



Assessment of Principals' Performance Appraisal System in
Government Primary Schools of Akaki Kaliti Sub City;
Addis Ababa City Administration

By

SisayBelayneh G/Tsadiq

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
AND MANAGEMENT**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR THE DGREE OF
MASTERS OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

Aug. 2019

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRAGUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Sisay Belayneh G/Tsadik, in titled: Assessment of Principals' Performance Appraisal System in Government Primary Schools of Akaki Kality Sub City; Addis Ababa City Administration and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in educational leadership complies with the regulation of the University and the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Internal Examiner _____ **sig** _____ **date** _____

External Examiner _____ **sig** _____ **date** _____

Advisor _____ **sig** _____ **date** _____

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Coordinator.

DECLARATION

This thesis is my work, has not been presented for a degree in any university and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Sisay Belayneh G/Tsadik

Signature:-----

Date:-----

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank God that allowed me start and finish this thesis work.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Dejene Nigusse(Phd). For their encouragement, insight, guidance, and professional expertise for the completion of this work. For sure, this thesis without their assistance would not come to an end.

My thanks also extend to Akaki Wereda education officers for providing me up to date statistics and allow me to conduct the study. Moreover, I also thank principals, teachers ,student ,parents and supervisors who were involved in filling the questionnaire.

The authoralso takes this opportunity to thank his family and friends for their support in motivation

Finally, I would like to thank all EdPM department instructors of Addis Ababa University who have taken part in educating me.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
List of Tables and Contents	ii
Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
Abstract.....	v
1. CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3 . Objective of the Study	4
1.3.1. General Objective	4
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	5
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	5
1.6. Limitations of the Study.....	5
1.7. Operational Definition of Terms	5
1.8. Organization of the Study	6
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
2.1. Concepts of Performance Appraisal	7
2.2. Schools’ Principals’ Performance Appraisal	9
2.3. Purpose of Principals’ Performance Appraisal	10
2.4. Criteria for principal Appraisal	14
2.5. Performance Appraisal Methods.....	19
2.6. The Appraisal Process.....	21
2.7. Characteristics of Successful Appraisal Programs.....	24
2.8. Who Appraises School principals' Performance?	25
2.9. Problems of Pincipals’ Performance Appraisal and Approaches to Overcome them.....	27
2.10. Principals’ Performance Appraisal Practice in Ethiopian Educational System	31
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	33
3.1 Research Design.....	33
3.2 Population of the study	33
3.2.1 Sample size	34
3.2.2 Sampling Technique	34
3.3 Instruments of Data Collection	34
3.3.1 Questionnaire	34
3.3.2. Interview	36
3.3.3 Document.....	36
3.4 Procedure of Data collection.....	36

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis.....	37
4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	38
4.1. Presentation and Analysis of the Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	38
4.2. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Principals Performance Appraisal	41
4.2.1. Purposes of PPA as Perceived by the Respondents	41
4.2.2. Principal Performance Appraisal Criteria	44
4.2.3. Principal Performance Appraisal Processes.....	47
4.2.4. Principals Reaction Regarding Appraisers.....	51
4.2. 5. Principals Performance Appraisal Problem	54
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	59
5.1. Summary of the Major Findings	59
5.2. Conclusions.....	61
5.3 .Recommendations	62
<i>REFERENCES</i>	64
Appendixes	

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

HRM: Human Resource Management

MoE: Ministry of Education

PA; Performance Appraisal

PAS: Performance Appraisal System

PAT: Performance Appraisal Talk

PPA: Principal performance Appraisal

PTSA: Parent Teachers Students Association

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the system of school principals' performance appraisal in primary schools of Akaki kality sub city. To this effect, descriptive survey method of research was used. The research was conducted in Addis Ababa City Administration at Akaki-Kality Sub-City based on purposively selected 13 government primary schools from which 129 samples were selected . A survey questionnaire consisting both closed and open ended questions were developed for Principals, Teachers ,Parents(PSTA) committee and Students(PSTA) committee. Moreover 6 wereda education officials and 6 wereda Supervisors were also included in the study for interview. The performance appraisal document found in primary schools was also analyzed. Data collected through survey questionnaire was tabulated in tables and analyzed in descriptive statistical tools. The findings of the study revealed that, performance appraisal was rarely used as methods of identifying area of weakness of principals, plan setting process for each assessment period was practiced insufficiently, criteria of PPA mostly involve external controls, that is, no appraisees have freedom of choice to formulate, adapt or modify the criteria, there was visible gap in reviewing with employees to use performance review meeting to give feedback and also gather feed aback from employees about what has been done well and what areas need improvement. There were situations which makes performance appraisal as the controlling tools for the management instead of professional development, motivation and satisfied, The research revealed the following as major problems of principals' performance appraisal system .Some Appraisers rate employees on subjective criteria, lack specific planned outcomes that can be tied to measurable results ,the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria and absence of sufficient rewards for better performer ,there are some reluctant Appraisers to devote enough time to the task of appraising ,Poor administration of the overall appraisal process and Practice of biasedness and prejudice. In sum, the present principals' performance appraisal system was considered as ineffective to achieve its goal. Therefore, it is suggested that adequate training should be given to both the appraisers . Besides, principals' performance appraisal system ought to be designed in such a way that it will meaningfully involve education officers, supervisors, principals, and other education stakeholders.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives and significances of the study, delimitations of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the whole study.

1.1. Background of the Study

According to Decenzo and Stephen (2005), the term employee performance appraisal is a formal method employed in the evaluation and analysis of given tasks with a major aim of rewarding, appreciating or revising employee performance. Other researchers note that performance appraisal is the assessment of the past and present, an over view of current and potential skills, resources and capability available for the human resource management in the organization to meet present and future challenges, and identification of training needs (Dunham, 1995).

With positive impact for employer and employees, performance appraisal has been exercised for a long time in Ethiopian \school or another organization. According to Ethiopia management institute (2013) from the time of the imperial regime up to the present managers exercise performance because it helps the supervisors to take the promotion programs for efficient employees. In this regards, inefficient workers can be dismissed or demoted, and performance appraisal helps to marking out compensation packages for employees. Merit rating is possible through performance appraisal. Performance Appraisal tries to give worth to a performance. Benefit packages which include bonus, high salary rates, extra benefits, allowances and pre-requisites are dependent on performance appraisal. And also the systematic procedure of PA helps the supervisors to frame training policies and programs. It helps to analyze strengths and weaknesses of employees so that new jobs can be designed for efficient employees.

It also helps in framing future development programs, and also it helps the supervisors to understand the validity and importance of the selection procedure. The supervisors come to know the validity and thereby the strengths and weaknesses of selection procedure. Future changes in selection methods can be made in this regard. For an organization, effective

communication between employees and employers is very important and it serves as a motivation tool. Through evaluating performance of employees, a person's efficiency can be determined if the targets are achieved. This very well motivates a person for better job and helps him to improve his performance in the future (Ethiopia Management institute, 2013).

A performance appraisal is a review and discussion of an employee's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. The appraisal is based on results obtained by the employee in his/her job, not on the employee's personality characteristics. The appraisal measures skills and accomplishments with reasonable accuracy and uniformity. It provides a way to help identify areas for performance enhancement and to help promote professional growth. It should not, however, be considered as the supervisor's only communication tool. Open lines of communication throughout the year help to make effective working relationships. Each employee is entitled to a thoughtful and careful appraisal. The success of the process depends on the supervisor's willingness to complete a constructive and objective appraisal and on the employee's willingness to respond to constructive suggestions and to work with the supervisor to reach future goals (Lawler, 2012).

Dunham (1995) notes that performance appraisal is the assessment of the past and present, an over view of current and potential skills, resources and capability available for the human resource management in the organization to meet present and future challenges, and identification of training needs. Similar to other organizations, school principals performance appraisal is a mechanism for improving quality education.. We all agree that school principals' professional competence and conscientiousness are the keys to the delivery of quality education in schools. In a well-designed principal's appraisal system, the instruments and procedures can constitute valuable professional development for school principals and enable the Woreda education management to assess school principals' performance. The school principals' appraisal system assists in recognizing and encouraging of good performance, identifying areas for development, and improving overall performance of school principals, (Manpower Bureau, 2003). An appropriate appraisal of principals' performance appraisal is a decisive factor for the economic, social political and technical development of the country. Because the value of human skill still remains important for all institutions (Chandan, 2003).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

In educational management, the purpose of school principals' performance appraisal is developing school principals' performance which makes quality education enhancement.

According to this, some studies suggest that effective leading is a significant predictor of quality achievement. Therefore effective and motivational school principals should produce conducive school environment. However, effective appraising is not that much practiced in Africa. For example, Poor academic performance of students in Nigeria has been linked to poor school principals' performance in terms of accomplishing the leader task, Negative attitude to work and poor leading habits have been also attributed to poor motivation. Ofoegbu,(2004). Ineffective principals' performance appraisal can affect quality education, and these prevailing conditions would definitely show a negative influence on the education quality in government schools, which may translate to poor academic performance, attitude and values of primary school students.

In support of the above view, a study carried out in Nigeria by Joshua et al. (2006) showed that Nigerian teachers and school principals condemn the use of student achievement scores as indicators of teachers and principals competence, performance or effectiveness. Since students' academic scores are not the only predictors of teachers and principals effectiveness, researchers have sought other fairer ways of evaluating teachers and principals effectiveness.

Students' competence in the evaluation of the effectiveness of their leaders has been of great concern to researchers in education. The school administrators' evaluation has also been used to evaluate teachers' effectiveness. The accuracy of school administrators' evaluation of teachers' effectiveness has also been studied. Jacob and Lefgren (2006) found a positive correlation between a principal's assessment of how effective a teacher is raising students' achievement and that teacher's success in doing so as measured by the value-added approach. Administrator's rating may also be one of a comprehensive evaluation system to measure School principal's effectiveness in schools and the literature reviewed indicates that effective principals positively influence the academic achievement of students. However, students' related factors are also found to have influence either positive or negative on students' academic outcomes.

Unqualified supervisors will not perform fair evaluation of school leader's performance, even evaluators are not fully emphasizing on the job behavior of employees. Generally, they are not striving to enhancing principals' skill developments and professional up grading.

In the other way the purpose of the performance appraisal have other problems. According to Usleyman, (2011) some schools have got problems because of unfairness and lack of quality of the appraisal system. According to the above report, the problematic performance appraisal

can affect principals' motivation, and high quality leading is essential to improving student outcomes and reducing gaps in student achievement.

However, I have practically observed that school principals are complaining about the procedures and objective of appraisal system. Hence, the purpose of this study is to assess the practice of school principals' performance appraisal in some primary schools of Akaki Kality sub city and identify the problems and come up with possible recommendations

In order to deal with the objective of the study, the following basic questions were addressed.

- 1- What is the purpose of principals 'performance appraisal system of Akaki Kality sub city primary schools and to what extent does it serve the purpose?
- 2-How clear are the performance appraisal criteria as perceived by primary school principals?
- 3- How adequately does the management of woreda education office implement primary school principals' performance appraisal system?
- 4-How do primary school principals perceive the performance appraisal system?
5. What are the major challenges of the current system of PPA in primary schools of Akakikality sub city?

1.3. Objective of the Study

The study had the following general and specific objective to achieve at the end of study.

1.3.1. General objective

The General objective of this study is to assess the system of school principals' performance appraisal in some primary schools of Akaki kality sub city.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the study are;

- ❖ To examine the extent to which the school principals' appraisal practice meets its objective.

- ❖ To assess whether the performance appraisal criteria are clear and attainable as perceived by primary school principals
- ❖ To assess the extent to which the woreda education management implement the appraisal procedures.
- ❖ To assess the reactions of principals regarding the competence of appraisers
- ❖ To identify major problems of school principals' performance appraisal.
- ❖ To identify ways to improve performance appraisal practice.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The findings of the study on school principals' performance appraisal assessment might help education experts ,supervisors ,academic directors and others personnel in demonstrating successful ways of school principals performance appraisal. The study may also benefit the education management by identifying the problems of current practices of performance appraisal process, it give chance to improve the problems. In addition to this, the study provides some thoughts as a reference for the other researchers as a stepping stone for further study.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The newly established system of principal's performance appraisal has been applied in all government primary schools of Addis Ababa without exceptions. But to make the study manageable, it is delimited only to some primary school sat Akaki Kality sub city in Adis Ababa. The study was under taken only at Akaki Kality sub city because the research would not be manageable if all schools in the city administration are included. This study does not include non-government school in the sub city for the reason that the performance appraisal procedure and criteria in these schools are different from the government schools.

According to the city administration education statistics annual abstract of 2009E.c, there are 18 government primary school in Akaki Kality sub city. However, to make the study more manageable, the study involved 13 primary schools which constitute 72% of the total primary schools.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

This study is not free from limitations. The researcher faced shortage of recent and local review of related literatures, absence of willingness of few respondents to fill in the questionnaires and return on time and the shortage of the time to collect and analysis the data were the constraints which were encountered the researcher. However, an effort was made to manage and ensure reliability of the study in spite of these limitations. To overcome the

shortages of recent review of related literature the researcher contacted higher education institutions repeatedly.

1.7. Operational Definition of Terms

Performance Appraisal: An assessment or estimation of the worth, value, or quality of principals of primary schools.

Appraisee: Primary school principals whose performance is subject to evaluation.

Performance: This refers to the actual accomplishment as distinguished from Potential ability.

Principal; The instructional leader of a school who shall be provided with adequate personnel assistance and training to assume the instructional leader role in a public school. For this study it refers to both principals and vice principals

Primary School; an institution that is having grades from 1-8 level of schooling in the Ethiopian education system

PTSA; Parent, teachers and student association found in primary schools

1.8. Organization of the study

The paper is organized in to five main chapters. The first chapter is an introduction part which contains background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study and limitation of the study. The second chapter provide review of relate literature. The third chapter provides the research meteorology, such as sources of data, sampling method, data collection and analysis. The fourth chapter data analysis and interpretation. The last chapter provides the conclusion and recommendation forwarded.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Under this section, a comprehensive review of policy guidelines and other selected literature on school principal's performance appraisal is presented. The purpose of the review is to determine what is known about performance appraisal and identify strategies that have been suggested and collect evidence on approaches that are effective and/or ineffective.

2.1. Concepts of Performance Appraisal

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 and 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. 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 Weather 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 on 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

Aswathappa (2007) defines performance appraisal as the assessment of an individual's performance in a systematic way, the performance being measured against such factors as job knowledge, quality and quantity of output, initiative, leadership abilities, supervision, dependability, cooperation, judgment, health and, all the like. According to Filippo, E.(1980), a prominent personality in the field of human resource, " performance appraisal is the systematic, periodic and an impartial rating of an employee's excellence in the matters pertaining to his present job and his potential for a better job."

From the point of view of school personnel, Adesina (1980) defines performance appraisal as the process by which individual effectiveness is determined. As the author tried to put briefly, through appraisal we know whether the teacher has served the purpose for which he was employed. When properly conducted, performance appraisal not only lets someone know how well he/ she is performing, but should also influence the teacher's future level of effort, activities, results and task direction.

Performance appraisal is viewed as a process for studying an operation to more clearly understand it, in order to guide changes, while retaining and supporting those components of the operation which are judged to be desirable(Harris,1986).

According to Pennington and Edwards (2000:163) performance appraisal 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 Weather 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 interval.

2.2. School principals’ Performance Appraisal

School principal appraisal is a report on how well a principal is working, and it’s done through a periodical advisory and support discussion between principal and office management. These discussions provide agreements about objectives and the achievement of targets, which are then incorporated in target agreements.

It provides an opportunity, in a systematic and structured way outside of every-day working routine, to discuss matters that support and advance target-oriented cooperation (Baily, 1986). A principal appraisal can be defined as the periodic support discussion and advisory that goes on between the education officers and principals. It is usually held to discuss things like salary pay disputes and working conditions. And also it is the process of evaluating the job performance of principals using parameters such as quality, quantity, cost and time. This process helps to ascertain the general worth of an employee to an organization, because it analyses principals' success, failures, and general work performance (Baily, 1986).

Through appraisal programs, an organization will be able to ascertain whether there are re-training needs, suitability for promotion, and how to manage principals in order to ensure they perform to their best. This is the process of carefully and systematically comparing options to deliver an objective to school principals and at the same time making a balance between positive criticisms in performance and improving morale and performance in the work environment (Baily, 1986).

School principal appraisal is the judgment or assessment of the professional performance of principals. Appraisals are essential for the effective management and evaluation of principal, helping to develop individuals, improve school performance. A school principal appraisal is the periodical evaluation of a school principal to review their performance. The main aim of an appraisal is to help improve the entity's performance as a whole through developing individuals. It is not based on productivity alone but also on considerations (Baily, 1986).

Generally, current Performance Appraisal is supportive and developmental process designed to ensure that all principals have the skills and support they need to carry out their role effectively. It helps to ensure that principals are able to continue to improve their professional practice and to develop as school principal.

2.3. Purpose of Principals' Performance Appraisal

According to Gizaw (2010), Performance appraisal is the process of evaluating how well employees perform their jobs when compared to a set of standards and then communicating that information to those employees. The result of the rating helps the management identify the good performing employees as well as underperformers. The good performers are rewarded by being given, for example, merit pay or bonuses. Underperformers are given some type of training (developmental purpose) to improve their deficiencies. There are many

tensions within the multiple agendas and purposes of appraisals. Boswell and Boudreau (2000) make a most useful and clear distinction between two types of functions for appraisal systems: Evaluative functions include use of performance appraisal for salary administration, promotion decisions, and recognition of individual performance and identification of poor

performance. Developmental functions include the identification of individual training needs, providing performance feedback, determining transfers and attachments, identification of individual strengths and weaknesses. The purpose of performance management is on elements such as recognition, constructive feedback, personal development and career opportunities (Baron, 2004).

Performance appraisal is widely used for administering wages and salaries giving performance feedback and identifying individual employee's strengths and weaknesses, Mathias and Jackson (2004). PA can be a primary source of information and feedback for employees which are often key to their future development. In the process of identifying employee strengths and weaknesses, potentials and training needs through PA feedback, supervisors can inform employees about their progress, discuss what areas they need to develop and identify development plans. The manager's role in such a situation parallels that of a coach. A coach rewards good performance with recognition, explains what improvement is necessary and shows employees how to improve. After all, people do not always know where and how to improve and managers should not expect improvement if they are unwilling to explain where and how improvement can occur (Mathias and Jackson, 2004).

Thomas and Carl (1993:138) explained performance appraisal is the assessment of employees" job performance appraisal serves three basic purposes:

1. To provide information on the basis of administrative decisions like promotions and pay.
2. To foster developmental feedback to employees concerning their performance by describing what improve well and what the employee needs to improve.
3. To provide documentation of human resource development activities that can justify human resource decisions.

As indicated by walker (1992:274) "performance evaluation is important to employees because it answers their basic questions." people want feedback how they are doing for the

organization. This feedback provides the reassurance that employees are contributing and doing the right things and the awareness of the impact of performance on desired results . The four suggested principal benefits of performance appraisal as stated by Graham and Bennett (1998:240)

1. To determine the future uses of an employee. Whether the employee shall remain in his or her present job or be transferred, promoted, demoted or dismissed.
2. To indicate training needs, that is area of performance where improvements would occur if appropriate training could be given.
3. To help a manager decide what increases of pay shall be given on grounds of merit.
4. To motivate the employee to do better in his or her present Job by providing the worker, recognition of merits and the opportunities to discuss work with his or her manager.

As many scholars agree, performance appraisal has two roles in any organization. The first role is in relation to administrative uses and the second one is in relation to development uses. In this regard Mathis and Jackson (1997) described the first role that is administrative use as a role to measure performance for the purpose of rewarding; or other-wise making administrative decisions about employees, promotion and layoffs. The second role of performance appraisal helps as a primary source of information and feedback for employee's future development. In this case the appraiser should act as counselor rather than decision maker. Therefore when the supervisor identifies the potential of employee work behavior and training needs through performance appraisal feedback, Employees" can be informed about their performance or progress they discuss what skills they need to develop and what support they prefer has to be planned and work accordingly.

According to Gomez-Mejia et.al (2001), Organizations usually conduct appraisals for administrative and/or developmental purposes. Performance appraisals are used administratively whenever they are the basis for a decision about the employee's work conditions including promotions, termination and rewards. Development uses of appraisal which are geared toward improving employees" performance strengthening their job skills, including counseling employees on effective work behaviors and sending them for training.

According to Jobn and John (1992:604) performance appraisal is the process of evaluating someone's work and providing feedback on his or her performance. This is an important element in the comprehensive control system of an organization. It provides a formal basis for direct superior-subordinate interaction for purposes of performance control and improvement. When properly done performance appraisal serves both "Evaluation" and "development" purposes. On the other hand Mullins (1996:639) has pointed out some benefits of performance appraisal. It can improve communication by giving staff opportunities to talk about their ideas and expectations and how well they are progressing, it can identify individuals' strength and weakness and also indicate how much strengths may be utilized and weaknesses overcome, and it can provide information for human resource planning, to assist successive planning to determine suitability for promotion and for particular types of employment and training. The process of appraisal can improve the quality of working life by increasing mutual understanding between manager and their staff or subordinate. The purposes of principal's performance appraisal are also two types, as Davies and Ellison (1994) suggested that: the first one is formative evaluation which is developmental and used to identify the shortcomings and take remedial action to improve the quality of performance.

Whereas summative evaluation in contrast to the developmental approach is a formal evaluation made twice a year. The purpose of summative evaluation does not seem to be about developing the strength of the school but of defining the outcomes of evaluation and assessing their achievements by individual schools. In addition to the above mentioned purposes of performance appraisal James and Edward (1992:394) stated that the movement of personnel within an organization their promotion, transfer, demotion and separation are the major aspects of human resource management in relation to employee's performance appraisal. According to Mathis and Jackson (1997:193), the appraisal of staff performance is expected to provide answer to many questions in managing human resource in all organizations, including school systems. The performance of staff members is evaluated for many reasons

According to Randel, (1984) as cited in Thomson and Mabey (1999:201), the outcomes of performance appraisal such as "auditing, successive planning, identifying training needs, motivating staff, developing individuals performance, checking effectiveness and efficiency." Evaluation is a systematic collection and analysis of information about the

quality of performance of tasks by employees and then the formation of values, judgments with a view to further decision and action or development. Evaluation should be an acceptable growth and development of the organization.

Evaluation is ultimately concerned with doing things better by considering the past performance and comparing to present performance and planning to the future performances of employees and the organization at large. This developmental function of evaluation is to assist in the process of improving of the effectiveness of meeting the organizational objectives. According to Webb and Norton (1992:381) described the purpose of principals appraisal is evaluation should determine how well the school objectives are being carried out and implemented. The success of educational program is dependent on the

quality of classroom instruction, supervision and administration, should foster the basis for motivation and for self-improvement. The employees must be aware of their strengths and weaknesses in order to improve the performance of individual and organizational objectives; evaluation has to provide the basis for in service training and supervisory activities. Such activities can be validated when objectives are used up on clear measurement instruction to enhance employee's performance and also evaluation is vital for administrative decisions. Such decisions include the employment of personnel, their assignment promotion, demotion or termination.

2.4. Criteria for principal Appraisal

Lashway's (1998) research found that the "evaluation of principals often has been an afterthought, consisting of little more than bland checklists or off-handed conversations.

In many districts evaluation is treated more as an irksome bureaucratic requirement than as a vital part of the self-renewal process" (p. 14).Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993) found that approximately one quarter of all states do not even require some form of principal evaluation. Thomas et al. (2000) stated that even when principal evaluation policies and practices are "carefully enunciated in school systems, human judgment is heavily involved" (p. 235). Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993) wrote that school districts "seize on standardized instruments and use them as the measure of principal performance even though they are not sensitive to the particulars of a given principal's job in a given year" (p. 33). The lack of agreement about the criteria for principal evaluation permeates the literature.

The de facto national standards for principal evaluation come from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) (2008). Murphy (2005) called the ISLLC standards “the most significant reshaping initiative afoot in the profession during this time” of “a post-theory era” and “post-industrial world” (p. 154). ISLLC offers a national standard with their 2008 Educational Leadership Policy Standards. The Educational

Leadership Policy Standards cite six non-binding standards for educational leaders. The six ISLLC standards outline the expected role of the educational leader and intended impact on all students

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader, who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts appears to have used the ISLLC standards to frame the state’s thinking around principal evaluations. There are similarities between the language and proposed expectations regarding the behaviors to be exemplified by building principals. Massachusetts has identified four standards: curriculum, instruction and assessment; management operations; family and community engagement; and professional culture.

According to Armstrong (2009), the criteria for reviewing performance should be balanced between: achievements in relation to objectives; the level of knowledge and skills possessed and applied (competences or technical competencies); behavior in the job as it affects performance

As Mathis and Jackson (1997) stressed, performance criteria are standards commonly used for testing or measuring performances. Criteria for evaluating job performances can be classified as trait-based, behavioral based, or results based.

Trait based criterion: identifies a subjective Character trait such as “pleasant personality”, “initiative,” or “creativity and has little to do with the specific job. Such traits tend to be ambiguous, and courts have held that evaluation based on traits such as “adaptability” and general demeanor” are too vague to use as the basis for performance-based HR decisions.

Behavior-based criterion: focus on specific behaviors that lead to job success. Results-based criterion: look at what the employee has done or accomplished. For some jobs where measurement is easy and appropriate, a result based approach works very well.

Generally, criteria are relevant when they measure employees on the most important aspects of their jobs. But there are also problems with these criteria. Mathis and Jackson (1997) again said, jobs usually include many duties and tasks, and so measuring performance usually requires more than one dimension. If the performance criteria leave out some important job duties, they are deficient. If some irrelevant criteria are included in the criteria, the criteria are said to be contaminated. Managers use deficient or contaminated criteria for measuring performance much more than they should. Under the No Child Left behind Act (2001) there is an option to remove or reduce principals’ power when a school chronically underperforms. The federal government has addressed the issue of poor performing schools. This action speaks volumes to the perception of the role of the principal as vital in student learning and improvement.

The MA DESE has embedded the ISLLC standards into the state’s statutory regulation, the Code of Massachusetts Regulations (CMR). The evaluation of teachers and administrators found in chapter 603 CMR 35.00 “requires that school committees establish a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation process for teachers and administrators, consistent with these

principles, to assure effective teaching and administrative leadership in the Commonwealth's public schools.”

Every organization requires the continual development of the people who work for it. Schools and school districts are no different. As stated earlier, a consistent direction for the organization to follow is also crucial to meeting with success as part of a school or as a school district. Continual development and consistent direction is not the only criteria for consideration. Walters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) contend that nothing replaces “good teachers” and that it is incumbent of school administrators to support those teachers by offering, “intellectual stimulation and individualized support by providing models of best practice and beliefs considered fundamental to the organization” (p. 38).

In addition to the increased responsibilities, the growing complexity of the role principals are expected to play in running our nation’s schools has reached an accountability crescendo

where, “today, principals are performing balancing acts in order to respond effectively to the numerous demands of multiple constituencies” (Catano&Stronge, 2006, p. 224). Moore (2009) notes, “the ever-changing role of the principal has created a position of leadership so complex that traditional methods of evaluation or feedback can no longer provide enough data to develop required skills” (p. 38). Despite the accountability bar being raised to a historic high, Catano and Stronge (2006) point out that this increased scrutiny in building-level principals’ responsibility for educational outcomes has been accompanied by little in the way of examination of the tools used to evaluate the effectiveness of principal performance.

These are mutually exclusive ideas where accountability increases for principals, yet their evaluations remain virtually unchanged. This reveals that while more and more expectations are being added to school leaders’ responsibilities, traditional methods to assess the effectiveness with which principals meet these demands remain woefully outdated. Thomas et al. (2000) found Alberta, Canada’s principals and their superintendent held different perspectives on their respective involvement in the principal evaluation process. “Principals strongly considered that they should have more involvement in planning the evaluation process. In sharp contrast, [the] superintendents' responses focused more on the need to have principals engage in self-evaluation activities” (p. 232).

The Alberta principals recommended three areas for superintendents' improvement in principal evaluation. "First, principals believe that evaluators need to be more aware of the school culture and principal performance based on direct contact with a principal regarding performance. Second, a superintendent or designee who is in frequent contact with principals is in a much better position to model desired behavior or to act as a mentor. Third, principals prefer direct, meaningful feedback regarding their performance" (Thomas, et al., 2000, p. 232-233). Moore's (2009) observation that "administrators rarely receive the type of feedback necessary to improve their leadership capabilities" (p. 39) supports the Alberta principals' recommendations.

Until most recently, little has been done to design and/or implement a standardized school principal evaluation system at the state or federal level. This has not been due to a lack of government guidance or mandates. As Clifford and Ross (2011) suggest, "In 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act required states to adopt new methods for evaluating principals that included high-stakes summative measures of student performance while also addressing principal pre-service and in-service quality improvements" (p. 2). At the state level in Massachusetts, Chapter 603, section 35 CMR states "The evaluation of teachers and administrators "require that school committees establish a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation process for teachers and administrators" (p. 1).

As the pressure increases to make significant changes to principal evaluation systems in preparation for funding initiatives such as Race to the Top (RTTT) (2009), states like Massachusetts have adopted guidelines from the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation's (JCSEE) Personnel Evaluation Standards (2010) and incorporated them into their evaluation procedure. Most recently, Massachusetts made significant changes to its Standards for Effective Administrative Leadership (603 CMR 35.00) by embedding the ISLLC (2008) standards as well as incorporating the 360-degree multisource feedback model (Berk, 2009; Dyer, 2001). Although these changes have made Massachusetts "more attractive" for federal funding opportunities such as RTTT, (Clifford & Ross, 2011) an issue that will still need to be addressed is "the lack of uniformity in job responsibilities and the lack of empirically supported information about best practices" (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1990, p. 67). Recent developments in the area of principal evaluation and performance standards in Massachusetts will guide our study of one New England school district's principal evaluation process. We will consider the relevance of the new evaluation standards,

along with the body of research outlined in the literature review as we collect data about the perceptions of the principals and the superintendent, examine the district's current policies and practices, and study how each connects to the research on effectively assessing principals, all in an effort to formulate recommendations that are grounded in both theory and best practice.

The research indicates that there is a strong relationship between the work of a principal and student achievement (Hallinger& Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, &Wahlstrom 2004; Leithwood&Riehl, 2003; Marzano, et al., 2005). In addition to student achievement, the research also indicates that a principal's work has been shown to have a bearing on school performance, teacher quality, and policy implementation. These leadership functions can indirectly influence student learning (Hallinger& Heck, 1998; Marzano, et al., Robinson et al., 2008). The research also suggests that very little has been done to create a consistent principal evaluation system that utilizes a standard terminology or criteria in which to evaluate school principals (Lashway, 1998; Stufflebeam&Nevo, 1993; Thomas et al., 2000).

2.5. Performance appraisal methods

2.5.1. Ranking methods

According to Wayne (1992), simple ranking requires that a rater orders all employees from highest to lowest, from best employee to worst employee etc. Alternative ranking requires that a rater initially lists all employees on a sheet of paper alternating them from the top to the bottom of the list until all employees have been ranked.

2.5.2. 360 degrees feedback

According to Ward (1995), 360 feedback is the systematic collection and feedback of performance data on an individual or group derived from a number of the stakeholders on their performance. 360 degrees which is also called multi-source assessment or multi-rater feedback generates its performance data on individual from their peers (team members or colleagues in other parts of the organization), supervisors (those one reports to), subordinates (those who report to the individual), customers, self and team. Also according to Mathias and Jackson (2004), 360 degrees feedback recognizes that the manager is no longer the sole source of PA information. Instead, various colleagues and constituencies supply feedback about the employee to manager, thus, allowing the manager to obtain input from a variety of sources. Mathias and Jackson (2004) again postulate that, the sole purpose of 360 degrees

feedback is not to increase reliability by soliciting like-minded views but rather to capture the various evaluations of the individual employees' different roles.

2.5.3. Essay method

Wayne (1992) observed that the narrative essay is the simplest type of absolute rating system. Here a rater describes in writing, an employee's strengths, weaknesses and potentials together with suggestions for improvement. If essays are done very well, they have the tendency to provide detailed feedback to subordinates regarding their performance. Notwithstanding, comparisons across individuals, groups or departments are almost impossible since different essays touch on different aspects of each employee's performance. It then becomes difficult to use essay information for personnel decisions since subordinates are not compared objectively and ranked relative to each other.

According to Mathias and Jackson (2004), the format allows the rater more flexibility than other methods do and this makes appraisers often combine the essay with other methods. According to them, one challenge with the method is that, the effectiveness of the essay approach depends on the supervisor's ability to write. Some supervisors do not express themselves well in writing resulting in a poor description of employee performance.

2.5.4. Critical incident method

Sudhir (2001) indicates that a critical incident means a significant act by an employee exceeding or failing, any of the requirements of his job. It denotes an exceptional behavior of an employee at work, for example, resisted the implementation of charge and refused to help a fellow worker to accept the management decisions. This method requires every supervisor to record all such significant incidents in each employee's behavior which indicates effective or successful action and those which show ineffective or poor behavior. With the challenges concerning the critical incident method, Torrington and Hall argued that using this method is quite time consuming and burdensome since appraisers are required to write these incidents down regularly. They also argued that the method faces the same challenges as the essay since these do not lend themselves to quantification.

According to Mathis and Jackson (2004), in this method, the manager keeps a written record of both highly favorable and unfavorable actions in an employee's performance during the entire rating period. According to them, when a critical incident involving an employee occurs, the manager writes it down. They also saw the method as having challenges since

producing daily or weekly written remarks about each employee's performance takes considerable time.

2.5.5. Behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS)

According to Harris (1997), the major aim of BARS is to provide a set of scales that is defined in a precise behavioral manner. According to Wayne, (1992), BARS method has received considerable attention by academics in recent years. Wayne maintains that, these scales combine major elements from the critical incident and graphic rating scale approaches in that the appraiser rates the employee based on items along a continuum but the points are examples of actual behavior on the job rather than general descriptions or traits.

Harris on the other hand, argued that the development of BARS is time consuming than the other methods. Wayne also argued that BARS require considerable efforts to develop, yet there is little research evidence to support the superiority of BARS over the other types of rating systems.

2.5.6. Management by objectives (MBO)

In the opinion of Torrington and Hall (1995), MBO is a process that converts organization objectives into individual objectives. It can be said to consist of four steps: goal setting, action planning, self-control and periodic reviews. They observed that, in goal setting, the organization's overall objectives are set. At the individual level the manager and subordinates jointly identify those goals that are critical for the subordinate to achieve in order to fulfill the requirements of the job as determined in the job analysis.

According to Werther and Weihrich(1975), the heart of MBO consists of goals that are objectively measurable and mutually agreed on by managers and employees. In action planning, the means are determined for achieving the ends established in goal setting, thus, realistic plans are developed to attain the objectives.

According to Mathias and Jackson (2004), MBO specifies the performance goals that an individual and his manager agree to try to attain within an appropriate length of time. They again that MBO should not be a disguised means for a superior to dictate the objectives of individual managers or employees. They observed that the MBO process seems to be most

useful with managerial personnel and employees who have a fairly wide range of flexibility and control over their jobs.

2.6. The Appraisal Process

The method of evaluation can include various criteria imbedded within the process. One criterion included in a more powerful evaluation is collaboratively designing and implementing both the evaluation process and instrument with principals (Clifford and Ross, 2011). In the new Massachusetts regulations, collaboration is primary to the process (MA DESE, 2011). Amsterdam et al., (2003) present evidence from a substantial body of literature that supports the notion of a collaborative approach to principal evaluations by engaging a group of stakeholders to be active in the implementation of this evaluation system. Amsterdam et al. (2003) cite two instances - Brown, Irby, and Newmeyer (1998) and the Joint Committee on Standards of Educational Evaluations (JCSEE) - that speak to the importance of stakeholder collaboration in the evaluation process.

Amsterdam et al. (2003) “describe the collaborative development of district standards/criteria and accompanying rubrics for the review of principal performance” (p. 223) to be an integral component in principal evaluation. Likewise, research has repeatedly identified that processes which include goals developed cooperatively between the principal and the superintendent are considered important in the evaluation process (Davis et al., 2011, p. 29). The Joint Committee on Standards of Educational Evaluations (JCSEE) (1988) “takes the position that stakeholder’s collaboration benefits those who will be affected by the evaluation system and the assessment system itself” (Amsterdam et al., 2003, p. 223). The JCSEE states that technical accuracy of evaluation decisions is improved through the involvement of these groups in determining and refining its purpose, evaluation criteria, instrumentation, and procedures for collecting information (Amsterdam et al., 2003). More and more refined research needs to be done to identify the most beneficial and legitimate means of evaluating school principals (Clifford & Ross, 2011). Much of the preceding discussion has focused on the challenges of principal evaluative processes.

Feed back is an important part of the PAS. According to Longenecker (1997), the rates should be given feedback on their competence and overall progress within the organization. The feedback should be specific and timely and be against the predetermined performance expectations. It's within the employees’ rights to know how they are progressing in

performing the assigned tasks and to receive feedback. The feedback should be provided on a continuous basis – daily, weekly or monthly reviews (Lee, 2005).

Some common themes emerge, however, among researchers about what may constitute the positive aspects of the process. Davis et al. (2011) analyze the evaluation process using several lenses, including: sources of feedback; ways of collecting evidence; and structure of evaluation processes and procedures (Davis et al., 2011, p. 29).

Davis et al. (2011) identify the importance of involvement from a variety of stakeholders in the development and implementation of the evaluation process. Lashway (2003) identifies the principal as a key stakeholder. Murphy and Pimentel (1996) point to the usefulness of parent, student and teacher input in building principal evaluations (as well as using surveys as evidence gathering devices) as central to refocusing principals attention from “pleasing central office personnel” (p. 78) to actual customer satisfaction.

Additionally, Murphy (1985) suggests that “many successful school districts promote tighter coordination between district and site administrative staff” (p. 82) in the context of evaluative process.

The means of collecting evidence to inform principal evaluation can and should vary widely (Davis et al, 2011). As mentioned above, survey data from key stakeholders is one means of evidence collection (Murphy, 1985). Principal portfolios (Brown et al, 1998).

Direct observations (both scheduled and unscheduled) by trained central office staff Rhinehart and Russo(1995) and self-evaluations Peterson(1991) all comprise means of valid and reliable data collection (Davis et al, 2011). Structurally, the evaluation process should include explicit performance criteria (Rhinehart& Russo, 1995). Ediger (1999) claims that the assessment process for principals must be valid; harmonize with vital objectives; be utilitarian in terms of relevance to work of the principal; be effective in the process’ ability to emphasize good human relations; recognize accomplishments; and develop feelings of belonging. Milanowski, Kimball and Pautsch (2008) found that principals reported the desire for the process to be sensitive to the time needed to prepare for the process and that the demands of the process are worth it in terms of professional growth. Davis et al. (2011) state thatwhile their study found no single best way to evaluate principals, general agreement among researchers exists that evaluation processes “should be linked to the goals and

processes of school-wide improvement, based upon important organizational outcomes, and should advance powerful teaching and learning” (p. 31).

On June 28, 2011 Massachusetts adopted the Final Regulations on Evaluation of Educators. Since Massachusetts is the most recent state to adopt a new evaluation model, it will serve as a useful model that may be followed in other New England states. Massachusetts, driven by the federal Race to the Top (RTTT) fund, has clearly articulated this idea of a collaborative process. In 603 CMR 35.00, Massachusetts designed a process to involve stakeholders in an effort to create an evaluation process for principals that includes representation of all stakeholders. Specifically, the Family and Community Engagement standard “promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff through effective partnerships with families, community organizations, and other stakeholders that support the mission of the school and district” (MA DESE 603 CMR 35, 2011).

School committees are given the opportunity to “enhance professionalism and accountability for teachers and administrators” and “establish a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation process for teachers and administrators” (MA DESE 603 CMR 35, 2011). The process must reflect the promotion of “student learning, growth, and achievement” (MA DESE 603 CMR 35, 2011) “through feedback on improvement, opportunities for professional growth, and

accountability” (MA DESE 603 CMR 35, 2011). Facts for decisions regarding personnel must also be evident in the process.

An integral component of the Commonwealth’s evaluation process is annual educator self-reflection and self-assessment. In these reflections and self-assessments, administrators will be expected to show evidence of student learning, growth, and achievement. It is anticipated that administrators will be able to evidence student achievement through grade level assessments, building wide assessments, and/or other defined means. Goal setting and the development of an Educator Plan will be expected. While setting goals is common, the idea of a clear plan with measurable goals and outcomes for all administrators is no longer just the ideal; it is now an expectation, by which all administrators must be evaluated in the new evaluation framework (MA DESE, 603 CMR 35, 2011). The Massachusetts Regulations for Evaluation of Educators (2011) enter the educational landscape in a time when most evaluation systems are centered on performance criteria rather than outcomes; are loosely

coupled to professional standards; use various methods for gathering and analyzing principal performance; are applied unevenly; and are lacking in reliability or validity (Davis, et al., 2011). Thomas, Holdaway and Ward (2000) found that superintendents saw principal evaluation as more meaningful than the principals, and that there was a great deal of variation in the purposes and practices of evaluating principals. Similarly, Harrison and Peterson (1986) found that the perceptions of principals regarding the usefulness of their evaluation was less favorable than the perceptions of superintendents, and that principals reported less clarity on processes and procedures used to evaluate them than did their evaluators.

2.7. Characteristics of Successful Appraisal Programs

For an appraisal program to be considered successful it must meet certain technical and legal standards (Webb and Norton,1999).According to these waters technical standards includes validity and reliability the legal standards are intended to insure that the system meets substantiate and procedural due process requirement and is free from discrimination. Validity refers to the extent to which the appraisal measures the performance it is intended to measure (Manatt, 1987). The clarity of the criteria and standards, and the competence of appraisers all affect validity.

Reliability in performance appraisal refers to the consistency of measurements across appraisers and observations (webb and Norton, 1999). If different appraisers using the same criteria and standards to appraise the same individual produce different results, the appraisal system is not reliable. Thus, it is better to use multiple sources of data, to train appraisers in the use of the various appraisal instruments and techniques used by the school.

According to Lucio and Mcneil (1979:261), requirements for the successful operation of principals' performance improvement and appraisal plan includes:-

1. The school objectives should be clearly stated and available up on request.
2. The appraises and the appraiser should agree on what should be appraised and how the appraisal is to be made.
3. Focus should be on the results obtained and not the processes used.
4. The appraisal of teacher performance should be conscientiously and systematically under taken.
5. The appraisal plan must operate with in legal requirement of the ministry of education.

6. Adequate resources should be made available.

2.8. Who Appraise School Principals' Performance?

One of the important issues in appraisal system is the question of who is supposed to be designated to make actual appraisal and their capacity too. The designation of appraisal is determined by the purpose to be served by the appraisal system.

In some organizations, the human resource management department has a responsibility for performance appraisal. However, there are various suggestions as to who will evaluate employee performances. One of the possibilities is the immediate supervisor can conduct. Usually; the immediate boss is taken as appropriate position to evaluate job performance of an employee. In higher educational institutes, in most cases there is a culture and opportunity where faculty members (subordinate) participate in the evaluation of department heads and deans. This means that the appraiser has to be a person, who really knows the principal and, the school. It is important that, the appraiser has to be a person who has respected for the feelings of principals. As a matter of principle, appraisal is more likely to take place in a spirit of mutual confidence (Mulu, 2001).

The school principals should be treated as stakeholders in the educational process working in collaborative way, and they are more likely to be motivated to improve performance if they feel a sense of ownership. Since the appraisal of principals is to improve-principals the appraisers should have the expertise in leading. The appraisers in order to make competent job must be knowledgeable in the field of leadership and as well human behavior.

Montgomery and Hadfield (1989) revealed that appraisers, who were not expert, out of date with educational developments, lacked intelligence, made subjective judgments, and spent. Only a short time with the appraises were greatly resented and brought the whole process into disrupt. And most of the time recommended persons who are responsible for appraisals are education experts; heads of woreda education office, supervisor and core process heads jointly appraise school principals.

McNeil (1979) also confirmed this idea and that appraisal of school principals performance should not be a responsibility of persons remote from the leading profession. Thus, this shows that supervisors, education experts, head of woreda education office could be efficient than other outsider in appraising principals performance. Something to be taken in to

consideration is the question of appraiser is knowledge that has implications for who should appraise whom in the school hierarchy. The principals were arguing in favor of being appraised by someone who has a close knowledge of their everyday activities, that is who works closely with them.

The evaluator themselves must have some knowledge of evaluation. If the evaluator is an ignorant of the method or is not knowledgeable about its utility, the evaluation will be hazardous. Tuner and Cliff (1985) is of the opinion that "Training arrangements for those involved in appraisal will not only enable them to make a better job of it but will give status seriousness to it. It must be adequately thought out and prepared, be conducted by properly trained and dedicated people and to be clear about its aims and objectives".

In relation to the above idea of having sufficient knowledge about the person appraised, some principals believed that the appraiser should be a member of staff whom the appraiser can identify. Whereas person who is too distanced from the appraise might be unable to empathize with their particular predicament.

To emphasize this argument, a comment from Tuner and Cliff(1985) stated that: "Now I wonder if I'd like to be appraised by someone who didn't know me. I mean they might just get a couple of lessons that were funny, strange lessons and make a judgment from that. Where as someone who knows the work you've built up over years can see things in a different way ".Contrary to this idea some teachers on the other hand saw the advantage of the appraiser being a little bit outside the team.

If it was team leader asking me all those questions there are things I might want to say about him for example which I obviously can't say to him, whereas going to someone more senior than him there are things that one can say about almost anybody, reasonably (candidly Turner and Cliff, 1985).

Similar to the above idea one of Ethiopian researcher Wossenu (1998), mentioned that: using peer performance appraisal is beneficial in that there are no formal status differentials, no formal power relationships, and no competition for rewards. And it is useful mechanism with time saving for school managers and they have to facilitate material and training for the better accomplishment of the system objectives.

2.9. Problems of Performance Appraisal and Approaches to overcome them

Performance appraisal is important for organizations and employees. Unfortunately, performance appraisals are not on the top of the list of "favorite things to do" for either managers or employees, and there can be a number of problems with their administration. From managers not being trained to conduct performance appraisals effectively to the failure to tie performance appraisal expectations to desired business results, businesses are often challenged to use this tool effectively (Hilemariam, 2013).

Poorly Trained Managers: Effective performance appraisal doesn't just happen and organizations shouldn't assume that managers know how to conduct them effectively, even if they have many years of experience as managers. In fact, since the process can differ from organization to organization, it is important that training is provided to introduce managers to the philosophy of performance appraisal at the organization, including a review of the forms, the rating system and how the data gathered is used. Training should take place regularly as are fresher both for new and veteran managers.

Inconsistent Ratings: Inter-rater reliability is generally very low between managers at any organization. What one manager consider being "acceptable" performance, another may consider "not meeting expectations." This can be a challenge for any organization and is made more of a challenge in situations where the criteria used are subjective and not based on any measurable performance outcomes (Hailemariam,2013).

Lack of Outcome-Based Measures: Performance appraisals that ask managers to rate employees on subjective criteria such as "customer service skills" or "leadership ability" lack specific outcomes that can be tied to measurable results.

The best performance appraisal provide the ability for both managers and employees to judge performance based on measurable outcomes that are objective; level of sales, safety records and evaluations from customers are all measurable ways of providing insight into an employee's performance .

Leniency Error: Concerning to leniency error, Rue and Byars, (1992) say that" Leniency is the grouping of Ratings at the positive ends of the performance scale instead of spreading them throughout the scale". Every evaluator has his or her own value system which acts as a standard against which appraisal are made.

Relative to the true or actual performance an individual exhibits, some evaluators mark high positively lenient in their appraisal and low, which is negative leniency error (Decenzo and Robbins 1989). This idea was also mentioned in Ahuja(1987) that lenient or easy raters give consistently high values or scores to their subordinates while strict or harsh raters assign consistently low ratings. Both trends can rise from varying standards of performance among supervisors and from different interpretations of how they perceive an employee's performance (Ahuja, 1987).

Moreover, DeCenzo and Robbins (1989) noted that if all individuals in an organization were appraised by the same person, there would be no problem. Although there would be an error factor, it would be applied equally to everyone. The difficulty arises when there are different raters with different leniency errors making judgments.

Halo Error: The halo error is the tendency to rate high or low on all factors due to the impression of high or low rating on some specific factor. To elaborate more if an employee tends to be conscientious and dependable, one might become biased towards that individual to the extent that we will rate him/her high on many desirable attributes. Rue and Byars, (1992) say that halo error occurs when a manager allows a single prominent characteristic of an employee to influence their judgment on each separate item in the performance appraisal. And this often results in the employee receiving approximately the same rating on every item.

Stereotyping: it is a perception of a person around his nationality or race or occupation or sex. This is to construct a stereotype of people according to their ethnic or occupational identification. This means to perceive all members of that race or occupation as possessing the same or very similar traits or characteristics(Hilemariam, 2013).Rue and Byars (1992) say that personal preferences, prejudices, and biases can also cause error in performance appraisals. Managers with biases or prejudices tend to look for employee behaviors that make them biases. Appearance, social status, dress, race, and sex have influenced many

performance appraisals. Managers have also allowed first impressions to influence later judgments of an employee.

Recency: This is performance evaluation based on work performed most recently, generally on work performed one to two months before evaluation, Wossen (1998) noted "Recency is judging the performance of the appraises by emphasizing his/her recent behavior than the past behavior".

Central Tendency Error: It is possible that regardless of whom the appraiser evaluates and what traits are used, the pattern of evaluation remains the same. Wossen (1996) elaborates that: central tendency is the characteristics of most appraisers to give average ratings to all or in the center of the scale.

Similarity Error: When evaluators rate other people in the same way that the evaluators perceive themselves, they are making a similarity. Based on the perception that evaluators have of themselves, they project those perception onto others.

According to Glueck cited in Melaku (1992), studies have indicated that appraisers' personnel bias and favoritism can greatly influence appraisal results particularly if they expect their appraisees to behave in a manner appraisers think appropriate and acceptable.

Some measures can be taken to overcome most of the problems identified above. According to Mahapatron(2010), the following suggestions have significant help to make the appraisal process more objective and fair.

I. Training employees and Raters

For employees, performance appraisal training focuses on the purpose of appraisal, the appraisal process and timing, and how performance criteria and standards are linked to job description and responsibilities. And for supervisors, it coaches on how to do performance appraisal. Because conducting the appraisal is critical, training should centered around minimizing raters errors and providing raters with detail on documenting performance information (Mahapatron, 2010).

II. Use Multiple Evaluators

According to Mahapatron(2010), when the number of evaluators increase, the probability of attaining more accurate information increase. If rater error tends to follow a normal curve, an increase in the number of appraisers will tend to find the majority gathering together about

the middle. The use of multiple raters increases the probability of achieving more valid and reliable evaluations.

III. Document performance Behaviors in a Diary

Diaries help evaluators to better organize information in their memory (Mahapatron,2010).The evidence indicates that by keeping a diary of specific critical incidents for each employee, evaluations tend to be more accurate and less prone to rating errors . Diaries, for instance, tend to reduce leniency and halo errors because they encourage the evaluator to focus on performance related behaviors rather than traits.

IV. Provide Employees with Due Process

The concept of due process can be applied to appraisal to increase the perception that employees are treated fairly. Three features characterize due process systems:

1. Individuals are provided with adequate notice of what is expected of them;
2. All relevant evidence to a proposed violation is expose to in a fair hearing so individuals affected can respond; and
3. The final decision is based on the evidence and free from bias.

V. Evaluate Selectively

Appraisers should evaluate in only those areas in which they have some expertise. This approach also recognizes that different organizational levels often have different orientations toward rates and observe them in different settings. In general, therefore, we would recommend that appraisers should be as close as possible, in terms of organizational level, to the individual being evaluated. Conversely, the more that separate the evaluator and evaluate, the less opportunity the evaluator has to observe the individual's behavior and, not surprisingly, the greater the possibility for inaccuracies (Mahapatron, 2010).

VI. The balanced score card

According to Robert and Vijay (2004:496) the balanced score card is an example of performance measurement system. According to the proponents of this approach, business units should be assigned goals and then measured. Melaku (2010:68) stated that, "the balanced score card (BSC) is comprehensive management control system that balances traditional financial measures with operational measures relating to an organizations critical success factors." In this regard, the balanced score card is a newly introduced approach to performance measurements in Ethiopia.

2.10. Performance Appraisal Practice in Ethiopian education System

Performance appraisal has long history in Ethiopian education sector and it has positive impact on the employer and employees in school. From the time of the imperial regime up to the present managers exercise the system because it helps the supervisors to take the promotion programs for efficient employees. In this regards, inefficient workers can be dismissed or demoted in case, and help to marking out compensation packages for employees. Merit rating is possible through performance appraisal. Performance Appraisal (PA) tries to give worth to a performance. Compensation packages which include bonus, high salary rates, extra benefits, allowances and pre-requisites are dependent on performance appraisal (Management institute, 2013).

Performance appraisal could be taken either for evaluating the performance of employees or for developing them and the evaluation has two types: telling the employee where he stands and using the data for personal decisions concerning pay, promotions etc. (Useleyman, 2011).

The major objectives of the past evaluation as stated by MoE(1980:68) were: (i) to provide education opportunity, salary increment, promotion and reward to effective individuals. (ii) To identify inefficient individuals and arrange in service training to help then minimize their weakness (iii) To develop positive proportional attitude and (iv) To take proper measure on individuals who do not improve their performance after taking in service training. (v) To measure the attainment of the objectives of the educational process. Later, in 1996 the MoE added a new process of performance was career ladder plan, which helps to create hierarchies among employees and provide a means for promotion from one level to the next higher level appraisal which accompanied by proportional salary increment. According to Berhanu (2006), the 1996 performance appraisal was substituted by evaluation system which is called ROTPA. Hence the following points were described as the objectives of ROTPA: Ensuring that managers and employees are fully performing to their level best as expected of them in terms of quantity, quality, time and cost, identifying strengths and weakness at organizational level, department group, and individual level with intention of improvement in the fourth coming performance period, identifying the need assessment for development and training both for the managers and employees, providing performance based payment or incentive for

the managers and employees and making decision on management and employees” matter that is based on tangible documents and concrete facts.

In 2015 the Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau prepared individual cascading implementation manual by revising the existing performance appraisal system. The general objectives of this manual is that to create awareness in the implementation of BPR, BSC and School Strategic Plan, to improve the knowledge of individuals about the school vision, mission, values and strategies, to ascertain quality education and to create strategy focused organizations and to create employees who work for result. According to the 2015 City Administration Education Bureau new manual, to achieve the school objectives the current performance appraisal system was implemented based on the principles of balanced score card and strategic plan of the school.

Based on the 2014 Addis Ababa capacity building bureau manual of evaluation, recognition and reward, the city administration education bureau did an attempt to give answer for basic question “What is in it for me?” So, the November 2015 improved performance appraisal score card has the following strategic goal :- work for quality education, community participation, recording ability, service giving quality, school resource using ability, students’ learning outcome Evaluation mechanism, work for the improvement of teaching and learning process (Participation on the Evaluation of the Curriculum) and upgrading himself and his colleagues.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents about the research methodology, sample and sampling techniques, instrument of data collection, procedure of data collection and method of data analysis.

3.1. Research Design

The purpose of the study was to assess the system of school principals' performance appraisal in some primary schools of Akaki kality sub city in Adis Ababa .In this study, quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. Data for the quantitative approach is used to explain, predict, and control phenomenon through focused collection of numerical data, because it allows for vast amount of data to be collected and analyzed from large number of people or resources. Qualitative approach is used to explain and gain insight and understanding of phenomena through intensive collective of narrative data (written word). To this line, the qualitative approach is incorporated in the study to validate and triangulate the qualitative data (Muijs, 2004). Descriptive design was employed. The researcher uses descriptive method to explain widely varieties of data from different respondents. Similarly, the researcher collected the relevant data at a particular point and described the nature of existing conditions. . Best and Kahn (1998) assert descriptive method of research helps to describe and interpret the trend of even that exist now and existed in the past and that influence on the present situation Thus, the discussion was more reliable through explanatory approach in order to gather information, and those data was analyzed by mixed research method for comprehensive answer from the research question.

3.2. Population of the study

The data of this study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of data were primary school principals, supervisors, woreda education officers, teachers, parents and students. In addition, secondary sources such as school principal's appraisal guide line and the rated performance appraisal document that is found in primary schools and woreda education offices.

3.2.1. Sample Size

According to Addis Ababa Education Bureau Annual Statistics Abstract of 2009 E.C, there are 18 government primary schools in Akaki Kaliti sub city. Among these, 13(72 %) of primary schools were selected by using convenient sampling method. Because five primary schools are being led by recently assigned principals who are new to the performance appraisal practice and who may not have adequate information about the practice of school principals' performance appraisal. Therefore, 39(100%) principals, 6(100%) supervisors, 6(100%) wereda education officers, 26(100%) teachers (PSTA committee) 2 from each schools, 39 (60%) parents (PSTA committee) 3 from each schools and 13(100%) students (PSTA committee) 1 from each schools will be participated in this study. Totally, 129 respondents took part in this study.

3.2. 2. Sampling Techniques

In the study, the researcher used census and purposive sampling technique. In the sample schools, there are 6 supervisors, 6 heads wereda education officers, 39 principals (main and deputy), 26 teachers (PSTA committee) and 13 students (PSTA committee). So, all of them involved in the study since it provided a true measure of the population (no sampling error) and detailed information about small sub group within the population is more likely to be available. On the other hand, the total number of Parents (PSTA committee) in the sample schools was 65 out of which 39 of them were selected by purposive sampling technique. The main reason to incorporate these samples is the fact that, they are rich in information and involve in principal's performance appraisal and every activity of the schools.

3.3. Instruments of Data Collection

In order to gather the required data, the researcher used the following instruments related to the school principals' performance appraisal practice.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaires were administered as a major device to gather primary data using series of question that seek: personal information about the respondents themselves and

their opinions, ideas and perceptions about the issue at hand. It is also employed as it can incorporate diverse item of question (close and open) in order to explore issues in-depth.

Besides, it enables the researcher to cover more areas there by addressing large number of respondents in an economical manner. The Questionnaire involved 32 close and 3 open ended items that give a chance for the respondents to give their suggestions, opinions or comments for teachers, principals, Parents, and Students.

The five point Likert scale which response category of strongly agree, Agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree was used for quantitative data. Before the actual data was collected, pilot test was conducted with some of the staff members in Gelan primary school who were not included in the study. As a result of this pretest, some improvement was made .and after some modification a set of questionnaire distribution was conducted.

Validity means checking whether the instruments measures what it is intended to measure, the draft questionnaire was checked by thesis advisor, other relatives and modification was made according to the suggestions given. In addition to this, the questionnaire was adopted from the previous study by making some adjustments. Construct and Content Validity of the questions was established. In the case of Content validity, the researcher ensures that the elements of the main issues to be covered in the research were both a fair representation of the wider issues under investigation and the elements chosen for the research sample were themselves addressed in depth and breadth. Careful sampling of items was required to ensure their representativeness. Construct validity was an abstract; what separates it from the previous types of validity which dealt in actualities defined content. In construct validity agreement was sought on operationalized forms of construct, the researcher assured that his construction of particular issues agreed with other construction of the same underlying issues. To check the reliability and validity of the questionnaires, Cronbach's alpha reliability test will be calculated after the pilot test conducted. All items will be carefully input in to SPSS version 20.

The questionnaire consists 35 items written in English for 117 respondents .The question item of part one was Likert- type scale and the level of agreement was indicated on a five point scale ranging from strongly agree/5, Agree/4, Undecided/3, Disagree/2 and Strongly Disagree /1. For the rest part open ended items was formulated.

3.3.2. Interview

An interview guide was designed to obtain in-depth information from woreda education officers and supervisors. The aim of the interviews was to investigate and acquire a clear understanding of the principals' performance appraisal system in primary schools.

The interviews were made by the researcher in accordance with the objectives of the study and the basic questions rose in the statement of the problem. Interview guidelines were prepared by the researcher and it was conducted and filled with woreda education officers and supervisors at their respective working places. It further helped to test for variations in responses as suggested by Amin (2005). To make the study more comprehensive and reliable, semi-structured interview was administered to supervisors and heads of woreda education office to get information on the trends of primary school principal's performance appraisal. Because semi-structured interview was flexible and allows new questions to be brought during the interview.

The open-ended interview questions was prepared and presented to gather the relevant data from woreda education office officials and supervisors. In addition to fulfilling the original interview objective, the provided complete explanations could lead interviewers, researchers and other business people in new directions, letting them see perspectives and opportunities they didn't consider before. Participants also can clarify what they mean, with motivations often revealed. The numbers of interview questions were 9.

3.3.3. Document

Secondary source of data was obtained from school principal's appraisal guide line, the rated performance appraisal document that was found in primary schools and those documents were analyzed and obtained numerous background information about the issue.

3.4 Procedure of data collection

After all considerations and modifications were made, the instruments became ready for administration. In the main study, questionnaires were distributed for principals, Parents, Teachers and Students. Data collection was conducted from March 12 to April 2, 2019) and interview and questionnaire took three and 20 days respectively in each sample schools. The questionnaire was constructed into six parts. These are, Items related on performance appraisal objectives, Items related on performance appraisal Processes, Items related on

performance appraisal problem, Items regarding on improving performance appraisal problem and Items related on principals reaction regarding appraisers.

After taking the necessary correction and preparation, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents on the appropriate schedule time after they get necessary orientation on how to administer the questionnaire. Interviews were conducted well to produce rich data not possible with questionnaire. Semi-structured interview questions were conducted with the 6 woreda education officers and 6 supervisors from a total of 12 respondents. Before conducting the interview, letter of cooperation was sent to them. They were preferred because the researcher believed that they had better understanding about primary school principals' performance appraisal system. The interviewees were given sufficient time to review the questions prior to the interviews. The information gathering technique used at a time of interviews was Handwritten field notes. A professional, but relaxed atmosphere was maintained in the interviews. The interview guide includes open – ended questions and participants were asked to give personal responses. The qualitative data for the study were collected through naturalization inquiry utilizing personal interview techniques.

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis

When we come to data analysis, the gathered data were analyzed by using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. To make ready the collected data for analysis, the questionnaires were checked for completion and then classified and tallied by the researcher himself. The characteristic of respondents was analyzed by using frequency and percentages. The quantitative data was analyzed by using mean and standard deviations. Moreover, the data obtained by using open-ended questions, documents and interviews was qualitatively analyzed in the form of narrative descriptions. SPSS was used to process the analysis of the data obtained through questionnaire. In this study, the indicators of each factor was selected and presented to the respondents rated on fixed point Likert-scale from strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1). Table was used to display the response of each group of respondent on analysis of each data. The interpretation of the data was held. Finally, major finding of the study was clearly reported, conclusion reached and workable recommendation was given.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter consists of two main parts. The first part discusses the respondents' personal information, while the second part attempts to answer the basic questions raised in the starting of writing the research proposal. Hence later part deals with the interpretation of detailed data gathered through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. Briefly, this chapter is devoted to analysis and discussion of the data.

In order to assess the system of school principals' performance appraisal in some primary schools of Akaki kality sub city, 13 primary schools were included in the study. The analysis was made on the basis of information obtained from 129 respondents. 39 principals, 6 supervisors, 6 wereda education officers, 26 teachers (PSTA committee), 39 parents (PSTA committee) and 13 students (PSTA committee) were participated in this study.

For the analysis parts the researcher used as Mean value ≥ 4.50 = very high performance, 3.50-4.49 = high performance, 2.50 -3.49 = moderate performance, 1.49-2.49 low performance, and < 1.49 very low performance.

4.1. Presentation and Analysis of the Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

As it is stated earlier, the over view of the respondents' background information which entails the sex and age of the respondents are discussed in table 1, and academic qualification and years of service is presented in the table 2.

Table I. Characteristics of the Respondents

Items		Respondents of Questionnaire								Respondents of Interview			
		Principals		Teachers		Parents		Students		Supervisors		Educ.Officers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Sex	Male	22	56.4	14	53	25	64	8	62	5	83	4	66.7
	Femal	17	43.6	12	47	14	36	5	38	1	17	2	33.3
	Total	39	100	26	100	39	100	13	100	6	100	6	100
Age	<20	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	100	-	-	-	-
	21-30	12	30.7	18	69	1	3	-	-	2	33.3	3	50
	31-40	20	51.3	6	23	28	72	-	-	4	66.7	3	50
	>40	7	18	2	8	10	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	39	100	26	100	39	100	13	100	6	100	6	100
Experience	1-5	7	18	5	19	39	100	13	100	1	17	2	33.3
	6-10	17	43.6	14	54	-	-	-	-	4	66	4	66.7
	11-15	9	23.1	5	19	-	-	-	-	1	17	-	-
	16-20	6	15.3	2	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	21-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	26-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	>30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	39	100	26	100	39	100	13	100	6	100	6	100
Edu.Level	Diplo ma	-	-	8	31	2	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1 st Degree	37	94.9	18	69	3	12	-	-	5	83	6	100
	2 nd Degree	2	5.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	17	-	-
	Others	-	-	-	-	34	80	13	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	39	100	26	100	26	100	13	100	6	100	6	100

As shown under item 1 of table 1 above, 22(56.4%) of principals were male. 17(43.6%) of principals were females. 14(53%) of teachers were males; 12(47%) were females. 25(64%) of parents were males; 14(36%) were females 8(62%) of students were males the remaining 5(38%) were females. This implies that the participation of both sex was not proportional. This might be due to the fact that the number of female participation at primary school level was generally low. When it comes to the sex of interviews respondents: out of 6 supervisors, 5 (83%) were males, while the remaining 1(17%) were females. On the other hand, 4(66.7%), and 2(33.3%) of education expert, were males and females respectively.

Age distribution of the respondents indicates that the majority of the respondents of interview, 4(66.7%) supervisors were found in the ranges of 31-40 age. Similarly, With reference to the age of the questionnaire respondents (principals, Teachers, parents, and educational experts the majority of them were found in the ranges of 31-40 age which was believed to be at their adult age. This shows that, the majority of respondents were mature enough to know what has been happening in their respective schools.

With regard to work experience, the majority of them, 17 (43.6%) had experience of 6-10 years, 7(18%) had 1-5 years, 9(23.1%) had experience of 11-15 years. And the rest had 16-20 years of experience. When coming to the parents and students all of them had 1-5 years of experience in PTSA committee, the majority of supervisors and education officers had experience of 6-10 years. ; With respect to the teaching experience the majority; 14(54%), 5(19%) and 2(8%) of the teachers replied to have served above five years as teaching. Therefore, it would be possible to argue that such experiences in their current position might have made the respondents to have better knowledge and understanding about various issues about appraising.

Regarding to educational level, according to blue print of teachers development program (MOE, 2007, pp-30-31) stated that the academic qualification required for primary school principal is 1st Degree. So, the majority, 37(94.9%) of the principals hold first degree. But only very few number of principal holds a master's degree with different disciplines such as geography and Amharic language. But only 1(17.7%) of the interviewee principals was specialized with educational leadership and management. This proves that the respondents are from diverse educational backgrounds. This is helpful in getting diversified viewpoints on the issue under research. a blue print of teachers development program (MOE, 2007, p.60) has stated that the school principals need to have adequate knowledge, skills and attitude in the area of educational management.

18 (69%) teachers have Bachelor of Education and 8(31%) of teachers respondents have diploma. This indicated that most teachers are in possession of teaching qualifications. Most teachers have first degree while few numbers of teachers were diploma. But all teachers who have diploma were attaining their education in summer program training. 2(8%) and 3(12%) of parents had diploma and 1st Degree respectively, but the rest were below grade 10. When coming to the individual interview respondents; 5(83%), 1 (17%), supervisors, were first degree and second degree holders respectively. All of the education officers were 1st degree holders.

4.2. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Principals Performance Appraisal

The groups of respondents were requested to assess the system of school principals' performance appraisal in some primary schools of Akakikality sub city. The responses of the respondents were illustrated in the table below.

4.2.1. Purposes of PPA as Perceived by the Respondents

The purpose of principal's performance appraisal is to assist the principal's professional learning and development, and improve and acknowledge performance.

The knowledge of respondents about the purpose of performance appraisal is very essential. It is required to have an evaluation after performing any activity. The table below tried to show how far the respondents perceive about performance appraisals purpose.

Table II: Purposes of PPA as Perceived by the Respondents

Items	Respondents									Mean	SD
		Principals		Teacher		parents		Students			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1.1 . Identify area of weakness of principals	Stro.disagree	0	0	0	0	0		0		2.81	0.94
	Disagree	19	48.71	12	46.15	22	56.41	7	53.84		
	Undecided	11	28.2	6	23.07	2	5.12	2	15.38		
	Agree	5	12.82	8	30.76	15	38.46	4	30.76		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1.2. Helps the evaluators to know how performance and achievements have been made by the principals	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	0.84
	Disagree	14	35.89	8	30.76	19	48.71	8	61.53		
	Undecided	12	30.76	8	30.76	15	38.46	2	15.38		
	Agree	13	33.33	6	23.07	5	12.82	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	0	0	2	7.69	0	0	0	0		
1.3. Help to compare performance standard with actual performance	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.89	0.88
	Disagree	18	46.15	11	42.3	18	46.15	8	61.53		
	Undecided	8	20.51	5	19.23	10	25.64	1	7.69		
	Agree	9	23.07	10	38.46	5	12.82	4	30.76		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	0	0	6	15.38	0	0		
1.4. Works as a bridge of communication between the evaluator and principals.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15.38	2.9	1.12
	Disagree	15	38.46	12	46.15	23	58.97	5	38.46		
	Undecided	14	35.89	5	19.23	0	0	2	15.38		
	Agree	9	23.07	4	15.38	11	28.2	2	15.38		
	Stro.agree	0	0	5	19.23	5	12.82	2	15.38		
1.5. The mechanism to fill principals' professional gap	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.81	0.85
	Disagree	18	46.15	11	42.3	17	43.58	6	46.15		
	Undecided	8	20.51	9	34.61	13	33.33	4	30.76		
	Agree	13	33.33	6	23.07	7	17.94	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	0	0	0	0	2	5.12	0	0		
1.6. Identifying the principals who most deserves to be promoted	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.09	1.07
	Disagree	13	33.33	13	50	13	33.33	6	46.15		
	Undecided	16	41.02	5	19.23	9	23.07	1	7.69		
	Agree	10	25.64	4	15.38	8	20.51	4	30.76		
	Stro.agree	0	0	4	15.38	9	23.07	2	15.38		
1.7. Helps as a source of the organizations complete statistical data	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	2	5.12	2	15.38	2.81	1.0
	Disagree	18	46.15	14	53.84	15	38.46	4	30.76		
	Undecided	7	17.94	4	15.38	8	20.51	4	30.76		
	Agree	14	35.89	8	30.76	9	23.07	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	0	0	0	0	5	12.82	0	0		

As it is indicated on Table 4.2, with regard to the purpose of principal performance appraisal there were seven elements and the respondents rated the extent to which why performance appraisal practiced in an organization.

With regard to identifying area of weakness, principals, teachers, parents and students confirmed that performance appraisal was rarely used as methods of identifying area of weakness of principals since the mean values obtained from this items was 2.81.

As it is shown on item two of the same Table, principals, teachers, parents and students responded 2.8 mean values which is found at the border line between fair and good. This also implies performance appraisal was some time used for the reason of knowing how performance and achievements have been made by the principals.

In relation to these, Jobn and John (1992:604) performance appraisal is the process of evaluating some one's work and providing feedback on his or her performance.

In item three, principals, teachers, parents and students of the school replied 2.89 as the rating scale was calculated in terms of mean values which is to be rated average. This indicates that the school some time used principals' performance appraisal to compare performance standard with actual performance.

Regarding to this, Gizaw (2010), Performance appraisal is the process of evaluating how well employees perform their jobs when compared to a set of standards and then communicating that information to those employees

In item four and five; principals, teachers, parents and students replied 2.81 and 3.09 mean values respectively. This indicated that the performance appraisal rarely uses as a bridge of communication between the evaluator and principals, and also as one of the mechanism to fill principals' professional gap.

Related to this, Stoner and Freeman (1989) stated that systematic performance appraisal purposes are useful for to identify those employees who deserve merit raises locate employees who need additional training and identify those employees who deserve promotion.

On the similar table in item six; principals, teachers, parents and students responded 4.67 mean values. This indicated that principal performance appraisal mostly used for deciding who most deserves promotion.

Regarding to this, Girma (2012) stated that: performance appraisal provides legal and formal organizational justification for principals' decision to promote outstanding performances, to weed out marginal or low performers and to train, transfer and

discipline others and to justify merit increases. It also provide feedback to the principals as hereby serve as a vehicle for personal and career development and help to achieve educational goals.

In the last item , respondents were asked about why appraisal system is used. Regarding this item, 4.45 mean values were calculated. This indicatedthat, to some extent.Performance appraisal practicehelps as a source of the organizations to complete statistical data

Thomas and Carl (1993:138)examined that Performance appraisal practice helps to provide documentation of human resource development activities that can justify human resource decisions.

It is conclude that without understanding thepurpose of performance appraisal of the principals andapplyingthem to its objectives, it impossible to achieveorganization objectives. Thus, evaluators and otherstakeholders of the school need to do more in this respect.

With regarding to the major objectives and beneficiary of the school performance appraisal, the wereda education officers and supervisors were interviewed and responded thatperformance Appraisal helps the organization in deciding compensation packages for employees ,like: bonus, salary rates, extra benefits, allowances and pre-requisites are dependent on performance appraisal. It also usesto frame training policies and programandto understand andaccept skills of appraises.

4.2.2. Principal Performance Appraisal Criteria

Principals are appraised on the basis of possessing certain personal characteristics, demonstrating behaviors associated with successful performance, or producing specified results (Seyfarth, 2005). According to this author, the characteristics, behaviors, and results used to judge performance are called criteria.

According to Armstrong (2009), the criteria for reviewing performance should be balanced between: achievements in relation to objectives; the level of knowledge and skills possessed and applied (competences or technical competencies); behavior in the job as it affects performance (competencies); the degree to which behavior upholds the core values of the organization; day-today effectiveness.

Table.III: Principal performance appraisal criteria

Items	Respondents									Mean	SD
		Principals		Teacher		parents		Students			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
2.1. The evaluators set clear and challenging ,but achievable performance plans for each assessment period	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.22	0.89
	Disagree	22	56.41	13	50	5	12.82	2	15.38		
	Undecided	6	15.38	4	15.38	8	20.51	6	46.15		
	Agree	11	28.2	9	34.61	8	20.51	5	38.46		
	Stro.agree	0	0	0	0	18	46.15	0	0		
2.2. The criteria are adequate to differentiate good performance from poor performance	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.06
	Disagree	21	53.84	11	42.3	14	35.89	9	69.23		
	Undecided	3	7.69	4	15.38	0	0	0	0		
	Agree	15	38.46	9	34.61	23	58.97	2	15.38		
	Stro.agree	0	0	2	7.69	2	5.12	2	15.38		
2.3.The criteria are differentfor newly deployed and experienced principals.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.51	0.99
	Disagree	18	46.15	9	34.61	16	41.02	3	23.07		
	Undecided	6	15.38	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Agree	15	38.46	16	61.53	9	23.07	5	38.46		
	Stro.agree	0	0	1	3.84	14	35.89	5	38.46		
2.4.Students' learning result is included as an evaluation criterion.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.31	0.88
	Disagree	18	46.15	14	53.84	14	35.89	4	30.76		
	Undecided	4	10.25	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Agree	17	43.58	8	30.76	22	56.41	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	0	0	4	15.38	3	7.69	6	46.15		
2.5.Includes principals organizational and interpersonal skills	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.15	1.12
	Disagree	23	56.41	12	46.15	12	30.76	6	46.15		
	Undecided	8	20.51	0	0	5	12.82	0	0		
	Agree	8	20.51	9	34.61	14	35.89	4	30.76		
	Stro.agree	0	0	5	19.23	8	20.51	3	23.07		
2.6.The principals have the opportunity to participate in designing the criteria upon which their evaluation is based.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.03	0.84
	Disagree	24	61.53	15	57.69	2	5.12	4	30.76		
	Undecided	8	20.51	3	11.53	19	48.71	0	0		
	Agree	7	17.94	8	30.76	15	38.46	9	69.23		
	Stro.agree	0	0	0	0	3	7.69	0	0		
2.7.Evaluative criteria describe what the principal is, rather than what the principal does	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	5	12.82	0	0	3.09	1.15
	Disagree	21	53.84	14	53.84	10	25.64	5	38.46		
	Undecided	4	10.25	0	0	5	12.82	0	0		
	Agree	14	35.89	8	30.76	8	20.51	8	61.53		
	Stro.agree	0	0	4	15.38	11	28.2	0	0		

In Item one the respondents responded as there was some visible skill and knowledge gap in setting clear and challenging, but achievable plans since the mean obtained were 3.22. This is to mean the plan setting process for each assessment period was practiced insufficiently.

As summarized by Leanne H. Markus (2004, P. 8 and 9): -The Performance Plan should clearly start from an organizational objective and clearly relate the individual objective to it. The objective can be written as an activity to be completed, but as with the job description there must be a description of the measure and the expected outcome.

On the item two of this table, the majority of the respondents confirmed that the criteria recently used do not relate to the real events of the principals actual performance and could not mostly differentiate good performance from poor performance.

The third item describes conformity of appraisal criteria undertaken for experienced principals with that of the newly deployed principals. The majority of the respondents confirmed that there is high difference in criteria between the two evaluated groups, since the mean value was 3.51.

As it is shown in item four; the respondents replied 3.31 mean values. This implies that the system moderately inculcate Students' learning result as an evaluation criterion. So every evaluator should match leadership activities with the students result in the evaluating criteria.

As it can be shown in item five, employees Principals, teachers, parents and students were asked to answer if the evaluation criteria includes principal's organizational and interpersonal skills. Their response clearly implies that there was gap in this area, since the response confirmed 3.15 mean values.

Related to this idea, Aswathappa (2007) indicates that performance appraisal as the assessment of an individual's performance in a systematic way, the performance being measured against such factor as job knowledge, quality and quantity of output, initiative, leadership abilities, supervision, dependability, cooperation, judgment, health and, all the like. According to Filipino, E. (1980), a prominent personality in the field of human resource, "performance appraisal is the systematic, periodic and an impartial rating of an employee's excellence in the matters pertaining to his present job and his potential for a better job."

The sixth item deals about principal participation in designing the evaluation criteria. Rare involvement of principals in the development of PPA criteria. This shows that criteria of PPA mostly involve external controls, in the sense that no appraisees have freedom of choice to formulate, adapt or modify the criteria.

According to Davis et al. (2011), the importance of involvement from a variety of stakeholders in the development and implementation of the evaluation process. Lashway (2003) identifies the principal as a key stakeholder. Murphy and Pimentel (1996) point to the usefulness of parent, student, principal and teacher input in building principal evaluations (as well as using surveys as evidence gathering devices) as central to refocusing principals attention from “pleasing central office personnel”

With regard to item seven, 3.09 mean values confirmed that the evaluative criteria describe more of about the principal’s behavior rather than his activity.

According to Wiese and Buckley (1998), Yong (1996) defines performance appraisal as “an evaluation and grading exercise undertaken by an organization on all its employees either periodically or annually, on the outcomes of performance based on the job content, job requirement and personal behavior in the position”.

4.2.3. Principal Performance Appraisal Processes

Performance appraisal is a systematic, general and periodic process that assesses an individual employee’s job performance and productivity in relation to certain pre-established criteria and organizational objectives. The following table tried to show how performance appraisal is applied in any organization.

Table IV: Principal performance appraisal processes

Items	Respondents									Mean	SD
		Principals		Teacher		parents		Students			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
3.1. The evaluators have regular meetings reviewing the standards and expectations with the school principals.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15.38	3	1.21
	Disagree	22	56.41	11	42.3	17	43.58	4	30.76		
	Undecided	6	15.38	6	23.07	13	33.33	1	7.69		
	Agree	5	12.82	5	19.23	4	10.25	2	15.38		
	Stro.agree	6	15.38	4	15.38	5	12.82	4	30.76		
3.2. The evaluators appraise principals with standardized way.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.08	1.02
	Disagree	20	51.28	7	26.92	13	33.33	5	38.46		
	Undecided	8	20.51	10	38.46	8	20.51	4	30.76		
	Agree	7	17.94	4	15.38	11	28.2	4	30.76		
3.3. Performance appraisals must be reviewed with employees to be effective	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	4	10.25	0	0	3.46	1.01
	Disagree	12	30.76	6	23.07	13	33.33	2	15.38		
	Undecided	8	20.51	10	38.46	3	7.69	1	7.69		
	Agree	15	38.46	6	23.07	14	35.89	2	15.38		
3.4. The evaluators set an action plan for future performance appraisal.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.01	1.01
	Disagree	18	46.15	14	53.84	15	38.46	5	38.46		
	Undecided	2	5.12	4	15.38	9	23.07	2	15.38		
	Agree	17	43.58	8	30.76	8	20.51	6	46.15		
	Stro.agree	2	5.12	0	0	7	17.94	0	0		
3.5. Evaluation process affects relationship of principals and evaluators.	Stro.disagre	0	0	4	15.38	0	0	0	0	3.2	1.16
	Disagree	14	35.89	8	30.76	16	41.02	4	30.76		
	Undecided	6	15.38	3	11.53	6	15.38	1	7.69		
	Agree	11	28.2	11	42.3	9	23.07	6	46.15		
	Stro.agree	8	20.51	0	0	8	20.51	2	15.38		
3.6. The evaluators must determine what out puts; accomplishments and skills will be evaluated.	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.16	1.29
	Disagree	16	41.02	11	42.3	13	33.33	5	38.46		
	Undecided	5	12.82	7	26.92	3	7.69	2	15.38		
	Agree	14	35.89	8	30.76	14	35.89	5	38.46		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	0	0	9	23.07	1	7.69		

With regard the first item, the evaluators sometimes arrange meetings with the school principals in reviewing the standard and expectation reiterates to employee that everybody must meet certain minimum requirement to certain employments or to be eligible for promotion. Since the response confirmed 3.0 mean values.

As observed in item 2, the response's confirmed 3.08 mean values. This indicated that, which lied on the moderate range. That means, the evaluators some time review how employees are performed based on the stated standards.

Regarding on review of performance appraisals with employees to be effective Principals, teachers, parents and students expressed with 3.46 mean values .This also implied that, there was visible gap in reviewing with employees to use performance review meeting to give feedback and also gather feed aback from employees about what has been done well and what areas need improvement. .

Related to this idea Mulu (2001) indicate that: the appraisals should cover similar periods of time. Feedback sessions and appraisal communications are some of the mechanisms and should be regularly scheduled for all employees because most employees have strong need to know how well they are performing. And employees simply could notperform better without having access to this information

Concerning on setting an action plan for future performance appraisaland in building great goals around areas of employees success and provide specific plans of action where improvement is needed; the respondents indicated that there was insufficient practices since the mean valuesfor this item is 3.01.

As it is shown in item fifthof the same table principals, teachers, parents and students replied that evaluation process not always affect relationship of principals and evaluators as the mean value for this itemwas 3.2.

In the last item of the table three, the respondents expressed the extent to which the evaluators determining what out puts; accomplishments and skills evaluation were practiced insufficiently

According to Gomez-Mejia (2001), the first step in the performance appraisal process is identifying what is to be measured. This process seems fairly simple at first glance. In practice, however, it can be quite complicated.

The Second step in performance appraisal process is measuring employees' performance. Measuring employee performance involves a number to reflect an employee's performance on the identified characteristics or dimensions. Technically numbers are not mandatory. Label such as "Excellent", "Good", "average" and "Poor might be used instead.

The result obtained from the responses implied that the evaluators was applying the activities traditionally . They had conducted performance appraisal for the employees without determine its out puts.

In general, from the above table we summarizes that the overall process of performance appraisal the respondents' response regarding how the evaluators applied in the area of setting clear and understandable objective, having regular meeting in reviewing the standards and expectations, in standardized ways appraisals, and so on, the seven items score summed up to yield a mean value ranges in between 2.50-3.49 .. This shows that the evaluators in the sample schools were performed their roles and responsibilities delegation moderately.

With regarding to the appraising processes in primary schools, the wereda education officers and supervisors were interviewed and responded in the following way:-

The wered aeducation officers responded that the appraisal process involves the following steps: firstly, the appraiser and appraisee agree on him or her duties, appraise performance to compare actual performance to the standards that have been set, this usually involves some type of rating form, and provide feedback . Here the appraisee's performance and progress are discussed and plans are made for any development that is required.

Likewise, the interview also presented for the supervisors and the responded that performance appraisal has different process these are: The evaluators develop an appraisal form or instrument which are directly related with organizational objectives, inform those who will be evaluated with these standards, the appraisers conduct evaluation process feed the results back to the employee in some form and Use the appraisal for whatever purposes like promotion and training.

With regard to the stakeholders who are involved in appraising principal's performance the wereda education officers were interviewed and responded that the appraisal can be

accomplished by one or more individuals involving a combination of the immediate supervisor, other vice principals acquainted with the work, a school's PTSA committees, peers and himself.

The open ended question also presented for teachers and principals about whether there are any pre and post appraisal discussions with the appraisers the principals responded that there are some appraisers who arranged pre-appraisal meeting aimed at establishing common understanding and agreement between the appraisees, the criteria against which their performance will be measured, the techniques that will be employed in gathering performance data. The teachers also confirmed the above ideas. As their response indicated the post-appraisal conference was arranged only for providing feedback. During post appraisal, there were some reluctant appraisees who didn't have any willingness for the conference that the appraiser attempts to counsel or coach the appraisee on the resolution of problems affecting performance.

With regard to the document analysis made in the school principal's appraisal guideline most of the guideline did not include principals organizational and interpersonal skills in the evaluation guideline. There are also different evaluation criteria which are listed repeatedly. Some activities should not be used as an evaluation criterion for principals since they directly related with teaches responsibilities. However, most of the duties show the actual practice of schools principals in relation to improving quality education.

4.2.4. Principals Reaction Regarding Appraisers

The participation of principals in the development of appraisal criteria, measures and in the process of conducting appraisal will satisfied the principals to accept the appraisal output. Appraisees were asked their reaction on the development and formulation of performance appraisal system on the table below and they gave their responses in the following ways.

Table V: Principals reaction regarding appraisers

Items	Respondents									Mean	SD
		Principals		Teacher		parents		Students			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
4.1.Appraisers tend to get biased and prejudice	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	1	2.56	0	0	3.98	0.91
	Disagree	6	15.38	5	19.23	1	2.56	0	0		
	Undecided	4	10.25	3	11.53	18	46.15	0	0		
	Agree	18	46.15	5	19.23	11	28.2	7	53.84		
	Stro.agree	11	28.2	13	50	8	20.51	6	46.15		
.2.performance appraisal is one of the controlling tools for the management rather than professional development ,motivation and satisfaction.	Stro.disagre	13	33.33	5	19.23	4	10.25	2	15.38	3.08	1.41
	Disagree	11	28.2	7	26.92	15	38.46	3	23.07		
	Undecided	8	20.51	0	0	8	20.51	1	7.69		
	Agree	3	7.69	8	30.76	5	12.82	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	6	23.07	7	17.94	4	30.76		
4.3. Appraisers lack skills to appraise principals' performance	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.13	1.18
	Disagree	18	46.15	14	53.84	14	35.89	6	46.15		
	Undecided	1	2.56	3	11.53	9	23.07	2	15.38		
	Agree	7	17.94	6	23.07	11	28.2	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	13	33.33	3	11.53	5	12.82	2	15.38		
4.4. Appraisers are reluctant to devote enough time to the task of appraising	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.25	1.1
	Disagree	13	33.33	11	42.3	18	46.15	4	30.76		
	Undecided	4	10.25	0	0	5	12.82	5	38.46		
	Agree	15	38.46	9	34.61	13	33.33	3	23.07		
	Stro.agree	7	17.94	6	23.07	3	7.69	1	7.69		
4.5. Most principals perceived the evaluation process as having neither positive nor negative impact on their leadership style	Stro.disagre	4	10.25	7	26.92	6	15.38	1	7.69	2.99	1.3
	Disagree	12	30.76	5	19.23	4	10.25	4	30.76		
	Undecided	8	20.51	5	19.23	10	25.64	5	38.46		
	Agree	11	28.2	3	11.53	8	20.51	1	7.69		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	6	23.07	11	28.2	2	15.38		

As it is indicated on Table 4.5, with regard to the principals perception regarding appraisers there were seven elements and the respondents rated them as follows.

With regard to believing whether appraisers tend to get biased and prejudice or not, the respondents confirmed as there weresomesubjective attempts being made by the evaluators since the mean values obtained were 3.98 .We understood from their response that, the

Evaluators sometimes didn't use objective data such as figures, attendance records and number of works. They added their subjective conclusion while they appraised

As it is shown on item two, principals, teachers, parents and students responses are ensured with 3.0 Mean values. This implies performance there were situations which makes performance appraisal as the controlling tools for the management instead of professional development, motivation and satisfied.

In item three; principals, teachers, parents and students replied 3.13 mean values. This indicates that they percept there are some appraisers who lack skills to appraise principals.

In item four; the respondents' replied 3.25 mean values. This implies that there some reluctant Appraisers to devote enough time to the task of appraising .this means, not all evaluator spend their time a programmed manner.

As it is shown on item five of the same Table, principals, teachers, parents and students responses are ensured with 3.0 Mean values. This implies some principals perceived the evaluation process as having neither positive nor negative impact on their leadership style. To sum up, since the mean values obtained in almost all elements range between 2.50 and 3.49 which lied on the moderate range.

This implies that the evaluators had gaps in appraising the principals and in relating with the instructional processes.

It is vivid that the ways of evaluator can change the opinion of appraisees toward negative or positive. Stakeholders of the schools need to do more in this respect.

With regard to the reaction principal's performance appraisal the wereda education officers and supervisors were interviewed and responded in the following manner:

“ The school principals performance appraisal has been helping to the organization however it's not helping the principals on their professional competency because of technical problems”

In addition to this, “the major objective of the school appraising is principals' professional development.” However the researcher observe that there is understanding gap between the principals, because some of respondent for the question of who is primary benefited by the appraising? Were they responding that, principals are primary beneficiary when the system .perfectly implemented' 'From this perspective the researcher perceives that in terms of

principals' professional development the school principals' performance appraisal objective needs attention.

4.2.5. Principals Performance Appraisal Problem

Problems related to performance appraisal can be of three general types. These are: human errors, problems of criteria, and problems of confidentiality (Saiyadain, 1999:204-207). Saiyadain further listed human errors such as single criterion, strictness or leniency, halo error, central tendency errors, recency of events and similarity error.

In line with this, respondents were asked to indicate the challenges they believe are prevalent appraisal in some primary schools of Akaki kality sub city, 13 primary schools. Accordingly, their response is shown in the following table.

Table VI. Principals performance appraisal problem

Items	Respondents									Mean	SD
		Principals		Teacher		parents		Students			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
5.1. The evaluators are biased on relationship	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	2	5.12	0	0	3.03	1.06
	Disagree	15	38.46	11	42.3	12	30.7	7	53.84		
	Undecided	6	15.38	5	19.23	12	30.7	1	7.69		
	Agree	11	28.2	8	30.76	9	23.0	5	38.46		
	Stro.agree	7	17.94	2	7.69	4	10.2	0	0		
5.2. The school principals performance appraisal practice has problems on schedule	Stro.disagre	3	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.06	1.04
	Disagree	13	33.33	14	53.84	19	48.71	5	38.46		
	Undecided	4	10.25	4	15.38	6	15.38	0	0		
	Agree	15	38.46	8	30.76	14	35.89	5	38.46		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	0	0	0	0	3	23.07		
5.3. Poor administration of the overall appraisal process	Stro.disagre	10	25.64	3	11.53	2	5.12	0	0	3.21	1.26
	Disagree	6	15.38	8	30.76	4	10.25	2	15.38		
	Undecided	8	20.51	3	11.53	21	53.84	6	46.15		
	Agree	7	17.94	7	26.92	4	10.25	1	7.69		
	Stro.agree	8	20.51	5	19.23	8	20.51	4	30.76		
5.4. Shortage of time to appraise principals' performance	Stro.disagre	0	0	4	15.38	0	0	0	0	3.11	1.14
	Disagree	18	46.15	12	46.15	16	41.02	2	15.38		
	Undecided	10	25.64	4	15.38	4	10.25	4	30.76		
	Agree	11	28.2	1	3.84	12	30.76	2	15.38		
	Stro.agree	0	0	5	19.23	7	17.94	5	38.46		
5.5. The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria	Stro.disagre	0	0	0	0	4	10.25	0	0	3.23	1.14
	Disagree	19	48.71	11	42.3	12	30.76	3	23.07		
	Undecided	2	5.12	2	7.69	8	20.51	1	7.69		
	Agree	17	43.58	8	30.76	7	17.94	7	53.84		
	Stro.agree	1	2.56	5	19.23	8	20.51	2	15.38		
5.6. Lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience on the side of appraisers	Stro.disagre	2	5.12	0	0	2	5.12	0	0	3.13	1.12
	Disagree	19	48.71	12	46.15	14	35.89	4	30.76		
	Undecided	0	0	0	0	7	17.94	1	7.69		
	Agree	14	35.89	10	38.46	13	33.33	8	61.53		
	Stro.agree	4	10.25	4	15.38	3	7.69	0	0		
5.7. principals are not f rewarded	Stro.disagre	8	20.51	10	38.46	9	23.07	4	30.76	2.99	1.63
	Disagree	12	30.76	2	7.69	6	15.38	2	15.38		
	Undecided	0	0	2	7.69	6	15.38	1	7.69		
	Agree	8	20.51	4	15.38	7	17.94	2	15.38		
	Stro.agree	11	28.2	8	30.76	11	28.2	4	30.76		

As it is indicated on Table 5 , with regard to principals performance appraisal problem there were seven elements and the respondents rated the extent to which each of the elements were practiced by the appraisers.

With regard to biasedness of the evaluators on relationship, principals, teachers, parents and students as respondents confirmed as there are some attempts being made by the appraisers since the mean values obtained were 3.03. This is to mean there were some evaluators who made prejudice in favor of or against someone or something by comprising an employee's performance to other employees instead of the schools standards.

According to Glueck cited in Melaku (1992), studies have indicated that appraisers' personnel bias and favoritism can greatly influence appraisal results particularly if they expect their appraisees to behave in a manner appraisers think appropriate and acceptable.

As it is shown on item two of the same Table, the respondents ensured with 3.06 mean values. This implies, there were some problems on deciding when to conduct the performance evaluation. That means, there were a visible knowledge and skill gap in scheduling the evaluations, ensuring that each appraisees consistently meets the deadline.

In item three; principals, teachers, parents and students of the schools replied 3.21 mean values. This indicates that the evaluators sometimes administer the evaluation process in wrongly ways. There were gaps in announcing when the performance appraisal process will begin, in distributing different information that will be expected from appraisees when they were going to be evaluated.

In item four; principals, teachers, parents and students replied 3.11 mean values..This implies that there were some evaluators who had time problems for evaluating the principals according to the schedule.

As item five indicated, the respondents asserted as there as some the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteriasince the mean values for this item is 3.23.This shows us, the inadequacy and in appropriateness of the appraisal criteria reported by respondents was the next appraisal problem. This might resulted from lack of validity and reliability of the appraisal criteria. A set of performance criteria is said to be valid if it accurately measures what it is meant to measure. The validity of an appraisal process heavily depends on its comprehensiveness in assessing teaching quality as defined by the criteria.

As observed in item six, the response's confirmed 3.08 mean values 3.13. This implies thatprincipals, teachers, parents and students responded as there was some knowledge and skill gaps on the side of evaluators' .this means, in schools there are some evaluators who are not trained on how to assess and give honest feedback.

Related to this Hailemariam (2013): Maintains that, Performance appraisal is important for organizations and employees. Unfortunately, performance appraisals are not on the top of the list of "favorite things to do" for either managers or employees, and there can be a number of problems with their administration. From managers not being trained to conductperformance appraisals effectively to the failure to tie performance appraisal expectations

In the last item of this table, respondents confirmed 2.99 mean values. This indicates that, they rewarded or recognized performance of principals in insufficient ways.

To sum up, since the mean values obtained in almost all elements range between 2.5 and 3.49 as responded by principals, teachers, parents and students of the schools. This implies that the managers had gaps in relating with the performance appraisal.

With regard to the problem of principal's performance appraisal the wereda education officers and supervisors were interviewed and responded in the following manner:

The major problems observed in appraising the performance of principals were found to be: - appraisers lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience, the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria, absence of rewards for better performer, appraise employees on subjective criteria

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of summary of the major findings, conclusion drawn and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of the findings.

5.1. Summary of The Major Findings

The major purpose of this study was to assess the practice of school principals' performance appraisal in some primary schools of Akaki Kality sub city. Accordingly, a descriptive case study with a mixed research method was used. The basic questions were raised on related to the practice of school principals' performance appraisal. More specifically, the research questions were:

- 1- What is the purpose of principals 'performance appraisal system of Akaki Kality sub city primary schools and to what extent does it serve the purpose?
- 2-How clear are the performance appraisal criteria as perceived by primary school principals?
- 3- How adequately does the management of woreda education office implement primary school principals' performance appraisal system?
- 4-What are the reactions of primary school principals to the performance appraisal program?
5. What are the major challenges that appraisers encountered in adopting the current system of PPA in primary schools of Akaki kality sub city?

The data were collected from some primary schools of Akaki Kality sub city. Among 13 primary schools 129 sample respondents were selected by using convenient sampling method.

Based on the data presented, analyzed and interpreted, the following major findings were identified and presented as follows: -

1. The finding indicates that there was a visible knowledge gap in understanding what performance appraisal was used for. This implies that the evaluators had gaps in understanding the purpose of performance appraisal relating with the instructional processes.
2. The study also opinion that the PPA criteria currently used to appraise principals' performance are found to be inadequate and inappropriate to appraise in the selected schools. The main reason was that there was awareness problem on setting clear and achievable objectives, principals were rarely involved in designing, reviewing, and improving of PPA criteria. Principals involved only in giving comments on what is already developed. Only officials of education are the determinant bodies to set performance criteria. This practice violated the principle of principal's participation.
3. As the finding of the study opinion there was problem of including principals' organizational and interpersonal skills in the evaluation guide line.
4. Some evaluators had no idea about whether or not the appraisal guide line is standardized as they were not involved in the development of the guideline at the beginning.
5. The appraisers and appraisees were rarely observed to undertake pre and post discussion on the appraisal practice, and the appraisal practice has problems when it comes to implementation on schedule and communication.
6. It is denoted from the analysis that there were some subjective attempts being made by the evaluators, there was number of respondents who agreed that there is practice of biasedness and prejudice.
7. The majority of respondents confirmed that, there were some reluctant Appraisers to devote enough time to the task of appraising.
8. It was evidenced that the performance appraisal used as one of the controlling tools for the management rather than professional development, motivation and satisfied.
9. As identified by appraisers and appraisees, the major problems encountered in appraising the performance of principals were found to be: - appraisers lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience, the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria and absence of sufficient rewards for better performer.

5.2. Conclusion

Based on the findings in this study, the following conclusions were drawn.

-The evaluators had gaps in understanding the purpose of performance appraisal relating with the instructional processes and professional growth and development.

-The evaluators do not apprise the principals according to the objective and procedure of performance appraisal which set in the appraisal system guidelines.

-Principals had doubt whether the appraisal is standardized or not since they didn't take part in the development of the system.

-There was gap in arranging pre-and post- appraisal meeting aimed at establishing common understanding and agreement between the appraisers and the appraisees about the purpose of the appraisal program, the criteria against which their performance will be measured, and to allow appraisees to look back at their performance over previous time and to look forward to work to be done.

--- The school principals' performance appraisal practice become one of the controlling tools for the management rather than principals' professional development and it come in to the line of evaluation.

-Pertaining to the identification of the potential challenges that affect principals performance appraisal practices, the major challenges underlined under each variable include :

- ✓ Appraisals not being trained to conduct performance appraisals effectively.
- ✓ Rate employees on subjective criteria such as "customer service skills" or "leadership ability" lack specific outcomes that can be tied to measurable results.
- ✓ The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria and absence of sufficient rewards for better performer.
- ✓ There are some reluctant Appraisers to devote enough time to the task of appraising.
- ✓ Poor administration of the overall appraisal process.
- ✓ Practice of biasedness and prejudice.

Generally, from the research finding the researcher conclude that the performance appraisal practice is ineffective and does not meet the intended objective, and also has implementation problems, such as feedback , communication gap and defective schedule execution.

5.3 .Recommendations

1. The education office has to acquaint raters how the appraisal practice is applied and purpose relating with the instructional processes and professional growth and development; particularly with the one the school is employing.
2. The education office are expected to use the performance appraisal regarding to principals professional development ,as problem identification mechanism and also use it as quality improver by framing training for principals.
3. All management members need to know that one of the appraisal system objectives is professional development rather than controlling and also the result of appraising shall be given for the appraisees immediately.
4. It is better to reach a consensus on the participation of principals in designing, reviewing, and improving of PPA criteria. So, the education office has to take this into account.
5. It is recommended that the evaluators need to arrange a pre- and post- appraisal meeting with all principals to review and decide with them about:
 - ✓ the purpose of the appraisal program,
 - ✓ the criteria against which their performance will be measured,
 - ✓ the techniques that will be employed in gathering performance data, and
 - ✓ the appraiser that will be involved in evaluating principals performance.
 - ✓ to allow appraisees to look back at their performance over previous time and to look forward to work to be done.
6. It is impossible to avoid rater bias for it is human nature to get biased somehow. But it is possible to reduce its magnitude through continuous training. Hence, the education officers has to give training to someone who are responsible for conducting performance evaluation. This will boost raters' ability to evaluate and alleviate bias.
7. The principals have to set clear and challenging, but achievable performance plans for each assessment period.
8. It is suggested that firstly, assigning qualified evaluators who have background knowledge of instructional leadership and those who qualified the MoE school standards that indicates the learning or teaching goals for what evaluators should know and be able to do at the evaluation process.
9. Upgrading the capacity of the already assignee evaluators through training. Moreover, the city administration education bureau with the collaboration of universities ought to prepare special training programs, for sub-city education officers supervisors, school

principals, parents and students which mainly focus on the challenges of PPA implementation.

10. In addition to extrinsic rewards it's recommended that the following intrinsic rewards ought to be functioned:

- ✓ Selection as primary principals of the year
- ✓ Certificate of accomplishment for years of service.
- ✓ Certificate of growth in specialized competency area.

REFERENCES

- Adesina ,S. (1980) .*Education Management* .Enugu :Fourth Dimension Publishing co.Ltd
- Ahuja, K. K. (1987).*Personnel Management*. New Delhi: Kalyani, Publisher.
- Amin, M..E (2005) .*Foundations of Statistical Inference for Social Science research*.
Makerere University, Kampala Uganda.
- Amsterdam, (2003).*A collaborative approach to the development and validation of a principal evaluation system: A case study*. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 17(3), 221-242.
- Armstrong, M. (1999) .*Performance Management*. London: Kogan, Page Ltd.
- Aswathappa, K.(2007).*Management, PB*.New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Education Private Limited
- Baily, C. T (1986).*The Measurement of Job Performance, Handbook*.London, England: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Beatty, R. (1984) .*Performance Appraisal: Assessing Human Behavior at Work*, Boston: Kent Publishing.
- Befekadu G/Tsadik, (1996) "*Teachers Performance Appraisal: Issues and Strategies*. Unpublished Material: Ministry of Education: Addis Ababa: Ethiopia.
- Best, J. W., and Kahn, J.V., (1998) *Research in Education: 7th edition*. Prentice hall of India.
- BlankStein, A.M. (1996).*Why TCM Can't Work –and a School Where it did*. The Education Digest, 62(1): 27 – 30.
- Blasé, J., and Blasé, J. (1999).*Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(3), 349.
- Brown, (1998).*Taking the lead: One district's approach to principal evaluation*.NASSP Bulletin, 82(602), 18.
- Catano, N., &Stronge, J. H. (2006).*What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards*.NASSP Bulletin, 90(3), 221.

- Chandan, J. S.(2003) *Management Concepts and Strategies*. New Nelhi: Vikas publishing house pvt.ltd.
- Clifford, M., and Ross, S. (2011). *Designing principal evaluation systems: Research to guide decision-making*.Concord, MA: American Institutes for Research.
- Cook, M. (1991).*10 - Minute Guide to Motivating People* .Alpha Book Publishers, New York.
- Davis, S., Kearney, K., Sanders, N., Thomas, C., & Leon, R. (2011). *The policies and practices of principal evaluation: A review of the literature*. Retrieved June 14, 2011, from <http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/smu/view/rs/26860>
- Decenzo, A & Robbins, P. (1998).*Personnel/ Human resource management*. New Delhi: Prentice hall of India.
- Dull, L.W. (1981).*Supervision: School Leadership Handbook*. Columus Charles E. Merrill Publisher Company.
- Dunham, I.(1995).*Developing Effective School Management*. New York: Rout Edge.
- Emjong, J(2004).*In-service training programs and their effects on the performance of staff at the Uganda Revenue Authority*.Kampala.Unpublished dissertation Makerere University, Makerere.
- Finnigon, P. (1973) .*Personnel Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Filipo,E.(1980). *Principles of Perssonnel Management*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- HailemariamMoreda. (2013)."*Study on Performance Appraisal Practice Bits Effects on Employee Performance*".(Unpublished Theses) Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia
- Harris, A. (2005). *Leading from the chalk-face: an overview of school leadership*. Leadership, 1(1), 73-87..
- Ivancevich J. M., (1998).*Human resource Management*.New york: MC Graw –Hill.
- Isaac, S. & Michael, W. (1997).*Handbook in Research and evaluation*: San Diego, CA: EDITS

- Jack N. Kondrasuk (2011) “*So What an Ideal Performance Appraisal Look Like?*” *Journal of Applied Business & Economics*. Vol.22 (1).pp, 57-71.
- Joshua, M.T., A.M. Joshua, A.W. Kritsonis, (2006). *Use of Students’ Achievement Scores as Basis for Assessing Teachers’ Instructional Effectiveness: Issues and Research Results* .National Forum of Teacher Education Journal.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Instruments for evaluation School Administrator*, 55, 14-20.
- Lawler,A (2012). *Wages and Salaries*. London: Irwin.
- Lucio,W. and McNeil,J.(1979). *Supervision in Thought and Action*. New Delhi: New Age International limited Publisher
- Mahapatro, B.(2010). *Human Resource Management* .New Delhi: New Age International Limited Publisher
- Management Institute, (2013). *personnel management retrieved on august 5, 2013 from <http://www.educationnext.org/20062/58.html>*.1)
- Manatt,R.(1987). *Student Feedback to Teachers Questionnaire*.IOWA: College Education
- MelakuYimam. (1992). *Appraiser-Appraise Perception of Teachers Performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa: Masters: AAU. Addis Ababa.*
- MuluLegesse.(2001). *Addis Ababa senior secondary schoolteachers' perception of the current teacher’s performance appraisal system*. (Masters Theses Unpublished), AAU
- Ministry of Education.(1979). *Education administration and supervision EMPDA*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Montgomery, D.and Hadfield.(1989). *Practical Teachers Appraisal*, London: Page Ltd.

- Moore, B. (2009). *Improving the evaluation and feedback process for principals*. *Principal*, 88(3), 4.
- Mullins, L.J. (1996). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Murphy, J. (1985). *Supervising and evaluating principals: Lessons from effective districts*. *Educational Leadership*, 43(2), 78-82.
- Murphy, J. A., & Pimentel, S. (1996). *Grading principals: Administrator evaluations come of age*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78, 74-81.
- Ofoegbu, F.I., (2004). *Teacher Motivation: A Factor for Classroom Effectiveness and School Improvement in Nigeria*. Gale Group. Retrieved August 15 2005, From <http://www.findArticles.com>.
- Peterson, D. (1991). *Evaluating principals*. ERIC digest series number 60.
- Russo, A. (2004). *Evaluating administrators with portfolios*. *School Administrator*, 61(9), 34-39.
- Stufflebeam, D., and Nevo, D. (1993). *Principal evaluation: New directions for improvement*. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(2), 24-46.
- Tumer, G, and P. Clief., (1985). *Studies in Teacher Appraisal*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- UseleymanGemechu. 2011. *Evaluating the Performance Appraisal system of secondary school principals in Harari region Unpublished Masters Theses*, Haramaya University.
- Webb,L. and Northon, M(1999). *Human Resource Administration: Personnel Issues and Needs in Education* . Upper Saddle River : Prentice Hall Inc.
- WossenYimam 1998. "The System of Appraising Principals in the technically vocational Schools of Ethiopia" in *Proceeding of the Conference on Quality of Education in Ethiopia: Visions for the 21st Century*. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa Ethiopia.

APPENDIX -A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRAGUATE STUDIES

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire to Be Filled By Principals, Teachers, Students and Parents

Dear respondents

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant data to the study entitled “Assessment of principal’s performance appraisal system in primary schools of AkakiKality Sub city, Addis Ababa City Administration”. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So you are kindly requested to read all questions and fill the questionnaires with genuine response, and your identity will be kept confidential and the response will be used for research purpose only.

Please note the following points before you start filling this questionnaires:

1. You do not need to write your name on the questionnaires;
2. Read all the instructions before you answer the questions;
3. Do not consult others to fill the questionnaires;
4. Please indicate by using ticking “/” or "X" for one of the Suggested liker scales. Kindly write your opinion briefly for the short answer questions on the space provide
5. Please do not leave any question unanswered

Thank you for your cooperation!

CHARACTERSTICS OF RESPONDENTS

1. Sex: A. Female B. Male
2. Age: A. below 25 B. 25 – 34 C. 35 – 44 D. Over 44
3. Educational Qualifications: A. Diploma B. Bachelor C. Masters & Above
4. Field of Study

Management

Accounting

Educational planning and management

Other (please specify)-----

5. Years of service in current position

5 year and below 6 – 10

11 – 15 16 – 20

21 – 25 26 and above

6. Total years of service

5 year and below 6 – 10

11 – 15 16 – 20

21 – 25 26 and above

Direction I:

Read each of the following items carefully and put the sign “√” for the alternative you think is true for you. Please rate your answer as number 1 being the item you strongly agree and number 5 being the item you strongly disagree.

5= strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3= undecided,

2= Disagree, 1= Strongly Disagree

1. Principal performance appraisal purpose

S/N	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.1	The performance appraisal of school principals uses to identify area of weakness of principals					
1.2	The school principals performance appraisal helps the evaluators to know what performance and achievements have been made by					
1.3	The school principals performance appraisal practice can help to compare performance standard with actual performance					
1.4	The school principal's performance appraisal practice works as a bridge of communication between the evaluator and principals.					
1.5	The organization use performance appraisal as one of the mechanism to fill principals' professional gap.					
1.6	Performance Appraisal helps in identifying the principals who most					
1.7	performance appraisal practice helps as a source of the organizations complete statistical data					

2. Principal performance appraisal criteria

SN.	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
2.1	The principals set clear and challenging, but achievable performance objectives for each assessment period					
2.2	The criteria are adequate to differentiate good performance from poor performance					
2.3	Criteria differ depending on newly deployed and experienced principals.					
2.4	Students' learning result is included as an evaluation criterion.					
2.5	The evaluation criteria includes principals organizational and interpersonal skills					
2.6	The principals have the opportunity to participate in designing the criteria upon which their evaluation is based.					
2.7	Evaluative criteria describe what the principal is, rather than what the principal does					

3. *Principal performance appraisal processes*

SN.	<i>Items</i>	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
3.1	The evaluators have regular meetings reviewing the standards and expectations with the school principals.					
3.2	The evaluators appraise principals with standardized way.					
3.3	Performance appraisals must be reviewed with employees to be effective					
3.4	The evaluators set an action plan for future performance appraisal.					
3.5	Evaluation process affects relationship of principals and evaluators.					
3.6	The evaluators must determine what out puts; accomplishments and skills will be evaluated.					

4. Principals reaction regarding appraisers

S/N	Items	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Appraisers tend to get biased and prejudice					
4.2	performance appraisal is one of the controlling tools for the management rather than professional development ,motivation and satisfied.					
4.3	Appraisers lack skills to appraise principals' performance					
4.4	Appraisers are reluctant to devote enough time to the task of appraising					
4.5	Most principals perceived the evaluation process as having neither positive nor negative impact on their leadership style					

5. Principals performance appraisal problem

S/N	<i>Items</i>	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.1	The evaluators are biased on relationship					
5.2	The school principals performance appraisal practice has problems on schedule					
5.3	Poor administration of the overall appraisal process					
5.4	Shortage of time to appraise principals' performance					
5.5	The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria					
5.6	Lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience on the side of appraisers					
5.7	Evaluators are not f rewarded					

Part II- Open ended Question for Principals, Teachers

1- Are there any pre and post appraisal discussions with the appraisers'?

2- What are major problems in Principals performance appraisal?

3- What do you suggest to overcome the problems and to improve the Performance appraisal system?

APPENDIX -B

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRAGUATE STUDIES

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Interview GuideforHead of Woreda education office& supervisors

Dear respondents

The purpose of this interview is to collect relevant data to the study entitled “Assessment of principals’ performance appraisal system in primary schools of AkakiKality Sub city, Addis Ababa City Administration. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So, you are kindly requested to respond to the questions genuinely. Your response will be processed only by the researcher and used only for research purpose. Your identity will also be kept strictly confidential.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

I. Personal Information

1. Name of your school-----
2. Sex-----
3. Age-----
4. Level of your education-----
5. Area of specialization-----
6. Total service-----

II. Interview Question for Supervisors & Woreda education Officers

1. How much is the system is standardized?
2. What are the appraising processes in primary schools?
3. Who has primary benefited from performance appraisal?
4. What are the major objectives the school principal's performance appraisal?
5. Who are involved in appraising principal's performance?
6. What is the reaction of principals in appraising by the students?
7. Do teachers who perform best awarded? In what form?
8. What are the major challenges of school principal's performance appraisal?
9. What do you suggest to improve the school principals performance appraisal system?

APPENDIX-C

በሚዛናዊ ስራ አመራርና ዉጤት ምዘና

ስርዓት

**ስትራቴጂክ ግብን ግብተኮርተግባራት
ለር/መምህር የማውረጃ /Individual
cascading/**

ማስተግበሪያ ማኑዋል

2008 ዓ.ም

