashing, W. E. (1992). Student ratings: The need for comparative data. *Instructional Evaluation and Faculty Development,* v.11; 146.

Cavanagh, R. R. (1996). "Summative and Formative Evaluation in the Faculty Peer Review of Teaching*".Innovative Higher Education,* v.6; 235-240.

Central, J. A. (1993).*Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness.* USA: Josei-Bass.

Chasm, N. (1999).*Peer Review of Teaching*. Anker: Mass.

Cohen, L. &Manion, l. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*.(4th Ed.). London

Cohen, P. A., & McConachie, W. J. (1980). "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of College Teaching. ".*Improving College and University Teaching*, v.5; 147-154.

Darlig-Hammond L, Richardson N. (2009). Teacher learning: what matters? Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 66(5): 47-53

Dessler, G (2003). *Human Resource Management.* London: Prentice Hall.

Duke, D. L. (1995).Teacher's Evaluation policy from Accountability to Professional development. New York; *State university of New York press*, Albany.

Feldman, K. A. (1997). *Identifying exemplary teachers and teaching: Evidence from student ratings. In R.P. Perry & J.C. Smart (Eds.), Effective Teaching in Higher Education: Research and Practice* (pp. 368-395). New York: Agarthan Press.

Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance Appraisal and Management: *The developing research agenda.*Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74(4), 473-487. Retrieved December 15, 2015 from http:// dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317901167488.

French, W.Z. (1990). *Human Resource management*.(2nd Ed.) Dallas: Houghton Mifflon Company.

Gary Dessler. (1985). *Management Fundamental*. (4th Ed.). Reston Virginia: Apprentice Hall company Inc.

Glueck, W.G. &Ivancevich, J.M. (1989).*Foundation of personnel*. HRM.(4th Ed.). Boston:R.R Richard D.IRWWIN, Inc.

Goldman, L. (1993). *On the erosion of education and the eroding foundations of teacher education (or why we should not take student evaluation of faculty seriously).* Teaching Education quarterly.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkkin, D. B., &Cardy, R. L. (2010).Managing Humn Resources. (6thEd.).Boston, Prentice Hall.

Graham, G. (1998). *Human Resource Management*. London: Long man Group.

Grub, T. (2007). Performance Appraisal Reappraised: it's Not all positive. *Journal of HumanResource Education,* 1(1), 1-22.

Hacket B. &Csoka L.(1998). *Transforming the HR function for global business success.* London, Conference board.

Hailesilasie W/Gerima. (1999). Module on Human Resource Mangement. (Unpublished), Addis Ababa Universty.

Hutchings, P. (1999). The Peer Review of Teaching: Progress, Issues and Prospects." *Innovative Higher Education,*v.7; 221-234.

Ikramullah, M., B. Shah, et al.(2012). "purpose of Performance Appraisal System: A perceptual study of Civil Servants in District Dera Ismail Khan Pakistan" *International Journal of Business and management.* 7(3):142-151.

James,A.F & R. Edward. (1992). *Annotated Instructors Management.*(5th Ed.). Virginia

James, E. Rosen Zewig&Fremonte E. Kast. (1970). *Organization and Management System Approach.* Washington Dc: Mc-craw hill Book Company.

James M. Higgins. (1991). *The management challenge*. New York: MacMilan publishing company.

Jobn R. Schermerbon&JhonWilkey (1992).*Management for Productivity*.(4th Ed.). New York: Jhon Wiley & Sons Inc.

Koon, J., & Murray, H. G. (1995).Using multiple outcomes to validate student ratings of overall teacher effectiveness.*Journal of Higher Education* , v.19; 61-81.

Langham, D. M., & Dubois, P. L. (1996). "Can Nightmares Become Sweet Dreams? Peer Review in the Wake of a System wide Administrative Mandate."*Innovative Higher Education,* v.22; 213-218.

Lewis, A.C. (1982). *Evaluating Educational Personnel:* Virginia the American Association of school administration

Louis Cohen, Lawrence Manion and Keth Morrison.(2005). *Research Methods in Education.* London: Taylor &Francis e- Library.

Marlin, J. W. (1987).Student perception of end-of-course evaluations.*Journal of Higher Education* , v.23; 704-716.

Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1997).*Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective*. New York: Agarthan Press

Marsh, H.W. (1997). *Changing Practices in Faculty Development.* New York: Agarthan Press.

Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (1997). Human Resource Management.(8th Ed.). USA: West publishing company.

MelakuYimam. (2010).Resource Management in Education (set Reader) EDPM College of education Addis Ababa University: Ethiopia.

Milkovich and Boudreau (1991).*Human Resource Management*.(6th Ed.), USA.

Moorhead, G.J., Griffin, R.N. (1992). *Organizations Behavior*.(3rd Ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin company.

Mullins, L.J.(1996). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. London: pitman publishing

Nagy, S. (2010).*Mixed Research*.New York & London: Guilford publication Inc.

Nordstrom, K. (1995). "Multiple-Purpose Use of a Peer Review of Course Instruction Program in a Multidisciplinary University Department." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* , v.18; 125-144.

Parvo, R. S., & Brail, G. L. (1993). Instructor Ratings: Controlling for bias from initial student interest. *Journal of Education for Business*, v.15; 362-366.

Pinnigton, A. & Edward, T. (2000).*Introduction to Human Resource Management*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Randall, S. S. (1981). *Personnel and Human Resource Management*.NewYork: West Publishing.

Rice, R. E., Stewart, L. P., &Hujber. (2000). Extending the domain of instructional effectiveness assessment in student evaluations of communication courses. Communication Education, v.41;253-266.

Ryan, J. J., Anderson, J. A., & Bircher, A. B. (1990). Student evaluations: The faculty responds. *Research In higher Education* , v.12; 317-333.

Seldom, P. (1993).*Changing Practices in Faculty Development*. San Francisco: Josei Bass.

Stephen P. Robbins. (1998). *Management Concepts and Applications*, Prentice Hall.New Jersey: USA.

Terry, Franclin (2002). *Principles of management* (8th Ed.)A.I.T.B. Publisher and distributer.KrisanNagar:India.

Trout, P. (2000). What the numbers mean: Providing a context for numerical student evaluations of courses. Change: *The Magazine of Higher Education*, v.19; 25-30.

UNESCO (2008).EFA Global Monitoring Report. Education For all BY 2015: Will we make it? New York: Oxford University Press.

Vallance, S. (1999). Performance Appraisal in Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines: Acultural perspective. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 58(4): 78-95.

Warner Burke Dale G. lake and JilWaymirepaine (2009). *Organization Change*. Josei-Base: San Francisco, Wiley & Sons Inc.

Webb, L.D & Norton, Ms (1992).*Human Resource Administration.* Personnel issues and Needs in Education.

Werther, W. B & Davis, K. (1982).*Personnel Management and Human Resource.* Intentional student Edition, Tokyo: Tosho printing Co. ltd.

William, M.F. (1993). *Human Resource and Personal Management.* Singapore: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Yilma (2007). Practice of Teachers' Performance Appraisal the case of SNNPRS. (Unpublished masters' thesis) Addis Ababa University.

Zoller, U. (1992). Faculty teaching performance evaluation in higher science education: Issues and implications (a cross-cultural case study). *Science Education*, v.24; 673-684.

Appendix I

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE Of EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

A Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers

Dear respondent;

This questionnaire is designed to collect data on the views, perceptions, of teachers in the Ministry of National Defense colleges of the Joint Military Staff College towards the current result oriented teachers' performance appraisal system. The success of this study depends on your genuine responses. Therefore, you are kindly requested to answer all items provided in the questionnaire.

In responding to the questions, please note the following:

1. All the questions raised here are equally important to attain the objectives of the study. Failure to complete any of them will affect the overall study;
2. All your response will be kept confidential and used only for academic purposes;
3. Please put (√) mark for questions with options, or write brief answer

Whenever necessary;

4. You are not required to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your Kind cooperation!

Part One: Background Information

1.1. Name of the College_____

Department_____

1.2. Sex Male □ Female □

1.3. Age 20-25□ 26-30 □ 31-35 □ 36-40 □ 41-45 □ above 46 □

1.4. Year of service in teaching

5 years and below□ 6 -10 □ 11-15 □ 16 -20 □ above 21 years □

1.5. Educational qualification

PhD□ MA/MSC □ B.A/B.SC □ Diploma□ Certificate□

Part- Two: Data pertaining to perception of teachers towards the objectives of result oriented Teachers' Performance Appraisal system.

Direction: Some of the objectives of result oriented teachers' performance appraisal systems are enumerated below. Please read each item separately and indicate your degree of agreement by putting tick mark (√) under one of these alternatives.

Very high = 5

High = 4

Moderate = 3

Low =2

Very low = 1

Item	Very high (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very low (1)
2.1. To what extent the following purposes of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system are achieved in your faculty. 2.1.1. To provide information to promotion, transfer and termination decisions.					
2.1.2 To insure the selection and development Programs for teachers.					
2.1.3 To provide feedback to teachers					
2.1.4 To serve as basis for reward and punishment.					
2.1.5 To counsel Teachers					
2.1.6 To arrange in-service training for incompetent teachers.					
2.1.7 To promote college improvement.					
2.1.8 To decide on teacher's salary improvement					
Generally, to what extent/degree has the result oriented teachers performance appraisal system met the purposes it is intended for					

2.2. Would you have an additional idea about the purpose of teachers performance appraisal intended for it.

_____

_____

_____

Part Three: Participation in the discussion of the appraisal criteria and the objectivity, clarity and relevance of the criteria made during the preparation time.

Direction: please respond to the following items by putting tick mark (√). Use the rating scales: Strongly Agree = SA, Agree= A, Undecided = UD, Disagree = DA and Strongly Disagree = SD

No	Item	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
3	In the result oriented teachers Performance appraisal system 3.1 There is a high participation of teachers and stake holders in the development and formulation of criteria.					
	3.2 Adequate training is given to the formulators of the criteria.					
	3.3 physical and psychological preparation is made during the formulation of criteria					
	3.3 The criteria used are clear					
	3.4 the criteria used are relevant to the purposes of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system					
	3.5 The criteria employed are better in promoting teachers professional development					
	The current appraisal system objectively; 3.6. Measures teachers' professional competence.					
	3.7. Promote teachers motivation to work					
	3.8.Strengthen teachers - student relationships					
	3.9. Strengthen teachers – Administrative relationship.					
	3.10. The preparation of teachers' appraisal system has been exhaustive.					

3.11. Would you add your opinion regarding to the problems encountered in formulating the Teachers Performance Appraisal criteria and their relevance.

_____

_____

_____

Part four; the extent in which the implementation of teachers result-oriented performance appraisal system in Joint Military Staff College.

Direction: Please indicate your answer by putting a check mark or by writing where necessary in the space provided.

4.1. How often do your appraisers provide you with your own performance appraisal feedback?

1. Once in a semester□ 2. Twice in a semester □
3. more than twice in a semester □ 4. Once in a year □
5. Not at all □

4.2. What is your opinion regarding the timeliness of the performance feedback in your faculty?

1. Well-timed □ 2. Late □ 3.Too late □ 4.Not at all□

4.3. Do appraisers discuss with you on the result of your performance appraisal?

1. Yes □ 2. No □

4.4. Do you have the right to appeal and challenge against your performance appraisal if you do not agree with the result?

1. Yes □ 2. No□

4.5. Who take part in Teachers result oriented Performance Appraisal process in your faculty (please check as many as you think appropriate).

1. Supervisors □ 2. Peers □ 3. Students' □

4. Department heads □ 5. Others _____

4.6. The following problems are related to appraisal process (you can choose more than one problems). Circle it the letter you choose.

A. Lack of adequate training given to deans, department heads and teachers.

B. Using deans or department heads alone as appraisers.

C. Low participation of teachers in developing appraisal criteria.

D. Poor communication between the appraiser and the appraisee during ongoing Performance review.

E. Absence of students' involvement to appraise teachers' class room performance.

F. Poor follow up and remedial approach of the appraiser.

4.7. Are there any other problems related appraisal process. Mention

_____

_____

_____

4.8. Give your own suggestion to improve the practice of result oriented teachers' performance appraisal system?

_____

_____

_____

Part Five: Data pertaining: to competence and objectivity of appraisers in the implementation of result oriented performance appraisal system of teachers.

5.1. In responding to the following items, show your degree of agreement or Disagreement with regard to competence, objectivity, etc. of your appraisers.

Use the rating scales, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (DA), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

No	Item	Appraisers	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
1	Have competence and fitness	Dean					
		Department head					
		Students					
2	Have adequate training on teachers result oriented performance appraisal system	Dean					
		Department head					
		Students					
3	Use reliable and clear criteria	Dean					
		Department head					
		Students					
4	Have adequate experience on teachers result oriented performance appraisal system	Dean					
		Department head					
		Students					
5	Show favoritism or bias	Dean					
		Department heads					
		Students					
6	Much focus on criticism	Dean					
		Department head					
		Students					

Part Six: Data pertaining regarding to the process of monitoring and evaluation system of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system.

The following is a process to be followed in the successful operation of the teachers' Performance Appraisal Indicate your response if this is currently working in your faculty. Please show your degree of agreement or disagreement by putting (√) mark as you did previously.

No	Item	Very high (5)	High (4)	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Very low (1)
6.1	Prior to any action, both the appraiser and the appraisee meet and establish and agree upon Objectives					
6.2	Appraiser and their appraisees develop action plans from the already set objectives.					
6.3	Evaluation of performance is made against the previously established objectives.					
6.4	Providing feedback to the appraise					
6.5	Deans and department heads have a good follow up in monitoring and evaluation during the appraisal time.					

6.6. Do the college deans and your immediate supervisors/department heads orient you about the teachers result oriented performance appraisal system prior to the appraisal process?

1. Yes □ 2. No □

Part seven: Data pertaining to problems encountered in the implementation of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system.

Please respond to the following questions by putting the (√) mark in the box Provided (indicate as many as you think appropriate).

No	Item	Yes	No	Uncertain
7.1	What are the problems encountered in the appraisal system in general? 7.1.1. Lack of necessary knowledge of the appraisers.			
	7.1.2. Lack of adequate experience on the part of the appraisers.			
	7.1.3. Poor administration of the overall appraisal process.			
	7.1.4. . Lack of pre-appraisal discussion between you and your appraisers.			
	7.1.5. Lack of post appraisal discussion between you and your appraisers.			

7.2 Would you mention other problems of teachers result oriented performance appraisal system?

_____

_____

_____

_____

7.3. Which do you recommend to improve the Teachers Performance Appraisal system in your college?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix II

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE Of EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT Of EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire prepared for students

Dear respondent;

This questionnaire is designed to collect data on the views, perceptions, of teachers in the Ministry of National Defense colleges of the Joint Military Staff College towards the current result oriented teachers' performance appraisal system. The success of this study depends on your genuine responses. Therefore, you are kindly requested to answer all items provided in the questionnaire.

In responding to the questions, please note the following:

1. All the questions raised here are equally important to attain the objectives of the study. Failure to complete any of them will affect the overall study;
2. All your response will be kept confidential and used only for academic purposes;
3. Please put (√) mark for questions with options, or write brief answer

Whenever necessary;

4. You are not required to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your Kind cooperation!

Part one; Students' background information

Name of the

College_____ Department _____

Sex; Male □ Female□

Academic year; I□ II□ III□

Age; 20-25 □ 26-30□ 31-35 □ 36-40 □ 41-45 □

Year of service in the army;

5 years and below□ 6 -10 □ 11-15 □ 16 -20 □ above 21 years □

Part two; data pertaining regarding to the purpose and relevance of the criteria set for the teachers' performance appraisal system at joint military staff college.

Directions: In responding to the following items, show your degree of agreement or Disagreement with regard to competence, objectivity, etc. of your appraisers. Use the rating scales, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD),

Disagree (DA), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

No	Item	SA	A	UD	DA	SD
1	The criteria of TPA is meet with the purpose intended for it					
2	The current appraisal system objectively measures teachers' professional competence.					
3	Result oriented teachers performance appraisal can better appraise teachers performance					
4	Result oriented teachers' performance appraisal objectives, criteria and standards are clear to students					
5	Teachers' performance appraisal systems are designed and operated based on teachers development and level of experience.					
6	The current appraisal system is strengthening teacher- student relationship.					
7	The appraisal system is deteriorates teacher-student relationship.					

Part three; data pertaining regarding to the implementation and problems encountered during the implementation process.

Direction: for the given items below circle the letters which clearly reflect your opinion/ attitude or understanding about result oriented performance appraisal system in your college.

1. Do you have enough awareness about implementation of result oriented performance appraisal measurement
   a. Yes c. uncertain
   b. No
2. As a student appraiser which of the following errors you have observed in the result oriented teachers' performance appraisal system of your faculty?
   2.1. Including appraisal dimensions (example, personality of teachers) that is irrelevant to the performance appraised.
      a. Strongly agree d. Disagree
      b. Agree e. Strongly disagree
      c. Undecided
   2.2. Taking only one factor of a teacher (as positive or negative) and giving good or bad overall rating.
      a. Strongly agree d. Disagree
      b. Agree e. Strongly disagree
      c. Undecided
   2.3. Tendency of giving relatively high or low rating to virtually every one.
      a. Strongly agree d. Disagree
      b. Agree e. Strongly disagree
      c. Undecided
   2.4. Rating all or most teachers' average.
      a. Strongly agree d. Disagree
      b. Agree e. Strongly disagree
      c. Undecided
   2.5. Focusing on the behavior of teachers just before the appraisal and ignoring which are more distant past.
      a. Strongly agree d. Disagree
      b. Agree e. strongly disagree
      c. Undecided

2.6. A tendency of rating high a person who is similar to you in attitude, interest, race, sex etc. and rating low those who are not.

a. Strongly agree c. Undecided d. Dis agree

b. Agree e. Strongly dis agree

2.7. A tendency of rating high for a teachers who give high score to students and rating low for those who are gives low score.

a. Strongly agree d. Disagree

b. Agree e. Strongly disagree

c. Undecided

3. Would you mention other problem of result oriented teachers' performance appraisal system in your faculty?

_____

_____

_____

4. What do you recommend to improve the teachers' performance appraisal system in your college?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix III

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE Of EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT Of EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Interview guide questions for dean, department heads and selected officers.

1. What are the purposes that teachers' result oriented performance appraisal system scheme is intended to serve in your college?
2. Does the system of ROPAS in your college involve teachers in reviewing the appraisal criteria? If so in what way?
3. How the objectives of reviewing teachers' ongoing performance are understood in the colleges' context and how it is practiced?
4. What is the process you follow to undertake the current result-based TPA?
5. What is your opinion regarding the objectivity, clarity, and relevance of the result oriented teachers performance appraisal criteria?
6. What problems have been perceived so far in practicing ROTPA based on your institution system? And what are the strategies to curb the problem in order to improve the future practice of ROTPA?
7. Do you have any other idea about the current appraisal system? Explain please?