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ABSTRACT

Education commissions in Kenya starting with the Report of the Commission of the Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond of 1988 studies have persistently recommended for the need to establish the practice of SBTE in secondary schools as a remedy to the inadequate and ineffective role of the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in Education (DQASE). Recommendations made by the commissions to the effect that SBTE practice be established in secondary schools in Kenya and yet it is supposed to be an on-going practice led to the conclusion that there was a problem with the practice. It was in view of this that this study analyzed factors influencing SBTE practice in secondary schools in the selected districts of Western Province, Kenya with the purpose of providing explanations and suggestions solutions on issues surrounding it. A survey study design was used because of the type of information collected and also because of the large target population of the study. The study was conducted in three districts of Western Province, Kenya, namely, Bungoma, Butere/Mumias and Vihiga. Thirty-seven out of 282 schools were sampled for the study. The target population was 3826 subjects while the sample size was 514. Data was collected using headteachers, senior teachers, selected heads of departments and selected teachers. Stratified, purposive, simple and systematic random sampling procedures were used to select the districts, schools and respondents. A questionnaire, two different interview schedules and document analysis guides were used to collect the information. Validation of the research instruments was partly based on a pilot study conducted in two schools not involved in the study. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis approaches were used. The data was analyzed manually according to themes derived from the specific objectives of the study. The findings were discussed and presented through descriptive tables. The main findings of the study were: there were no awareness programmes especially with regards to the analysis of professional tools; less than half of the respondents had received some in-service training course; there were no proper strategies laid down for the institutionalization of SBTE and observation of teachers during instruction is done in very few schools. Understaffing especially in district schools, failure by head-teachers to initiate and enforce observation of teachers during instruction, lack of funds by most of the schools, lack of know how and lack of a clear government policy especially with regards to peer teacher evaluation were some of the factors militating against SBTE practice. There was no mutual understanding by the respondents about the purpose of SBTE and the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice. The following recommendations were made: headteachers to take a leading role in SBTE practice; in-service training courses targeting all teachers to be conducted; schools to be staffed with enough teachers; need for a clear government policy about the purpose and practice of especially peer teacher evaluation; the Ministry of Education through the DQASE to be more involved in SBTE practice.
CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the background information to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, specific objectives, research questions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, scope and limitations of the study, the theoretical and conceptual framework and the definition of operational terms.

1.2 Background to the Study

1.2.1 Concept of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation according to Rehore (1991) is as old as the teaching profession. Teachers have always been evaluated by heads of schools and inspectors of schools nowadays known as Quality Assurances Officers. Teacher evaluation can be described as the systematic process of collection, analyzation and interpretation of information leading to judgement about the behaviour/disposition of a teacher during instruction and activities related to it like preparation and updating of professional tools of teachers such as: schemes of work; lesson plans and lesson notes; records of work covered, learners' evaluation records, among others. Teacher evaluation like learner evaluation is supposed to be a continuous activity during curriculum implementation process (Shiundu & Omulando, 1992) because it may help establish the teachers’
shortcomings which may eventually be addressed to improve both the teacher and the learning process.

Teachers are evaluated under two main forms of evaluation, namely, external teacher evaluation and school-based-teacher-evaluation (SBTE) or internal teacher evaluation. External teacher evaluation is evaluation conducted by persons who are not members of the school such as quality assurance officers also known as inspectors of schools for some education systems like His Majesty the Queens Inspectorate in Britain. Worthen and Sanders (1987) and Nevo (1995) applaud the importance of the two types of evaluation. According to them, SBTE is most likely to yield more accurate and immediate results because it is based on established needs of the teachers and the school. It can also be conducted on more regular basis because the evaluators and evaluatees are always on the spot. External evaluation, on the other hand, is more objective because of the unfamiliarity of the evaluator to context in which the evaluation takes place. The external evaluator according to Worthen and Sanders (1987) and Nevo (1995) is expected to be an expert compared to the internal evaluator and so brings in the expertise in teacher evaluation. S/he is also expected to be an evaluator and advisor of SBTE. According to Nevo, the external evaluator in any education system is indispensable and so external teacher evaluation must be conducted even where SBTE does not exist. He also appreciates that an external evaluation will be more acceptable where there is effective SBTE.

External teacher evaluation in Kenya is primarily the responsibility of the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in Education (DQASE)
previously known as the Inspectorate. The DQASE is the arm of the Ministry of Education (MoE) in Kenya that is mandated through the Education Act 211 Section 18 of the Laws of Kenya to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the curriculum in all learning institutions in the whole country [except universities] (Republic of Kenya, 1980). The key functions of the DQASE in teacher evaluation is to analyze the professional tools of teachers and to observe teachers during instruction. Other external teacher evaluators in Kenya are parents and the immediate community to the school. However, teacher evaluation by parents and the immediate community in most cases is informal and sometimes based on learners’ performance especially in continuous assessment tests, end of term/year examination and national examinations such as the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) and the Kenya Certificate of Secondary of Education (KCSE) and the learners’ conduct.

School-based-teacher-evaluation is an evaluation conducted by academic members of the school like the headteachers, senior teachers, heads of departments, the rest of the teachers and learners. Teachers as per their professional requirement are supposed to conduct self-evaluation during and after instruction by reflecting on the teaching-learning techniques especially where the expected outcomes are not realized and take appropriate measures to address the shortcoming(s) (Shiundu & Omulando, 1992 and Sawa, 1995). Apart from self-evaluation, teachers are supposed to be evaluated by the headteachers, heads of departments (HoDs) and subject heads in what is known as clinical evaluation and the rest of the teachers in what is known as peer

In Kenya, secondary schools are mandated by the government through the Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) Code of Regulations for Teachers (Republic of Kenya, 1986), A Manual for Heads of Secondary Schools in Kenya (Ministry of Education, 1987) and the Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions (Republic of Kenya, 2000) to engage in the practice of SBTE. According to the TSC Code of Regulations for Teachers, headteachers are expected to fill teachers’ confidential report forms from the TSC every year and return them to the TSC. The headteacher according to the form, is supposed to write a confidential report about each individual teacher on the following areas:

- Performance in teaching and carrying out assignments
- General conduct and personal characteristics
- Administrative and organizational ability
- Co-operation with others
- Overall assessment (Outstanding, very good, good, unsatisfactory and fail) (Republic of Kenya, 1986).

For the headteacher to provide a satisfactory report about each teacher on the basis of the above five listed areas, s/he requires to closely monitor and evaluate the teacher on regular basis.

According to the Manual for Heads of Secondary Schools in Kenya, headteachers and the deputy headteachers are expected to conduct SBTE in their learning institutions. They are expected to supervise and evaluate
teachers especially during instruction and other activities related to it such as preparation of professional tools by the teachers, updating the tools and evaluating the learners. The Manual further notes that the headteacher is not a specialist in all subjects. S/he, therefore, can delegate some of her/his responsibilities like analysis of teachers professional tools and even observation of teachers during instruction to HoDs or subject heads (Ministry of Education, 1987). The HoDs and subject heads in this respect are expected to make sure that proper implementation of the formal curriculum in the relevant subjects is done through thorough supervision and evaluation of the teachers.

The Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions in Kenya is also emphatic about SBTE practice. According to the handbook, the individual teacher observation schedule: Schedule 8 found in the handbook will be a key professional development tool. Apart from its use in [external] inspection [evaluation], it can also be used by college principals and heads of schools for regular monitoring of teachers or by teachers observing one another (Republic of Kenya, 2000). Schools are expected to use schedule 8 and other schedules in the handbook for professional planning before the [external] evaluation takes place. A report of findings through internal evaluation according to the handbook will be one of the audit and review reports to the external evaluator(s) during the external evaluation (Republic of Kenya, 2000). The preceding statement according to sources from the Ministry of Education makes SBTE mandatory in schools in Kenya.
1.2.2 Characteristics of an Effective Teacher-Evaluation System

An effective teacher evaluation according to Simons (1981), Millman and Hammond (1990), Nevo (1995) and Wanzare (2002) is characterized by: teacher preparedness through awareness and in-service training programmes; organization of resources; implementation and institutionalization strategies such as, frequent evaluation activities, pre-and post-teacher evaluation conferences, the use of an evaluation criterion or guide, information and storage systems, administrative support and the involvement of the external evaluator. Awareness and in-service training programmes according to Nevo (1995) are very vital in the practice of teacher evaluation because they are used as forums to enlighten and/or remind teachers about the purpose of their evaluation and also to provide knowledge and skills about the procedures of teacher evaluation. Organization of resources ensures that teacher evaluation is conducted in schools by making it part of the school routine through programming and availing relevant resources like teachers and time.

Frequent evaluation activities make teacher evaluation part and parcel of curriculum implementation or institutionalizes the practice which can be best realized through the practice of SBTE because the persons involved are always on the spot. Pre-teacher evaluation conferencing which is a discussion session held between the evaluator and the teacher is used for goal setting and laying down the procedures for the evaluation. It is a very important stage because it makes the exercise objective, focused and ensures clarity. Post-teacher evaluation conferencing on the other hand is a discussion session held between the evaluator and the teacher after an evaluation session. It is used to cite and
discuss strengths and weaknesses observed during the evaluation session so that the weaknesses can be addressed for improvement. The use of an evaluation criterion or guide ensures that systematic, objective and focused information is collected (Republic of Kenya, 2000). The kind of feedback the evaluator gives the teacher after an evaluation exercise will influence the kind of perceptions and commitments the teacher develops towards the practice of SBTE (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2002).

Information and storage system ensure that teacher evaluation records are preserved for future reference. It is also an evidence of commitment to the practice of teacher evaluation by the school (Hammond, 1990 and Nevo, 1995). Administrative support of the practice of SBTE motivates the members of the senior management team and the rest of the teachers and so it is also important for the sustainability of the practice. The external evaluator is deemed to be an expert in teacher evaluation and so her/his role in the practice of SBTE is indispensable. S/he comes in as an evaluator and advisor (Worthen & Sanders, 1987 and Nevo, 1995).

1.2.3 The Role of Teacher Evaluation

Historically, teacher evaluation has been conducted by heads of schools and external evaluators either directly or indirectly for the main purpose of promoting improved teaching and learning. Teacher evaluation whether school-based or conducted by an external evaluator is used to: establish strengths and weaknesses of teachers during curriculum implementation so that relevant
measures are taken especially where weaknesses are noted; it helps determine whether new teachers can teach; it indicates what a teacher can effectively teach and teacher decisions for tenure, promotion or demotion, retention or dismissal according to Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984) are greatly influenced by teacher evaluation.

Montgomery and Hadheld (1989) claim that a fair and non-threatening, valid and comprehensive [teacher] evaluation system offers what is often an unprecedented opportunity to learn and develop that which benefits the individual and the school and meets the prime aim of [teacher] evaluation, to improve the quality of teaching and learning. The same sentiments are echoed by Wareng (1990) who observes that an effective evaluation process will serve to minimize fears and maximize human potential and ultimately improve the quality of the teaching-learning process. Teacher evaluation helps identify professional development needs of teachers; provides the basis for planning professional development of teachers and administrators; provides information regarding the knowledge and skills gained during staff development and also judging the degree of permanency of the acquired knowledge and skills. Improved teaching and learning is as a result of both teacher and learner evaluation outcomes (Toledo Federation of Teachers, 1996)

Teachers are cornerstones of any education system because they are interpreters of educational and curriculum goals at the instructional level. That is why emphasis is being placed on their evaluation by many educational systems to ensure proper and effective implementation of the school curriculum (Hopkins, 1989 and Nevo, 1995). A number of studies stress that the
quality of an educational system is a reflection of the quality of the teaching force. For example, the Botswana National Education Commission (Republic of Botswana, 1977) made the following observation to underscore the role of the teacher in education:

The commission is concerned that the quality of teaching is the most important influence on the quality of education provided in schools (p.93).

Sharing almost the same sentiments about the importance of the teacher in education was a former Chief Inspector of Schools in Kenya who in the opening remarks in a paper entitled, ‘Maintenance of Standards in Teacher Education’ stated that a country’s quality of education is as good as the quality of the teachers and thus the quality of the training (Sitima, 1994). He echoed the observation of the first independent education commission in Kenya, the Kenya Education Commission (Republic of Kenya, 1964) that:

Provision of a well educated, keen, competent, respected and contented teaching force is by far the most important contribution the government can make to the schools (p.107)

Among the suggestions Sitima made for the improvement of standards in teacher education was the use of appropriate and effective [teacher] evaluation methods and the intensification of teacher evaluation.

Despite the importance attached to teacher evaluation because of the role teachers play in education, the practice has over the years had its shortcomings related to procedures of the practice and also resulting from limitation of resources. Peterson (2000) observes that 70 years of research on
principals’ rating of teachers depicts them as inaccurate raters of both individual teacher performance behaviour and overall teacher merit, a symptom of incompetent principals. To underscore the claim, Peterson cites studies based on research findings by Wise et al (1984); Medley and Coker (1987) and Johnson (1990). Wise et al (1984) report that almost all respondents to a survey of thirty-two district offices felt that principals lacked sufficient resolve and competence to evaluate accurately. According to Medley and Coker (1987), 12 studies from 1921-1959 reached the same conclusion that correlation between the average principals’ rating of teachers’ performance and direct measures of teacher effectiveness were near zero.

In a paper entitled ‘Evaluating the Work of Teachers in Australian Schools: Vision and Reality’ based on research findings and presented at an annual conference in Brisbane, it was reported that teachers who were interviewed criticized formal supervision and evaluation practices in their school. Teachers reported that evaluation practices were not effective for improvement because administrators were rarely prepared to offer useful advice and an opportunity for learning. Very good teachers according to the findings regarded the practice as an institutional obligation to be endured rather than an opportunity to be seized (Johnson, 1990).

In another study conducted in one thousand schools by a research team from Exeter University, it was found that there was considerable teacher and headteacher dissatisfaction with evaluation methods prescribed by the British Department of Education and Training of the ‘threshold’ position (Chamberlin, Wragg, Hayness, Wragg, 2001). The purpose of such evaluation was to
eventually determine who was to get a substantive pay increase. The study established that the success rate of applicants was 97 percent, a figure that raised questions about the effectiveness and validity of the evaluation and even if the evaluation had been necessary in the first place. There was a general feeling that teachers should instead have been given a pay rise without being subjected to evaluation.

The problem of inadequacy of teacher evaluation is another area of concern in many countries. Elliot (1981) and Hopkins (1989) observe that the importance attached to the role of evaluation for educational improvement is so great that in this era of accountability, transparency, rapid technological and educational advancement against limited resources, many countries such as Great Britain, Australia, Israel, and United States of America among others are reforming their education systems in such a way that schools are empowered to strengthen school-based-approaches in evaluation including teacher evaluation. Kleinhenz and Ingvarson (2002) report that it was approximately 30 years since the system of inspection used to evaluate teachers during the preceding one hundred years in Australia. In those 30 years, most Australian teachers had little or no experience of formal evaluation of their work because of inadequate resources. To address the problem, many schools in Australia have instituted their own peer appraisal schemes.

Teacher evaluation in Kenya conducted by both the external and internal evaluator(s) has had its shortcomings for a number of years as reported by some education commissions and some other studies. Though there is no explicit evidence highlighting shortcomings of SBTE, recommendations made by some
of the education commissions and other studies on how to address the problems of the DQASE indirectly reveal that there is also a problem with the practice of SBTE. For example, the report of the Commission of the Presidential Working Party on Education and Man-power Training for the Next Decade and Beyond (Republic of Kenya, 1988) and the report of the commission on Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training (Republic of Kenya, 1999) recommends that senior teachers and heads of schools be utilized to assist with the inspection and guidance of teachers in schools as a cost-effective measure in education in the country. The recommendation was made because during the investigations by the two commissions, it was found that inspection of schools was not being done effectively because of inadequate and incompetent DQASE officers. The officers lacked funds to expend on their training and provision of facilities like means of transport which could enable them make frequent visits to schools and for their subsistence. As a result, the officers hardly coped with the demand to inspect all schools and various subjects taught in secondary schools in the country.

The Master Plan on Education and Training (1997-2010) (Republic of Kenya, 1998) has almost similar sentiments with the report of the Presidential Working Party on Education and Man-power Training for the Next Decade and Beyond with regard to the practice of SBTE. The Plan stresses that a system whereby experienced heads of schools and subject teachers would give professional guidance in their schools and to neighbouring schools would be institutionalized as a cost-effective measure in education. The recommendation was made because it was found that most teachers in schools were not being
evaluated by the DQASE officers. Their visits to schools were infrequent since they were inadequate in numbers.

Wanzare (2002) in a study on teacher evaluation in the third world countries with focus on Kenya cites problems of teacher evaluation in Kenya such as: top-down bureaucratic character; lack of a comprehensive teacher evaluation policy; inadequate evaluations; lack of productive feedback and lack of empirical research on teacher evaluation. Though the study went further to propose strategies for improvement of teacher evaluation in Kenya, it was very categorical that the strategies were unlikely to bring about any meaningful contributions in teacher evaluation without considering among other things the importance of having a clear vision about the practice of School-Based-Teacher-Evaluation.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

School-Based-Teacher-Evaluation is supposed to be an on-going practice in the school curriculum in Kenya according to the TSC Code of Regulations for Teachers (Republic of Kenya, 1986), a Manual for Heads of Secondary Schools in Kenya (Ministry of Education, 1987) and Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions (Republic of Kenya, 2000). Therefore, the fact that recommendations are made by some of the education commissions in Kenya and other studies to the effect that SBTE should be established in schools as a remedy to the problem of ineffective teacher evaluation by the DQASE and yet it is supposed to be an on-going practice is an indication that there may also be a problem with the practice of SBTE in secondary schools in Kenya. Such a
recommendation would not have been made if the impact of the practice of SBTE was being felt. It was in this respect that questions such as: Is SBTE actually being practiced? If it is practiced, how is it conducted and how effective is it? If SBTE is not conducted as expected what are the causes? Are the causes related to procedures and/or perceptions about the role of the practice of SBTE? It was in view of this that this study analyzed the procedures and factors influencing the practice of SBTE in secondary schools with the purpose of making suggestions that will help bring about improvement in the practice in order to strengthen it in schools.

1.4 Specific Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives were to:

1) Establish awareness strategies that had been put in place for SBTE practice.

2) Establish if the headteachers, senior teachers and heads of departments and teachers were trained to engage in SBTE practice.

3) Examine how the resources were organized for SBTE practice.

4) Establish the extent to which SBTE had been implemented and institutionalized in schools.

5) Establish the teachers' perceptions about the purpose of SBTE practice.

6) Examine the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice.

7) Establish teachers' perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice.
1.5 **Research Questions**

The researcher was guided by the following questions to achieve the objectives of the study:

1) What awareness strategies have been put in place for SBTE practice?

2) How much are the headteachers, senior teachers, HoDs and teachers empowered to engage in SBTE practice?

3) How are the resources organized for SBTE practice?

4) To what extent has SBTE been implemented and institutionalized in schools?

5) What are the teachers' perceptions about the purpose of SBTE practice?

6) How much is the DQASE involved in SBTE practice?

7) What are the teachers' perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice?

1.6 **Significance of the Study**

There is need to intensify the evaluation of teachers during curriculum implementation in secondary schools in Kenya. One of the ways by which teacher evaluation can be intensified in schools is through SBTE practice. If SBTE is not practiced or if its impact is not felt in schools, identifying and analyzing factors that hinder and/or promote the practice may help in strengthening the practice if the recommendation of this study are implemented.

The review of literature revealed that there have been no studies carried out of this nature in Kenya so far. Findings of this study may provide
information to the school-based-teacher and external evaluators, for example, the headteachers and the DQASE in reforming policy systems both at the national, local and school levels in Kenya. National, Provincial and District policy gives authority to SBTE practice while school policy directs the process and procedures for the practice in secondary schools.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The study was conducted with the assumptions that:

1) There were teacher, school and external related factors that promote or hinder SBTE practice.

2) There would be no or very minimal changes in the target population by the time this study was conducted.

3) All respondents would be co-operative and provide honest responses.

4) All schools in the districts of study had senior teachers and HoDs.

1.8 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The formal dimension of the school curriculum takes the greater part of the day in the school system in Kenya. It was in view of this that the researcher focused on this dimension to give it an in-depth study.

The study focused on selected secondary schools of selected districts of Western Province. For more conclusive results, all secondary schools from all districts of the province should have been studied. Due to financial constraints and for control purposes, it was not possible to conduct the study in all secondary schools in Western Province.
The study was confined to the school administration and teachers of selected secondary schools who are direct implementers of SBTE as evaluators and evaluatees. Only teachers who were present on the day of the study were sampled for the study because the researcher had to explain to the respondents the purpose of the study in person. Those teachers who were absent were not sampled though they would have had an interesting input in the study.

There may be other external factors arising from the influence of other surrounding schools and the community other than the DQASE, for example, the purpose for which SBTE is conducted and how it is conducted. This study focused on the DQASE only and made recommendations based on it only. Unless similar studies are conducted focusing on the other external related factors that were not studied, they may remain a barrier to SBTE practice incase the recommendations of this study are implemented.

There is scarce literature based on empirical studies focusing on SBTE. Most of the review was drawn from descriptive studies on teacher evaluation in general. Also, most recent studies, for example, in Kenya tend to focus on topical issues like HIV-AIDS, gender, Free Primary Education and how they impact on curriculum implementation while what goes on in the schools and classrooms is ignored. It was, therefore, difficult to get most recent empirical studies related to the topic of this study.

1.9 Theoretical Framework of the Study

The theoretical framework of this study was derived from Walsh and Gitlin & Smyth’s (1987 & 1989) Participative and Educatve Models of Teacher
Evaluation. The participative and educative models were successfully applied for the evaluation of the Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth for Teachers that was approved by the Tennessee State Board of Education. It was recommended on the basis of the findings that the Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth continues to be utilized.

Walsh (1987) and Gitlin and Smyth (1989) as opposed to McGreal’s (1983) Model of Dominance and Control argue that the participative and educative models can reduce the need for dominant accountability forms of teacher evaluation by removing blame from teachers for education problems to the wider community accepting legitimate responsibility in setting and monitoring the goals of schools. Walsh goes further to de-emphasize the dominant model of teacher evaluation by observing that, the notion of teachers as independent and autonomous professionals has been eroded, and the importance of management and hierarchical accountability emphasized. In dominant models of teacher evaluation, the teacher is effectively silenced. According to Gitlin and Smyth (1989), teachers are reduced to implementing the ideas of others rather than querying their own practice and the context in which it occurs.

On the contrary, the participative and educative models of teacher evaluation encourage the active participation of teachers in teacher evaluation and so are appropriate in the practice of SBTE. The models allow teachers as professionals the freedom to choose what they want to be evaluated on and how they want to be evaluated. This is based on the premise that it is the teacher who knows her/his needs. According to (Zahorik, 1987), the participative and
educative models discourage norms of isolation, privacy, protectionism of teachers that characterize the teaching profession when it comes to classroom based activities. At the same time, they give way to norms of professional sharing, joint curriculum implementation, collegial observation and feedback (Cousins & Earl, 1995).

To be involved in effective SBTE practice, teachers have to be initiated into it through well-planned and continuous awareness programmes. All participants in SBTE practice are supposed to be empowered with relevant knowledge and skills about the practice through the provision of in-service training courses. The teachers are involved in the actual evaluation process right from the first stage which is goal setting to the last stage which is the implementation of the evaluation outcomes (Tennessee State of Education, 2006). The teachers are involved in goal setting during the pre-teacher evaluation conference. Together with the evaluator, they discuss and agree on the parameters of the evaluation process in relation to why the evaluation has to be conducted, when, how and areas of focus. During the post-teacher evaluation conference, the teacher is given the first opportunity by the evaluator to make a brief assessment of the lesson in case of observation during the instruction. The teacher is the implementer of the evaluation outcomes upon which follow-ups are made. The teacher, therefore, is a very active participant in SBTE practice if well conducted. It is argued that if SBTE is well-implemented, the teachers will own it and be committed to it (Hammond, 1990 & Nevo, 1995).
Peer teacher evaluation which is one of the forms of SBTE embraces characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation such as collaboration, collegiality and dialogue that are spearheaded by a number of studies of modern education (Shulman, 1987; Walsh, 1987 and Sawa (1995). All these characteristics call for the active participation of teachers in the practice of SBTE. School-based-teacher-evaluation may be more effective than evaluation conducted by external evaluators because it is the school’s internal initiative and chances of it being conducted on regular basis are high (Nevo, 1995).

1:10 The Conceptual Framework

The analysis of the factors influencing SBTE practice was guided by a conceptual framework derived at by the researcher as depicted in figure 1:1
Figure 1.1: Schematic Presentation of the Conceptual Framework Guiding the Study

**Level One**
SCHOOL-BASED-TEACHER-EVALUATION PRACTICE

**Level Two**
Possible factors influencing School-Based-Teacher-Evaluation Practice

- **Management Related Factors**
  - Awareness strategies
  - Training Provisions
  - Organization of Resources
  - Implementation and institutionalization of SBTE
  - Perceptions about the purpose of SBTE

- **External Related Factors**
  - Frequency of SBTE
  - Pre-and post-evaluation conference
  - Use of Criteria/guides
  - Storage facilities
  - Administrative Support
  - The role of the DQASE in SBTE practice
  - Teachers’ perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice

**Level Three**
Intervention measures for the improvement of SBTE

- Continuous awareness programmes
- Proper planning of resources
- Intensification of the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice
- Intensified and well coordinated in-service training courses
- Frequent evaluation practices

**Level Four**
Expected Outcomes

- Effective and stable SBTE practices
- Effective role of the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in SBTE practice
- Effective school management and curriculum practice
The schematic presentation of the conceptual framework captures the interrelationship among the major variables presented at four levels as shown in Figure 1:1. The *first level* which is implementation of SBTE is a *dependent variable*. Review of related literature enabled this study identify factors most of them, derived from the procedures and characteristics of an effective SBTE practice. Management and external related factors which are captured at *level two* that formed the *independent variables* of this study were identified as possible factors influencing the practice. In other words, the success or failure of the practice of SBTE depends on the presence or absence of those factors. For example, it was assumed that without proper continuous awareness programmes; provision of in-service training opportunities; proper organization of resources, proper implementation and institutionalization strategies; and favourable views about SBTE practice; the advisory and evaluative role of the DQASE in SBTE practice, the practice would be ineffective.

It was also assumed that with proper intervention measures which were also *independent variables* reflected in *level three* such as: continuous awareness programmes about the role of SBTE; continuous in-service training courses; proper organization of resources; effective implementation and institutionalization strategies for SBTE practice and intensified role of the DQASE in SBTE practice, there will be effective and stable SBTE practices in schools, effective school administration and curriculum practice, favourable views about SBTE practice and the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice and also effective role of the DQASE in SBTE practice as shown in *level four*. 
Whereas a number of studies reviewed had a lot on how the factors already cited have a lot of influence on SBTE practice, they failed to acknowledge that other factors such as the type of institutions, teacher establishment and economical endowment of the institutions can have a direct or indirect influence on SBTE practice. For example, the data collected during this study revealed that SBTE practice is fairly effective in provincial schools than the district and private schools in Kenya. School-based-teacher-evaluation practice in most provincial schools fulfilled almost all the characteristics of effective teacher evaluation practice. One of the main factors contributing to the effectiveness was the fact that most of the provincial schools had a good staff establishment and were economically endowed. The implication was that the teachers had enough time to engage in SBTE practice since they had a lighter workload than those in the district and private schools. This was one of the factors that none of studies had addressed and yet was found to be one of the major impediments to SBTE practice in schools with poor staff establishment.

1.11 Operational Definition of Key Terms

Evaluation

Refers to the systematic collection and interpretation of information leading to the judgement of the nature, quality and worth of an educational object. Examples of educational objects are educational projects; institutional programmness; curricular materials; the entire educational system; learners, teachers, instructional materials and activities.
External evaluation

Refers to the evaluation conducted in an institution by someone who is not a member of that institution, for example, evaluators from the district, province or national level. In Kenya’s education system, this evaluation is conducted mainly by the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in Education (DQASE)

Institutionalization

Making teacher evaluation part of a system, an institution or organization through frequent evaluation, the use of evaluation criteria, holding of pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences, internal administrative support and storage facilities for teacher evaluation records.

Local Policy

Refers to the course of action or decision(s) made by the education office at the provincial, district, divisional or zonal level that affects SBTE.

Management

Management is the process of designing, developing and effecting organizational objectives so as to achieve the pre-determined organizational goals with maximum efficiency.

Senior Management Team

Refers to a group of individuals in an organization or institution who execute the function of designing, developing and effecting organizational objectives so as to achieve the pre-determined organizational goals with maximum efficiency. In the secondary school system, the senior management
team that comprises the headteacher; the deputy headteacher; senior teacher and HoDs /subject heads.

**School-Based-Teacher-Evaluation**

Refers to the kind of evaluation conducted within the school by the academic members of the school who comprise the senior management team and teachers. It involves observing teachers during instruction and analysis of the professional tools of teachers such as: schemes of work; lesson guides and notes; records of work covered; teaching/learning aids; learners’ exercise books. It can also be referred to as internal teacher evaluation.

**Teacher**

Someone who engages in the implementation of the secondary school curriculum. In this study, the term teacher sometimes refers to all academic members of staff that comprise members of the Senior Management Team (headteachers, senior teacher, HoDs) and ordinary teachers. Other times it is used to mean only ordinary teachers who are not members of the Senior Management Team.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on factors that influence School-Based-Teacher-Evaluation (SBTE) practice. The study identified management related factors such as: awareness strategies; in-service training provisions for teachers; organization of resources; implementation and institutionalization strategies and teachers’ perceptions of the purpose of SBTE practice and then external related factors such as the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice and teachers’ perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice. The chapter ends with a summary of the review of literature that presents the gaps that were addressed by the study.

2.2 Management Related Factors that Influence SBTE Practice

2.2.1 Awareness Strategies for SBTE Practice

School-based-teacher-evaluation according to House (1973), Hopkin (1989), Millman and Hammond (1990) and Nevo (1995) is supposed to lead to professional development and improvement of the teachers. That role, however, may remain unknown to teachers unless they are informed about it through well-organized and co-ordinated awareness programmes (Nevo, 1995). Millman and Hammond (1990) stress that understanding of purposes are foundations of teacher evaluation is very important because they have a direct effect on the performance expectation set for teachers as well as how they are evaluated and how they participate in the evaluation. They go further to
advise that what teachers require is training in goal setting, reflection and analysis through awareness activities for positive attitude building. Any school strengthening its teacher evaluation system should first begin by affirming its purpose through a well-organized and coordinated awareness programme. A unified vision about why teachers should be evaluated is necessary before efforts to improve evaluation procedures can have much impact.

Nevo (1995) shares the same sentiments by stressing that before any form of teacher evaluation is conducted, teachers must be initiated into the practice through a well-planned awareness programme to prevent anxiety and suspicion. According to him, awareness programmes are so crucial that any institution intending to establish or even those with established SBTE practices should spend more time trying to make teachers understand and appreciate the role of teacher evaluation in their lives. Awareness programme according to Nevo should be continuous because teachers like any human being tend to forget and so the need to be reminded on why they are being evaluated. Consequently, new teachers join the teaching profession and they too need to be inducted into understanding the purpose of SBTE.

Kleinhenz and Ingvarson (2002) are even more categorical about the need for a clear understanding of purposes of teacher evaluation before it is implemented or the need to remind the participants of a teacher evaluation process about the purposes. They warn:

Schools cannot ‘implement’ teacher evaluation systems if they do not know why they are doing so, finding answers to why – answers that are acceptable to all stakeholders will require solid investment of time and energy. Nonetheless, reassessment and clarification of the purposes of teacher evaluation in relation to
various interests is an essential step for any school system that is struggling to make teacher evaluation ‘work’ (p.3).

The attitude of teachers towards evaluation will be influenced by the purpose for which it is practiced and hence the need for continuous awareness programmes focusing on the purpose of teacher evaluation (Love, 1981). Teachers who hold positive attitudes towards evaluation are most likely to benefit from it than those who do not. The resources and time spent on the preparation and effecting of the awareness programmes may in itself be a pointer to the importance attached to the practice of SBTE which helps to capture interests of teachers from the very beginning.

A study conducted by Kamindo (1998) on Head-teachers’ Instructional Supervisory Functions in Private and Public Primary Schools conducted in Ngong Division of Kajiado District, Kenya revealed that orientation of new teachers in most schools both private and public by headteachers or the deputy headteachers mainly involved introduction of the teachers to the staff and students in the staffroom and the parade. The rest was left to HoDs to acquaint the new teachers with the running of the departments. The study sought information from the teachers, headteachers and personnel from the DQASE. The research instruments used were the questionnaires and interview schedules. The data was analyzed qualitatively. Kamindo’s study on orientation focused on new teachers. This study looked at both the new and experienced teachers. Kamindos’ study provided information on orientation of new teachers in general while this study zeroed on orientation of teachers on their evaluation.
2.2.2 In-service Training Provisions for SBTE Practice

Evaluation is a complex activity with its own methodology. Therefore, training for both the evaluators and evaluatees in teacher evaluation according to McLaughlin and Pfeiter (1988) and Toledo Federation for Teachers (1996) is very crucial because evaluatees as well as evaluators should know how to use evaluation instruments to acquire useful objective data, interpret results and also utilize those results. Training equips both school administrators and teachers with the knowledge, skills and attitudes for self-improvement and growth and effective implementation of the new curriculum or any new developments in the existing curriculum. Failure to train teachers on how to implement teacher evaluation and evaluate themselves during curriculum implementation may lead to failure to achieve curriculum objectives. This is because without frequent evaluation not only of the learners but also the teachers, the teachers’ weaknesses may be discovered when it is too late to change the situation.

Changes are taking place in schools as a result of changes taking place in the wider society. Those charged with the responsibility of implementing the curriculum within those schools must adjust to those changes. They must be equipped with the relevant knowledge and skills in all aspects of curriculum implementation including evaluation of the implementers. According to Nevo (1995), this can only be realized through a well-organized and focused in-service training for teachers (INSET).
The role of INSETs is described in the functional definition of INSETs that was developed by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECP) as:

Those education activities engaged in by primary and secondary school teachers and principals following their initial professional certification and intended mainly and exclusively to improve their professional knowledge, skills and attitudes in order that they can educate children more effectively (Bolan, 1982:3).

This view is shared by Eraut (1988) who summarizes the role of INSETs by observing that, introducing schools to new ideas and approaches is an important purpose of INSETs. He goes further to note that teachers and educational evaluators are normally not trained in evaluation skills during their pre-service teacher training and so it is very important that they are trained for the activity of evaluation if it has to achieve any purpose of professional development.

In a paper ‘Maintenance of Standards in Teacher Education’, a former Chief Inspector of Schools in Kenya, Sitima (1994) applauded the role and importance of INSETs by noting that:

- It is inherently important that teachers because of the nature of their job continue with their professional education
- The rapid intensive and fundamental nature of present day changes whether be it technological, economical, cultural, social or political makes it imperative for education systems in general and teachers in particular to review and modify teaching methods and curricula practice
- For widely prevalent demographic reasons, demand for new teachers is falling in some areas and the INSET needs of a stable force are equally important.

Despite the importance accorded to training, Toledo Federation for Teachers (1996) points out that emphasis placed on the need to train and re-train teachers in all aspects of curriculum implementation is underemphasized in school
systems. Even where those provisions are availed, they are presented in sporadic training for administrators and at worst, it allows no time for orientation for teachers or headteachers.

Many education systems and schools do not have clear and defined statements for the provision of training of teachers in their education policies. Even where such considerations are made, training for teachers who are key to curriculum implementation is often ignored. For example, in a study where teacher evaluation policies of 47 rural Saskatchewan school divisions were subjected to an assessment to determine the degree to which aspects of effective teacher evaluation attributes like training were reflected in those policies, it was found that training provisions for evaluator training was given very low consideration. Only 9 percent of the policies had training provisions for evaluators only and nothing for the evaluatees. Other aspects such as distinction between tenured and non-tenured teachers, purposes and teacher standards, among others, scored quite highly with scores of 85 percent, 83 percent and 79 percent respectively. The study recommended that school divisions should train evaluators in evaluation techniques including reporting diagnosis and clinical supervisions skills. In-service training should also be provided to teachers so that they are cognizant of the purposes and procedures of teacher evaluation (Sawa, 1995).

In one of the recommendations based on a case study on teacher evaluation undertaken in a Victorian government secondary school in Australia in 2002, the researcher opines that the system of staff performance and development reviews instituted by the Victorian Department of Education and
Training would only work if school educational leaders and teachers were able to increase their capacity in form of requisite knowledge and skills. The study went further to observe that teachers can learn to move beyond outmoded notions of bureaucratic accountability towards taking responsibility for their own professional learning and improvement. The researcher observes that it was unfair for schools' educational leaders and teachers to be asked to do that if they were unclear about why they were doing it, how to do it and what were the roles and responsibilities of the participants in various evaluation processes (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2002), questions that could best be answered through a well-prepared and coordinated training programme.

In another evaluation study of the Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth for teachers that was approved in 1997 and effected in 2000, teacher evaluators as opposed to teachers reported more value in the training received in the framework. One possible explanation to this was the extra length of time and detail of training provided to evaluators. Teacher evaluators had been given a three days training while teachers had received less than half a day’s training in the use of the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth for Teachers. Though the teachers had indicated that they did not perceive the value in additional training, the study went ahead to recommend that teachers be given more training and preparation in using the framework. School-based study groups on the framework facilitated by a teacher evaluator focusing on understanding each domain of the framework were to be utilized during the training (http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/Apr 06)
The importance of headteachers in Kenya as facilitators of curriculum implementation and change in schools has been lauded by a number of studies. Headteachers are key to curriculum supervision and evaluation at the school. They need continuous in-service training to equip themselves with relevant knowledge and skills in management practices so that they can keep their schools on sound footing. Studies by Mwanzia (1985) and Kitavi (1995) cite lack of expertise and experience on the part of the evaluators as one of the problems in the Kenyan system of teacher evaluation. To remedy the situation, they suggest that Kenyan teacher evaluators especially head-teachers and DQASE officers be trained. Headteachers in turn should facilitate on-going in-service training of teachers. As instructional leaders, they are expected to involve teachers in goal-setting, frequent classroom observation and instructional conferences, develop in teachers a sense of teamwork in planning, implementation and evaluating instructional programmes.

In two separate but related studies on 'Effectiveness of Supervision in Selected Secondary Schools in Kiambu District' by Okumbe (1987) and another one on 'Competences Needed by Secondary School Headteachers and Implications for Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education: A Case of Nairobi and Kakamega Districts, Kenya', by Onyango (2001), it was found that school heads lack effective training in educational administration thus lacking the expertise to carry out effective supervision and evaluation of the curriculum practice in the schools. Both studies recommend the need to train educational administrators at the school level in management knowledge and skills which
will enable them to carry out effective supervision and evaluation of the school curriculum.

Most studies reviewed on training provisions in Kenya have identified the training needs especially of headteachers for effective supervision and evaluation of the school curriculum. Hardly any study has identified training needs for teachers which this study went further to establish because it acknowledges the indispensable role teachers play in curriculum implementation. Also whereas a number of studies may have been conducted on training of school heads in general, this study focused on training in relation to teacher evaluation giving it an in-depth base.

2.2.3 Organization of Resources for SBTE Practice

Any activity involving many people automatically calls for organization and planning of resources for co-ordination and sustainability purposes and also to prevent confusion and suspicion. Planning enables those to be involved in a particular activity to see more clearly where they want to go, why they want to go there and how they want to go there. The importance of planning for any intent cannot be over-emphasized as reflected thus:

And indeed which of you here intending to build a tower, would not first sit down and work out to see if he had enough to complete it. Otherwise, if he laid the foundation and then found himself unable to finish the work, the on-lookers would all start making fun of him saying....

Or again what king marching to war against another king would not first sit down and consider whether with ten thousand men he would stand up to the other who advanced against him with twenty thousand men? (Luke 14: 28-33).
Quoting Harris and Ovando (1992), Wanzare (2002) suggests the need to use a collaborative approach to teacher evaluation in which people with diverse expertise (teachers, principals, supervisors and others) work jointly with others of equal status and shared commitment in order to achieve initially agreed upon motivated goals. Similar sentiments are expressed by Haertele (1991) who observes that the active involvement of teachers in the process of designing and implementing teacher evaluation is important if professional rather than bureaucratic approach to teacher evaluation and teaching in general is followed. If teachers are to become an integral part of teacher evaluation, they should identify their needs, analyze goals, choose instrumental strategies, plan and monitor their work. Where this does not happen, teachers should be initiated into it through persuasion and empowerment before implementation. The involvement of teachers in teacher evaluation process from the beginning to the end is important because by so doing they own the evaluation activity and also come to understand it better since it is supposed to address their identified needs (Wothern & Sanders, 1987 and Nevo, 1995). If teachers are not involved in an evaluation process from the beginning, they may fail to be committed to it.

Involvement of staff in teacher evaluation planning for professional development and school improvement according to Kaufman (1988) has the following advantages:

(i) Teacher evaluation has a more visible and significant impact on school improvement than if teachers worked alone on performance.

(ii) Creates a feeling of ownership of the teacher evaluation process.
(iii) Greater tolerance to the inevitable mistakes and flows in developing the system.

(iv) Advice and assistance to teachers during the course of planning and development may be crucial to the system’s long-term viability.

Planning for teacher evaluation may require the consideration of aspects such as purpose of the evaluation, budget, work plan, staff requirements and other facilities relevant to it. According to Nevo (1995), organization of resources for the implementation of school-based- [teacher] evaluation would include identification of the source of funds to be used on all activities related with training of teachers and also for the installation of storage facilities and the institutionalization of school-based-[teacher] evaluation. For all this to be realized, it will require planning to ascertain how much of each item and money will be required. Apart from the provision of facilities, planning will be required for the whole activity of teacher evaluation in relation to when and how it will be conducted.

Wanzare (2002) while addressing the problems in the Kenya Teacher Evaluation system cited lack of a comprehensive evaluation policy as one of the problems. According to him, the present teacher evaluation system in Kenya lacks a clearly written comprehensive government evaluation policy that is known to the teachers and which specifies, among other things, the purposes of evaluation; evaluation criteria and evaluation procedures. Because of that, there is a great deal of confusion especially regarding the purposes served by teacher evaluation. This is an indication of lack of or poor planning. Wanzare’s
observation is not based on empirical findings because the study does not show any methodology used to derive at the information, a gap this study addressed.

Time has been identified as a very important resource to consider when planning for SBTE according to studies. Elliot (1979) notes that formalization of time for teacher evaluation will not only ensure that tasks are completed but lend them status and eventually encourage the acceptance of evaluation as a routine part of professional practice in the school. According to McCormick (1989), teachers are already burdened and so if teacher evaluation is not timetabled, they may resist it because they may view it as an extra burden. He notes that good intentions that may initially have been accepted may be undermined by failure to get them started because they were not scheduled along with other activities. There will be a tendency of postponing them until time is available. McCormick quotes Walker (1975) and Pollard (1982) who observe that, with respect to data collection and analysis, there is tendency to rely almost wholly on incidental or indirect observation to collect large amounts of data but postpone analysis sometimes indefinitely. This is because of failure to programme teacher evaluation activities which allow loopholes for excuses.

Similar sentiments are shared by Almond (1982) who identifies time as the greatest obstacle and source of trouble to school-based-management. He explains that, activities associated with school-based-management, [for example], SBTE require that the school staff [teachers] devote additional hours each day on top of an already hectic schedule. The stress produced by these extra time demands has led to pessimism and burnout in some settings on the
part of the teachers. Almond went further to propose a strategy for maximizing the use of time that is available to the teachers after they have completed their routine tasks. He advises that teachers should take note of the *peaks* and *troughs* of their routine commitment throughout the year then slot in evaluation activities in the *trough* periods to formalize it.

To underscore the importance of time as an important resource in teacher evaluation, Sawa (1995) in a study on Teacher Evaluation Policies and Practices recommends that school division evaluators be granted sufficient time, unburdened by competing administrative demands for evaluation activities. That meant, for example, providing a substitute teacher on a mandated regular basis. Substitute teachers will also enable teachers to have free time for post-teacher evaluation conferences to be held during school hours and to permit them visit each other's classrooms.

All studies reviewed did not show how they came to the observation that time is an important resource in teacher evaluation. This study confirmed that indeed time is a very important factor in the practice of SBTE. The study went further to determine the reason why schools lack time to engage in the practice of SBTE and established that it was due to heavy workload as a result of understaffing in most schools.

### 2.2.4 Implementation and Institutionalization of SBTE

The implementation of any new project is very important because it is only after implementation that the project becomes real and useful. Before that, it
remains known to the initiators and planners as observed by (Oluoch, 1982 and Shiundu & Omulando, 1992). The same may apply to any new aspects or elements of the curriculum, for example, teacher evaluation. Wagner and O’hanlon (1968); House (1973); and McCormick (1989) and Millman and Hammond (1990) observe that before internal teacher evaluation is implemented, there is need to ensure that the right conditions prevail. Some of these conditions are: social relationships among teachers; positive attitudes towards SBTE; autonomy of the teachers; encouragement and support from administration; relevant resources and readiness of the teachers to implement it. In other words, the success of SBTE depends on how it is designed and implemented.

When listing the characteristics of a teacher evaluation process, Simon (1981) observes that among many other characteristics, evaluation should be initiated and managed by teachers inside the school on assumption that it is only when schools and teachers retain control of the evaluation process that they will be committed to the implementation of any recommendations for action required. The observation is based on the view that effective change depends on genuine commitment of those required to implement it. Commitment can only be achieved if those involved feel that they have control of the process (Millman & Hammond, 1990).

Whereas a number of studies stress that training of teachers in skills is a pre-requisites for effective implementation of internal teacher evaluation, Nevo (1995) had a different opinion about it. According to him, SBTE should be implemented once the teachers have the basic training that will include
understanding of the purpose of the evaluation and the theoretical knowledge of school-based-evaluation process. He argues that it is difficult to learn how to perform evaluation without doing it. Teachers will learn how to perform teacher evaluation when they are performing it in their schools with the assistance of an external evaluation tutor.

Due to the importance accorded to teacher evaluation whether internal or external, studies have tried to come up with guidance on what is essential for an effective institutionalized teacher evaluation process which teachers and administrators should be concerned about. Kopp and Zufelt (1974) stipulate the following as essentials of effective teacher evaluation programme:

- Clearly stated objectives which will guide the evaluation process
- Regular, consistent and systematic evaluation programme activities which include a well-prepared and validated criteria (Sawa, 1995)
- Integrated continuously planned awareness programmes of evaluation activities
- An information storage and retrieval system
- Continuous in-service education of the staff which must include the personalized supervisory conferences

It is imperative that any teacher evaluation activity is preceded by a discussion about the objectives and procedures. After the exercise, it should be followed by a discussion of the findings. Kopp and Zufelt (1974); McCormick (1989); Millman and Hammond (1990) and Nevo (1995) advance the fact that, findings of an evaluation activity whether internally or externally conducted remain known to the evaluator unless some forum for discussion or conference
is availed. To emphasize the importance of post-teacher evaluation conference or discussion, Sawa (1995) under what he refers to as ‘Critical Attributes of Effective Teacher Evaluation Programmes’ advices that substitute teachers be hired to free teachers for post-evaluation conferences to be held during school hours. Discussions after an evaluation exercise should begin with the evaluator and evaluatee, then move into a discussion at the department and end with the whole teaching staff of the school in a conference. Discussions will be geared towards teachers and schools improvement because the weaknesses and strengths noted during the evaluation will be discussed upon which remedies for improvement will be suggested in a collaborative manner.

Discussions especially at the department and the whole staff should be recorded and stored along with reports of individual teacher evaluation activity for daily use by teachers, administrators and for future reference (House, 1973; Holt, 1981 and Nevo 1995). Nevo (1995) observes that a school which has institutionalized school-based-evaluation will apart from records of evaluation outcomes have a collection of sample instruments; an items’ bank for student assessments; sample instruments for other evaluations such as school projects and programmes, instructional materials, administration, the school as a whole and recent publications on various topics relevant to school-based-evaluation for teachers to refer to in order to improve their evaluation skills and the school as a whole. The availability of a well-defined evaluation storage system is one of the indicators of a successful evaluation culture in the school because it reveals the frequency and quality of evaluations and how the results are utilized by the school.
According to the Handbook of Inspection of Educational Institutions in Kenya, teachers are expected to use and discuss among other schedules, the Individual Teacher Observation Schedule: Schedule 8 for professional development and school improvement before the routine external evaluation takes place. On the day of the external evaluation, schools will be expected to submit among other documents and reports, schools internal audit and review reports (Republic of Kenya 2000). These reports do not only deal with finances and stores but records of internal teacher evaluation which reveal the culture of SBTE in the schools.

Frequency has also been identified as one of the indispensable attributes of an effective or successful teacher evaluation system because it makes the practice part and parcel of the school system. Sawa (1995) acknowledges a study by Stein (1992) and observes that frequency of teacher evaluation is one of the several practices that can be identified from literature which over the past decades or so has been reported as one of the characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation practice. Stein (1992) advises that, rather than relying on the ‘annual’ formal visits, many visits are required for better understanding of teacher performance. By making frequent visits to classrooms, claims Stein, administrators can reinforce and praise good teaching, gather data regarding curriculum implementation and address instructional problems before they become crucial. To underscore the importance of regular observation of teachers during instruction, Sawa (1995) suggests that substitute teachers should be hired to enable school administrators to visit classroom and also to permit teachers to visit others, classrooms.
The Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth that was approved by the Tennessee State Board of Education in 1997 and came into effect in 2000 is even more specific about the number of times different categories of teachers should be observed during instructions. A teacher under probation with a working experience of one and two years should be observed three times per year. A teacher on probation with a working experience of three years should be observed twice a year while a professional teacher within ten years of experience to be observed twice within that period or focused assessment (www.tn.state.gov/education). It is, however, important to note that this will depend on the context in which teacher evaluation takes place.

2.2.5 Perceptions about the Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

There are so many purposes for which teacher evaluation is conducted such as: helping identify professional development needs for teachers and administrators; providing information regarding the knowledge and skills gained during staff development; determining whether or not new teachers can teach; indicating what a teacher can teach effectively; making decisions for teachers’ tenure, promotion or demotion, retention or dismissal and certification (Wise, et al, 1984; Wood & Lease, 1987; Montgomery & Hadheld, 1989; Darling Hammond, 1990 and Wareng, 1990). Some of the purposes of teacher evaluation like demotion or dismissal can be very threatening and that is why teachers should be made to understand why they are being evaluated before the evaluation is conducted.
Many studies agree that out of the many purposes for which teacher evaluation is conducted, evaluation for professional development and improvement and school improvement are the most important because the rest will depend on them. Professional development and school improvement can best be realized through SBTE practice because it is formative in nature, it is less judgemental and more receptive. Formative or developmental evaluation as Reynolds and Martin-Reynolds (1988) refer to it, is very important because it helps teachers to diagnose and solve instructional problems in order to make improvements to further their professional development. It is an objective kind of evaluation that can best be realized in a situation where teachers engage in it on frequent basis (Acheson & Smith, 1986 and Alberta Teachers Association, 1995).

Studies by House (1973); Macdonald (1975); Stifflebeam (1975); Elliot (1983); Hopkins (1989); McCormick (1989); Rogers and Badham (1992) and Nevo (1995) observe that, so long as teachers view evaluation as an activity that will contribute towards their professional development, they will always be positive towards it. Likewise, they will resist anything that does not have direct positive influence to their professional lives. Millman (1981) and Millman and Hammond (1990) reveal that issues of teacher evaluation have drawn attention to educators in the United States of America as well as elsewhere. For a long time, teacher evaluation was perceived by those in authority as means to control teachers, motivate them, hold them accountable for their services and get rid of them when their performance was poor. Teachers were usually evaluated by their principals or heads of departments, school inspectors and especially
assigned evaluators. However, later studies reveal that the American system and other systems of education have articulated evaluation for improving teacher performance as one of the purposes of teacher evaluation.

The DQASE in Kenya also recognizes the fact that SBTE is a practice that can lead to professional development. In the introduction on how to use the Individual Teacher Observation Schedule: Schedule 8, it is noted that the schedule will become a key professional development tool. Apart from its use in external inspection [evaluation], it can be used by heads of colleges and principals for regular monitoring or by teachers observing each other. Accordingly, many teachers will have to radically change the way they are teaching to do well according to the criteria in the schedule. It will help teachers make efforts to improve themselves if the feedback is sensitively given to them (Republic of Kenya, 2000).

The need to come up with clearly stated and spelt out purposes has been stressed as a pre-requisite of any form of teacher evaluation, be it school-based or evaluation conducted by an external evaluator. Nevo (1995) stresses that more time should be spent on making teachers understand the purpose and role of teacher evaluation before the practice is implemented. It is only when teachers understand why they are being evaluated and what the evaluation will do to them that they will be committed to it. McLaughin and Pfeiter (1998) see teachers' suspicion of the evaluators' motives and dislike of method used to assess their work as primary obstacles to initiating and carrying out meaningful teacher evaluation. Winning the trust of teachers, they say, is a necessary pre-condition for a successful teacher evaluation system as they note:
The most difficult problem of teacher evaluation, then, is not only to develop a better instrument. It involves organizational questions of ‘getting started’ — how to overcome the resistance and negative attitudes that exist about teacher evaluation. (p.5)

‘Getting started’ according to Darling-Hammond, Wise & Pease (1983) and Stiggins & Duke (1990) entails recognizing that purposes need to be clearly understood and shared by all stakeholders. It also means commitment to the idea of improvement. Without such shared understanding and commitment, teacher evaluation descends into a pointless and, in many ways, hypocritical game in which teachers and administrators in their own ways, tacitly conspire to protect their own and each others’ territory.

Kleinhenz and Ingvarson (2002) also maintain that schools cannot implement teacher evaluation systems if they do not know why they are doing it. Finding answers to ‘why’, answers that are acceptable to all participants in teacher evaluation will require solid investment of time and energy. They conclude by observing that reassessment and clarification of the purpose of teacher evaluation in relation to various interests is an essential step for any school or system that is struggling to make teacher evaluation ‘work’.

A study conducted by Holt (1981) in one of the schools in East Anglia, England, on self-evaluation by teachers using a questionnaire on three occasions starting from 29th September, 1979 to 26th June 1980, revealed that teachers were positive about self-evaluation. Most of the teachers involved in the self-evaluation exercise made some of the following observations about the outcomes of the exercise:
... the honesty of the assessment was to some extent a way of proving our integrity to each other...
... procedures of that kind would become part of the teachers’ professionalism...
... the exercise could lead to greater co-operation among staff....

In a study conducted in one of the Victorian government secondary schools in Australia in 2002 to establish the principals, reviewers and teachers perceptions about teachers’ performance review that had been introduced in all Victorian government schools in the mid 1990’s to bring about improvement, it was established that generally, there was goodwill and respect among the participants in respect to the review process. However, the various participants in the study who were the principals, reviewers and teachers had divergent views about the role of the review process. Despite the divergent view but in view of the high level of goodwill and respect among the participants, the researchers were confident that it might be possible in future to focus more clearly on teacher improvement as a goal of the review process. The researchers summarize and conclude the study by stressing that, for teacher evaluation to be effective, all participants need to understand why the evaluation is being conducted and share a common understanding of the outcomes (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2002).
2.3 External Factors that Influence SBTE Practice

2.3.1 The Role of the DQASE in SBTE Practice and Perceptions about the Role of DQASE in SBTE Practice

Evaluation is a complex but mandatory activity in education and so care must be taken to ensure that it remains objective and sustained throughout. Because of this, some studies have stressed the practice of both internal and external teacher evaluation in schools because the two play different but complementary roles. The external evaluator is the determinant of the teaching standards that become the basis for teacher evaluation. Kleinhenz and Ingvarson (2002) note that good set standards legitimize teachers’ claims to the possession of special knowledge of a kind that lends itself to professional rather than bureaucratic evaluation methods. They even take note of Elmore (1996):

The existence of external norms is important because it institutionalizes the idea that professionals are responsible for looking outwards at challenging conceptions of the practice in addition to looking inward at their values and competencies. Without some kind of external normative structure, teachers have no incentive to think of their practice as anything other than a bunch of traits. The existence of strong external norms also has the effect of legitimizing the proportion of teachers in any education system who draw their ideas about teaching from a professional community and who compare themselves against a standard external to their school or community. External norms give visibility and status to those who exemplify them.

According to Worthen and Sanders (1987); Hopkins (1989); McCormick (1989) and Nevo (1995), an external evaluation plays both the formative and summative functions of evaluation. The unfamiliarity of the external evaluator to the environment and the teachers makes teacher evaluation by an external evaluator more objective than the one conducted by the internal
evaluator. It is also assumed that an external evaluator is a professional evaluator and so is in a better position to provide advisory services to the internal evaluator who is considered to be an amateur evaluator during the first stages of the practice of SBTE.

Worthen and Sanders (1987) and Nevo (1995) go further to explain the importance of the internal evaluator. According to them, an internal evaluator is better acquainted with the local context of the evaluation and is less threatening to those being evaluated. S/he knows the local problems, communicates better with the local people and remains on the site to facilitate the implementation of the evaluation recommendations. They, however, stress that external evaluation is mandatory even where school-based-evaluation is not practiced. Because of the expertise element, the external evaluator comes in as an advisor, guide and auditor of internal findings. The involvement of the external evaluator from the higher educational office especially in centralized systems of education in the practice of SBTE gives it credibility and legality.

2.4 Summary of the Literature Review

From the literature reviewed, it was possible to conclude that awareness programmes, empowerment of participants of SBTE, the way the resources are organized for SBTE practice and the way SBTE is implemented and institutionalized has a lot of bearing on the success and sustainability of the practice. For teachers to embrace SBTE practice, they must perceive it as a practice or an activity that will contribute towards their professional
development and improvement. The literature reviewed also revealed that the role of the external evaluator in SBTE practice is indispensable.

Even though, the review of the literature revealed some gaps which were addressed by this study. They are:

1) Most of the studies reviewed for most of the areas were descriptive in nature. The studies did not describe the methodology used to arrive at the information. It was, therefore, difficult to assess the validity of the information. This study confirmed some of the insights of the studies reviewed which have been discussed in chapter four.

2) Most of the empirical studies reviewed were conducted in situations outside Kenya because of lack of empirical studies in Kenya. To support the observation, Wanzare (2004) notes that:

...A problem with the present system of teacher evaluation in Kenya is the lack of relevant empirical studies in the area that reveal clearly the state of the current practice of teacher evaluation and from which to draw best practices....

Relying on foreign literature almost entirely may not always be applicable to the Kenyan context. Consequently, a few of the closely related studies conducted in the country were conducted in locations different from the one of this study, for example, a study by Mwanzia (1985) which was not accessed by the researcher entitled ‘A Study of Factors that Affect Inspection and Supervision on Changwithya and Mulango Zones, Central Division, Kitui District, Eastern Province.'
3) Most studies that were reviewed focused on teacher evaluation in general. Teacher evaluation is wide in nature in that it embraces both SBTE and external evaluation. This study was concerned more of the SBTE. There may be some variations, for example, in the conduct and organization of teacher evaluation in general and SBTE, which the studies failed to highlight.

4) The researcher did not identify any study focusing on SBTE conducted in Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE
MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters of this study laid the ground work for the rest of the study. This chapter presents the research design; location of the study; target population, sampling procedures and samples; research instruments; data collection procedures; field experience and data analysis procedures.

3.2 Study Design

This study used the descriptive survey design. Kothari (1984), Peters (1994), Koul (1998) and Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) observe that survey studies are conducted to determine a situation and report things the way they are. A survey study is also used to collect data about peoples’ opinions, attitudes and practices and to make suggestions for improvement of educational practice using a large sample. The survey was appropriate for this study since it focused on factors influencing SBTE practice using a large sample size of 574 respondents and reported the information obtained the way it was without manipulating the respondents. Management and external related factors such as: awareness strategies; in-service training provisions; organization of resources; implementation and institutionalization strategies; teachers’ perceptions about the purpose of SBTE practice; the role of the external evaluator in SBTE practice and teachers’ perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice were considered and analyzed as some of the possible factors influencing SBTE practice in schools. Recommendations for
the improvement of SBTE practice were made on the basis of the findings of this study. It is hoped that if the recommendations are implemented, they will help bring about educational improvement.

The study was also both quantitative and qualitative. Orodho (2004) identifies a large sample size, random and stratified sampling procedures, counts and measures as some of the characteristics of quantitative research while qualitative research is characterized by review of various documents and open-ended interviews. This study was characterized by a large sample size, used random and stratified sampling procedures and it also applied counts and measures. The researcher conducted interview sessions with some of the respondents and also did document analysis in the process of data collection. Both the questionnaire and interview schedules used had open-ended items which required explanations from the respondents and which also revealed the respondents' feelings towards the practice of SBTE in the schools.

3.3 Study Location

The study was conducted in three selected districts of Western Province of Kenya. By the time this study was conducted in 2005, Western Province comprised eight districts, namely, Bungoma, Busia, Butere-Mumias, Kakamega, Lugari, Mt Elgon, Teso and Vihiga as reflected in Appendix VII. The three selected districts of the study were Bungoma, Butere-Mumias and Vihiga. The main economical activities in the three districts are arable farming, cash crop farming and some manufacturing. Crops such as maize, sorghum, millet, sweet potatoes, sugarcane, tea, coffee and tobacco are grown. The main
industries are paper industry based at Webuye in Bungoma District; sugar in Mumias and Nzoia in Butere-Mumias and Bungoma Districts respectively; tea and coffee in Vihiga and tobacco at Malakisi in Bungoma. Apart from salaried employment, educational provisions for most students at secondary level of education in Western Province are realized through money accrued from the economical proceeds.

3.4 Target Population

Two hundred and eighty-two secondary schools which had registered students for the 2004 KCSE in the three selected districts of Western Province were considered for the study. Conflicting statistics regarding the exact number of schools from the three districts made the researcher decide to use mock examination result lists of schools that had registered students for the 2004 KCSE. The assumption was that schools that had not registered candidates for the 2004 KCSE were still new and could not be able to raise the required respondents for the study. The distribution of the schools per district was as shown in Table 3.1
Table 3.1: Distribution of Secondary Schools in Bungoma, Butere-Mumias and Vihiga Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Schools</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bungoma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butere/Mumias</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vihiga</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>282</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bungoma, Butere/Mumias and Vihiga District Education Offices, October 2004

The target population consisted of all headteachers, senior teachers, HoDs and teachers that totalled 3826 from the 282 secondary schools of the selected districts that were considered for the study. Their breakdown was as shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Teacher Establishment in Secondary Schools in Bungoma, Butere-Mumias and Vihiga Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Bungoma</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butere/Mumias</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vihiga</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bungoma, Butere-Mumias and Vihiga District Education Offices, October 2004

Headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs are enforcers of SBTE (Republic of Kenya, 1986 and Ministry of Education, 1987) during curriculum implementation. Apart from providing information on teacher, organizational
and external related factors that influence SBTE practice in secondary schools, they also provided information on why some activities related to SBTE were not conducted in the schools. The rest of the teachers provided information on their perception of SBTE practice and some management related factors such as in-service training provisions and organization of resources for SBTE practice.

3.5 Sampling Procedures and Samples

Western Province was selected through purposive sampling procedure. The researcher was familiar with the location and so that familiarity was expected to provide an advantage of entering the field which has an important implication on the quality of the data. Also having been a teacher in Western Province, the researcher was aware that peer teacher evaluation which is one of the modes of SBTE and was also one of the variables of the study was being conducted in some schools of Western Province. Due to logistic reasons especially financial constraints, but at the same time the need to cover a fairly wide area for generalization purposes, the researcher narrowed the study to three districts instead of the whole of Western Province of Kenya.

Simple random sampling through balloting was used to select the three districts that were involved in the study because of the small number of districts of Western Province and to also limit biasness. Thirteen percent of the 282 schools in the three districts was used to determine the sample size for the number of schools that were used in the study. Gay (1976) suggests that for descriptive research under which survey studies fall, a sample of 10 percent of
the population is considered minimum while 20 percent may be required for a smaller population. Using the 13 percent, a total of 37 schools were determined for the study.

During a feasibility study in the three districts, it was established that analysis of professional tools of teachers was conducted in all the schools. Observation of teachers during instruction both by the management team and through peer teacher evaluation was conducted in only nine schools. Six out of nine schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted were provincial while district and private schools were represented by two and one school(s) respectively. Since only nine schools were found to engage in observation of teachers during instruction, one school was used for the pilot study while the remaining eight were sampled through purposive sampling because of the small number and also the researcher felt they would provide relevant and useful information on why they were able to conduct observation of teachers during instruction while other schools did not.

To ensure equal representation in proportion to the total number of schools in each of the three districts of study, the rest of the schools were stratified according to provincial, district and private schools. The researcher used 50 percent to determine the sample size of the private schools that were selected from each of the districts because of the small number of schools in that stratum. Thirteen percent was used to determine the number of schools from the rest of the provincial and district schools. Simple random sampling through secret ballot was used to select the schools of study from provincial schools in Butere-Mumias District and private schools from all the three
districts because of the small number of schools in those strata. Systematic random sampling was used to select the schools for the study whereby every $k$th school starting from a random number smaller than $k$ was selected from the rest of the provincial and district schools in the three districts. Different $k$ and different random numbers were used because the number of subjects in the different strata was not the same. A total of 37 schools were selected as can be seen in Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Schools</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bungoma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butere/Mumias</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vihiga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>09</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>04</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifteen percent of the target population of 3826 subjects from the 282 secondary schools of the three selected districts of the study was used to determine a sample size of 574 respondents. All headteachers and senior teachers of the schools of study were selected through purposive sampling because they were expected to provide certain information on administrative matters that would not had have been provided by the rest of the teachers and the number was manageable. Simple random sampling through balloting was used to select two HoDs of the formal curriculum from each school of study.
To ensure equal representation in proportion to the rest of the teachers in the schools of study, the teachers were stratified according to departments and gender. Eleven percent was used to determine the sample size of teachers to be selected from each stratum. Simple random sampling through balloting was used to select individual teachers from a stratum or strata with less than 10 teachers. Systematic random sampling was used to select the teachers for the study from a stratum or strata with 10 teachers and above. To carry out systematic random sampling, every $k$th individual starting from a random number smaller than $k$ was selected from a list of teachers.

3.6 Research Instruments

Three research instruments, namely, a questionnaire, two interview schedules and a document analysis guide were used to collect data.

3.6.1 Questionnaire for Teachers

A questionnaire is a widely used instrument in an educational survey study to obtain information about certain phenomena, conditions and practices and to investigate into motivations, feelings, opinions, attitudes and practices of an individual or a group according to Borg & Gall (1983), Kothari (1984) and Koul (1998). Through the use of a questionnaire, information on management and external related factors that influence SBTE practice such as: awareness strategies put in place for SBTE practice; in-service training provisions; organization of resources for SBTE practice; implementation and institutionalization strategies; teachers’ perceptions about the purpose of SBTE
practice; the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice and teachers' perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was collected. Consequently, a questionnaire was used because of the kind of research design and the large sample size of the study. According to Mason & Bramble (1997), questionnaires and interviews are usually used to collect information in a survey research where a large population is involved in the study. The target population of this study was 3826 headteachers, senior teachers HoDs and teachers while the sample size was 574 respondents. The use of the questionnaire was, therefore, very appropriate.

The questionnaire consisted of open and closed-ended items. The items addressed all the specific objectives and research questions of the study. The open-ended items allowed the respondents the freedom to respond to them in their own words. Responses elicited through the open-ended items revealed certain information and feelings that would not have been catered for by the closed-ended items.

During a feasibility study conducted by the researcher, it was established that the analysis of professional tools of teachers was done in all schools in the three districts. Only nine schools conducted observation of teachers during instruction by management teams and through peer teacher evaluation as other modes of SBTE. This prompted the researcher to structure the questionnaire according to the modes of SBTE apart from the demographic data.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections A, B, C and D. All teachers were expected to respond to all items in Section A and B. Section A
had items on demographic data. It required teachers to show their gender; professional status; department and teaching subjects. Section B was on analysis of professional tools of teachers as one of the modes of SBTE. It had items on characteristics of institutionalized analysis of professional tools such as frequency of the analysis of the tools, pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferencing; in-service training provisions and if SBTE was one of the topics during the in-service training courses; programming and views about analysis of professional tools. Section C was on observation of teachers by management during instruction. The section had alternatives depending on whether or not a school was conducting observation of teachers by management. The section had items on frequency of observation of teachers by management team members; pre- and post-teacher observation conferencing; programming for the observation of teachers; views about observation of teachers by management; observation of teachers by DQASE officers and views about observation of teachers by DQASE officers. Section D was on peer teacher evaluation. The section again had alternatives depending on whether or not a school was practicing peer teacher evaluation. The section had items on frequency of observation of teachers by fellow teachers; pre- and post-teacher observation conferencing and programming of peer teacher evaluation; views about peer teacher evaluation and suggestions for the improvement of SBTE.

3.6.2 Interview Schedules for Headteachers, Senior teachers and HoDs

Two different interview schedules were used, namely, a schedule for headteachers and senior teachers and another one for HoDs. Interviewing
involves collecting data through interaction between the person being interviewed and the interviewer. The method was chosen as it gave the researcher the opportunity to ask questions, provide and seek clarifications through probes for more information (Koul, 1998, Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999 and Orodho, 2004). This method of data collection was particularly appropriate for sensitive topics, such as, views about SBTE practice and reasons why some schools did not conduct some of the modes of SBTE, for example, observation of teachers by management, that were better discussed in a more private setting. Greater depth and more detailed information was obtained than would have been the case if other methods of data collection, for example the questionnaire were utilized.

The two different types of interview schedules were structured in that they contained closed-ended items. However, the interview sessions were heavily semi-structured because a lot of probes were used to gather details about certain situations. Like the questionnaire and because of the reason already mentioned, they were divided into sections A, B, C and D. Section A and B were compulsory for all respondents. Section C and D had alternatives one and two. Sections A had items on demographic data. It required that respondents indicate the name of the school; gender; professional status; working experience as a teacher and teaching subjects. Section B for both schedules was on analysis of professional tools. It had items on: frequency of analysis of professional tools; the use of an evaluation guide when analyzing the professional tools; pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferencing; how analysis of the tools is organized; storage of the findings; forums on discussions
about analysis of the tools; views about analysis of the tools and problems encountered in relation with analysis of the tools.

Section C was on observation of teachers by management team members. Alternatives \textit{one} for both interview schedules was for schools where observation of teachers by management was conducted. It had items on: frequency of observation of teachers; the use of an evaluation guide; pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferencing; how observation of teachers by management is organized; preservation of the observation outcomes; forums on discussions about SBTE practice; in-service training courses attended, if they targeted SBTE and the purpose; kind of support the senior teachers and HoDs get from the head-teacher; kind of support the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs get from the DQASE; if the school has the Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions; views about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice; views about observation of teachers by management and any problems encountered in relation with observation of teachers by management. Alternative \textit{two} was for schools where observation of teachers by management was not conducted. It had the same items as alternative \textit{one} except for frequency of observation of teachers; the use of evaluation guide; pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferencing; how observation of teachers is organized and preservation of the observation outcomes. The respondents were also to explain why observation of teachers by management was not conducted by their schools.

Section D was on peer teacher evaluation. Alternative \textit{one} for both schedules was for schools where peer teacher evaluation was conducted. It had
items on: frequency of peer teacher evaluation; the use of evaluation guide; pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferencing; how peer teacher evaluation is organized; preservation of the observation outcomes; views about the practice of peer teacher evaluation; problems encountered in relation with peer teacher evaluation and suggestions for the improvement of SBTE practice. Alternative two for both schedules was for schools where peer teacher evaluation was not conducted. It had items on why peer teacher evaluation was not conducted; if the idea of practicing peer teacher evaluation had ever been sold to teachers; views about the practice of peer teacher evaluation and suggestions for improvement of SBTE practice.

3.6.3 Document Analysis Guide

A document analysis guide of YES/NO responses was used to analyze documents designated as sections A, B, C, D and E in the document analysis guide. Section A was on teachers' professional tools that consisted of schemes of work, lesson plan and records of work covered. The items for analyzing the schemes of work assisted the researcher to establish: the format of the schemes of work; breakdown of lessons per week; how the lesson objectives were stated; the kind of remarks made by the teacher; if the schemes were analyzed by the headteachers and HoDs and if remarks they made were informative. The items for analyzing the lesson plans assisted the researcher to establish if: the lesson objectives corresponded with those in the schemes of work; if the lesson plans had variation of activities; if the lesson plans were analyzed by the headteachers and HoDs and if the remarks they made were informative. The items for
analyzing the records of work covered sought to find out if: the records of work covered showed the breakdown of lessons per week; if the teachers’ remarks were informative; if the records of work covered were analyzed by the headteachers and HoDs and if their remarks were informative.

Section B dealt with internal individual observation schedule. It had items on introduction of a lesson; lesson development; conclusion; personality; feedback and utilization of the schedule.

Section C was on the schools term programme. The items in the section sought to determine if SBTE was one of the activities on the programme; if the programme clearly showed when SBTE would take place; if SBTE was actually conducted and how SBTE was to take place.

Section D dealt with SBTE storage systems. The items in this section helped researcher establish if the school had samples of utilized individual SBTE observation schedules; if the records were filed or computerized; if there were any evidence of pre- and post-teacher evaluation discussions and where the SBTE records were kept.

Section E was on SDP. The items assisted the researcher establish: if schools had SDP; if staff development was one of the tasks on the plans; if in-service training for SBTE was one of the objectives of staff development; if the plans reflected the expenditure on SBTE; if teachers were actually trained on SBTE and if the plans showed objectives of SBTE.

Any effective evaluation should be guided by an evaluation criteria or guide. To develop a document analysis guide for the teachers’ professional tools and the Individual Teacher Observation Schedules schools used, the
researcher used the Kenyatta University Teaching Practice Observation Report shown in Appendix VI to come up with the following components.

- Instructional preparation
- Teacher’s record keeping
- Lesson development
- Curriculum knowledge and interpretation
- Learning strategies
- Organization and use of learning resources
- Teacher’s feedback comments
- Overall quality of the lesson
- Evaluators’ comments and recommendations

The evaluation schedules or guides used by schools were analyzed to ascertain if they had most of the components listed above; if the schedules were actually utilized and the kind of information provided in them.

An analysis of the teachers’ professional tools; the schools term programmes and the storage facilities especially files of records of filled SBTE schedules was done to confirm if SBTE was being practised. Analysis of the schools term programmes and storage facilities was also to establish if schools were committed to SBTE practice.

Analysis of the School Development Plan was to establish whether or not teachers’ professional development through in-service training courses or seminars was catered for in the School Development Plan. A school that is committed to SBTE should be specific about its objectives in the School Development Plan according to Gough and Dave (1990).
3.7 **Pilot Study**

A pilot study is a small scale version of an intended study with a restricted sample of subjects according to Mason and Bramble (1997). It helps to answer specific questions about the design of the research and the suitability of research instruments. One school where analysis of professional tools of teachers was the only form of SBTE and another school where analysis of professional tools of teachers, observation of teachers during instruction by management and through peer teacher evaluation were practiced from one of the districts of study were used for the pilot study. Items on the questionnaire that were unanswered by most respondents or many respondents ticking more response codes than they were asked were re-phrased or eliminated. The researcher found the respondents' opinions about the interview schedules and revised them where necessary. For example, the term 'conference' was changed to 'discussion' because most of the respondents asked what it meant. The pilot study was also used to estimate the amount of time respondents required to respond to the items on the instruments.

The instruments were validated in order to determine the content, language and scope before and during the pilot study. Content validity was done to ascertain if the items on both the questionnaire and interview schedules would help achieve the specific objectives and answer the research questions of the study. Construct validity was conducted to establish if the items were well-stated in research language and to ensure that there were no irrelevant, ambiguous, threatening or embarrassing statements (Peters, 1994; Mason and Bramble, 1997). Validity of the instruments was conducted using the
researcher's supervisors; two lecturers of curriculum development and educational administration and a research methodology specialist, two post-graduate students and comments made during the departmental seminar and school defence. The views of the specialists were analyzed without reference to any of them. Their comments were incorporated in the final instruments.

A reliability test of the questionnaire was not conducted because the teachers were unwillingness to be subjected to two different administrations of the questionnaire in the test re-test procedure. Consequently, the split-half reliability procedure could not be used because the pair of items were not homogeneous. Hennerson, Marlene, Morris, Lynn & Fitz-Gibbon (1989) observe that the split-half method for estimating reliability is best used with instruments that have many items and when the pair of items can be considered equivalent enough for random distribution to essentially separate.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The actual data collection commenced after obtaining permits right from the Ministry of Education at the national headquarters, district education offices of the three districts of study and the headteachers of schools of study. Data collection from each school selected for the study was done in one day, all days of the week except Fridays. Fridays were avoided, because from the researcher's experience as a former secondary school teacher, most co-curriculum activities such as sports, drama and choir competitions are held over the weekends starting with Friday during the first and second terms of the school calendar. The researcher, therefore, avoided a situation whereby she
would go to a school only to find such activities going on in the school or a number of teachers absent because they had gone out for competitions. The researcher in most cases arrived at the schools latest 8.30 a.m. which made it possible for her to meet most headteachers. After obtaining permission from the headteachers, heads of departments and teachers who were to be involved in the study were sampled using the TSC staff establishment statistical returns. Sometimes interviewing of relevant respondents who were free was done immediately after the sampling of the respondents. The rest were interviewed after the sampled teachers had been given the questionnaires to respond to.

During the long breaks which were usually at 10.50 am for most schools, the researcher met with all the teachers in the staffroom, explained the purpose of the study and how to respond to the items in sections that had alternatives. The questionnaire was then handed to the selected teachers with the assistance of the senior teachers or the mistresses/masters on duty. Since lessons were going on at the same time, the teachers were allowed to respond to the questionnaire at their convenience so long as they were ready by 4.00 pm.

While the selected teachers responded to the questionnaire, the researcher continued interviewing the selected heads of departments, senior teachers and the headteachers or deputy headteachers. Explanations and probes were used for more in information and explanation during the sessions. The researcher took an average of forty-five minutes to interview the respondents. Document analysis of the Individual Teacher Observation Schedule, professional tools for teachers, schools’ term programmes, school development plans, storage facilities of SBTE records was done during the researchers free
time. Lesson plans/guides were not analyzed because according to reports from all schools, teachers of secondary schools do not plan. They use lesson notes during instruction.

The researcher managed to reach all schools though with a few problems like lack of public means of transport to some schools that were off the main road. Data collection in most schools was done during the rainy season in the area which also posed a problem. As a whole, there was a lot of co-operation from the respondents in most schools.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of the study was to analyze the factors influencing the practice of SBTE in secondary schools in selected districts of Western Province, Kenya with the view to making suggestions that will help bring about improvement in the practice in order to strengthen it in schools. The specific objectives were to: examine the awareness strategies put in place for SBTE practice in schools; establish if the headteachers, senior teachers, heads of departments and teachers had been empowered for SBTE practice; examine how the resources had been organized for SBTE practice; assess how SBTE was implemented and institutionalized in schools; establish teachers’ perceptions about the purpose of SBTE practice; examine the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice and to establish teachers’ perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice.

This chapter analyzes and presents the findings of the study. To achieve the objectives of the study, a questionnaire was administered to selected teachers while headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs of the selected secondary schools were interviewed by the researcher. Teachers' professional tools, internal individual teacher observation schedules, schools' term programmes, schools' development plans and storage facilities for SBTE records were analyzed using a document analysis guide. The data was categorized and analyzed according to the themes derived from the specific objectives. The findings were presented according to designation, gender,
professional status, departments and type of schools of the respondents for comparison purposes where necessary.

A total of 574 (15%) respondents were selected for the study. They comprised of 37 headteachers, 37 senior teachers, 74 HoDs and 426 teachers. Fourteen of the selected teachers failed to respond to the questionnaire and returned it the way it was. Twenty-four never returned the questionnaire while eight responded to less than a third of the items. During preliminary data analysis, such questionnaires were ignored. In two of the schools, the headteachers were absent while the deputy headteachers were very busy handling disciplinary cases. In one of schools, both the headteacher and the deputy headteacher were absent. In two schools, there were no senior teachers while in five other schools, it was not possible to raise two heads of departments. As a result, a total of 514 (13%) respondents fully participated in the study. A breakdown of the number of respondents who fully participated in the study and whose responses were analyzed is as shown in Table 4.1
Table 4.1: Breakdown of Respondents according to different Stratifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Creative Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modes of SBTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PGDE – Postgraduate Diploma in Education
A- Schools where observation of teachers was conducted
B- Schools where observation of teachers was not conducted
* Figure rounded to the nearest whole number

4.2 Management Related Factors that Influence SBTE Practice

4.2.1 Introduction

This section presents and discusses findings about management related factors that influence SBTE practice in selected secondary schools of the three selected
districts of Western Province. They were factors related with: awareness programmes; in-service training provisions; organization of resources; implementation and institutionalization strategies for SBTE practice and perceptions about the role of SBTE practice.

4.2.2 **Awareness Strategies for SBTE Practice**

To establish if awareness programmes had been put in place for SBTE practice, all the 34 headteachers, 33 senior teachers and 67 heads of departments who fully participated in the study were asked if there were any forums at which the role and purpose of SBTE was discussed. The findings revealed that awareness as a strategy for SBTE practice in relation with the analysis of the professional tools of teachers is an activity that is either ignored or taken for granted. According to the findings, analysis of professional tools is just done as and administrative routine. All headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs reported that the issue of professional tools of teachers is only addressed during departmental and staff meetings on term or yearly basis in relation to allocation of classes for teaching, preparation of schemes of work and giving reports on syllabus coverage. The issue of professional tools is also addressed during senior management team meetings only when there are common problems to most departments. Sometimes morning and tea breaks are also used to remind teachers who may not have handed in their documents for analysis. Twenty-nine headteachers, all the 33 senior teachers and 61 HoDs explained that it had never dawned on them that they should hold discussions on why analysis of professional tools of teachers should be done.
The situation was a bit different with regards to observation of teachers during instruction. All the eight headteachers, five senior teachers and 15 HoDs of schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted explained that observation of teachers especially through peer teacher evaluation was an issue that was extensively discussed at least every term. They explained that one of the main reason why peer teacher evaluation was initiated in their schools was for the academic improvement of the schools. Therefore, discussions on peer teacher evaluation in most cases are focused on the schools’ academic improvement apart from examining how it was conducted during the term and how successful it was. In fact one of the schools of study where peer teacher evaluation was practiced had clearly stated objectives of the practice that were even displayed on the staff notice board.

The study also established that six out of the 37 schools of study had made attempts to organize some special awareness sessions apart from staff, departmental and senior management meetings to address the issue of SBTE especially peer teacher evaluation. Through probes, it was established that the sessions were conducted by visiting some schools that had been identified to have institutionalized the peer teacher evaluation practice. The visits were followed by some discussions held back at the schools about the findings and making resolutions on the way forward.

Further findings revealed that more provincial schools as compared to the district and private schools had organized the special awareness sessions. Four out of the eight provincial schools, one out of the 24 district schools and one out of the four private schools that participated in the study had organized
the special sessions. The data further revealed that only two out of the 29 schools where analysis of professional tools of teachers was the only form of SBTE and four out of the eight schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted had organized the special awareness sessions.

Through probes, the researcher further endeavoured to find out why the visits to other schools were made. All the four headteachers, four senior teachers and 11 HoDs from the schools where peer teacher evaluation was practiced reported that the intention was to intensify the practice in their schools. The findings revealed that though the need for the schools to improve academically was the main purpose for initiating peer teacher evaluation in the schools that practiced it as reported earlier, it was no longer the main purpose for wanting it intensified in schools. Varied reasons were given, a variation that was noted even among members of the same school. Two of the four headteachers, two of the four senior teachers and three of the eight HoDs reported that the need for the schools to improve academically was the main reason why they wanted peer teacher evaluation intensified in their schools. Other reasons were: because inspectors of schools hardly come, provided by six respondents; in order to equip teachers with relevant knowledge about peer teacher evaluation, provided by four respondents and in order to be equipped with skills and to motivate teachers, provided by three respondents respectively. There was no single reason provided by all respondents from the same school to show why they wanted the practice intensified in their schools.

Consequently, all the two headteachers, two senior teachers and four HoDs of the two schools where observation of teachers during instruction was
not practiced organized the sessions in order to initiate it in their schools. The main reason behind the need to initiate peer teacher evaluation was because inspectors of schools hardly went to the schools. The reason was provided by one of the two headteachers, one of the two senior teachers and two of the four HoDs. Other reasons were: for the school to improve academically and to equip the teachers with knowledge, provided by two respondents respectively and in order to be equipped with skills, again provided by two respondents. No single reason was provided by all respondents from the same school to show why they needed to initiate peer teacher evaluation in their schools. This again revealed lack of mutual understanding why the schools wanted to initiate the practice of peer teacher evaluation in their schools.

Awareness programme as strategy for SBTE practice is supposed to be an on-going activity primarily meant to inform or remind teachers about the purpose of their evaluation. This is because it is only when teachers have understood why they are being evaluated that they will accept and embrace it (Nevo, 1995). It is important that teachers understand why their professional tools are analyzed and why they have to be observed during instruction to curb incidents of suspicion that may eventually lead to unfavourable working conditions due to conflicts. When schools engage in SBTE practice without any focused awareness programmes, the implication is that they may engage in the practice without a clear and mutual understanding of why they are doing it. Lack of a clear and mutual understanding of why peer teacher evaluation was either to be intensified or initiated in schools was reflected in the many varied
reasons provided by headteachers, seniors and HoDs even from the same school.

4.2.3 In-service Training Provisions for SBTE Practice

To establish if the headteachers, senior teachers, HoDs and teachers had been empowered to practice SBTE, all the 514 respondents were asked to indicate if they had received any in-service training and if SBTE was one of the topics at one time. Headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs were also asked to state if the schools had ever organized any in-service training courses internally. School Development Plans (SDP) and yearly budgets were also analyzed to establish if initiatives had been made by schools for staff development of teachers through provision of in-service training opportunities.

Training opportunities provided to individuals for the execution of a particular task equips the individuals with knowledge and skills relevant to the task. Possession of relevant knowledge and skills is very important for SBTE practice because it instills confidence both in the evaluator and the evaluatee (Agezo, 2005). Provision of training opportunities especially of teachers for SBTE practice was found to be a problem in most schools. The findings revealed that out of the 514 respondents, only 201 (39.1%) had attended some in-service training courses by the time this study was conducted. Two hundred and sixty-two (51%) had not attended any in-service training course as shown in Table 4.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headteachers (n=34)</td>
<td>29 (85.3)</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HoDs (n=67)</td>
<td>44 (65.7)</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Teachers (n=33)</td>
<td>18 (54.5)</td>
<td>15 (45.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (n=380)</td>
<td>110 (28.9)</td>
<td>219 (57.6)</td>
<td>51 (13.4)</td>
<td>380 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n=514)</td>
<td>201 (39.1)</td>
<td>262 (51)</td>
<td>51 (9.9)</td>
<td>514 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language (n=99)</td>
<td>59 (59.6)</td>
<td>31 (31.3)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>99 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics (n=96)</td>
<td>52 (51.2)</td>
<td>35 (36.5)</td>
<td>9 (9.4)</td>
<td>96 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science (n=115)</td>
<td>52 (45.2)</td>
<td>52 (45.2)</td>
<td>11 (9.6)</td>
<td>115 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities (n=105)</td>
<td>20 (19)</td>
<td>79 (75.2)</td>
<td>6 (5.7)</td>
<td>105 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical/CA (n=99)</td>
<td>18 (17.1)</td>
<td>65 (65.7)</td>
<td>16 (16.2)</td>
<td>99 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n=514)</td>
<td>201 (39.1)</td>
<td>262 (51)</td>
<td>51 (9.9)</td>
<td>514 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial (n=149)</td>
<td>79 (53)</td>
<td>56 (37.6)</td>
<td>14 (9.4)</td>
<td>149 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private (n=42)</td>
<td>15 (35.7)</td>
<td>20 (47.6)</td>
<td>7 (16.7)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District (n=323)</td>
<td>107 (33.1)</td>
<td>189 (57.6)</td>
<td>30 (9.3)</td>
<td>323 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n=514)</td>
<td>201 (39.1)</td>
<td>262 (51)</td>
<td>51 (9.9)</td>
<td>514 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode of SBTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (n=130)</td>
<td>99 (76.2)</td>
<td>27 (20.8)</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (n=384)</td>
<td>102 (26.6)</td>
<td>235 (61.2)</td>
<td>47 (12.2)</td>
<td>384 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n=514)</td>
<td>201 (39.1)</td>
<td>262 (51)</td>
<td>51 (9.9)</td>
<td>514 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **n** = number of respondents
- **UD** = Undecided
- **HoDs** = Heads of Departments
- **CA** = Creative Arts
- **A** = Schools where classroom observation of teachers is conducted
- **B** = Schools where classroom observation of teachers is not conducted

Figures on brackets are percentage scores
Teachers are key to curriculum implementation and yet they were the least considered with regards to the provision of in-service training opportunities. The findings revealed only 110 (28.9%) of the 380 teachers as reflected in Table 4.2 had been exposed to in-service training opportunities by the time this study was conducted. Analysis of the data according to departments, type of schools and schools where observation of teachers during instruction was and was not conducted further revealed that respondents from the Technical/Creative Arts department, district schools and schools where observation of teachers during instruction was not conducted had least been exposed to in-service training opportunities as shown in Table 4.2. On the other hand, the language departments, provincial schools and schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted had the highest percentage of respondents who had been exposed to in-service training opportunities.

It was established through probes during interview sessions that all in-service training courses that were attended by some of the respondents were externally organized by the provincial and district education offices. Headteachers had not taken any initiatives to organize in-service training courses internally. They explained that the externally organized courses are held almost on yearly basis targeting mostly headteachers and then sometimes deputy headteachers and HoDs. That explained why most headteachers with very few teachers had been exposed to in-service training opportunities.

Studies have revealed that inclusion of training provisions with clearly stated objectives with the related tasks in policies of teacher evaluation is one
of the indicators of an effective teacher evaluation system (Sawa, 1995). This was found to be lacking in most schools of study. The study found out that only 10 out of the 37 schools that were involved in the study had SDPs. Analysis of the SDPs revealed that though staff development was one of the tasks on the SDPs, they did not show objectives and content of the staff development. Through probes, the headteachers of the 10 schools explained that the SDPs did not show objectives and content of the staff development because they relied on the provincial and district education offices to come up with content for the in-service training courses. The rest of the 27 schools that did not have SDPs used the schools’ yearly budgets which only showed provisions for workshops and seminars that are catered for under the tuition vote.

When probed to establish why there were disparities in the provision of in-service training opportunities, the headteachers further explained that in-service training courses in the recent past years had targeted English, Mathematics and Science teachers because of continuous poor performance in those subjects in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) over a number of years. That was why more teachers from those areas as compared to those from the Humanities and Technical/Creative Arts departments as reflected in Table 4.2 had been exposed to in-service training opportunities. The headteachers further explained that in-service training courses for Science and Mathematics teachers are catered for by the Ministry of Education under what is known in Kenya as SMASSE (Strengthening Mathematics and Sciences in Secondary Education). SMASSE is an on-going in-service training
programme meant to bring about improvement in Science and Mathematics subjects. According to the headteachers, in-service training courses for the Languages, Technical/Creative Arts and Humanities are normally funded using money from the tuition vote of the school fees. However, English is given first priority because of poor performance as already noted.

Through probes eighteen headteachers from district schools reported that they normally found it difficult to send teachers for in-service training courses because of lack of funds. They explained that most district schools are established as day schools to cater for poor students who do not make it to boarding schools due to lack of school fees. The government regulates the fees payment for students in public schools whereby students in provincial schools pay more than those in district schools. Apart from bursary for poor and bright students and some Constituency Development Fund, the government only remunerates the teachers. All the other activities in the schools that require funds are taken care of by money paid by students in the form of school fees. The headteachers revealed that most of the students default in fees payment despite it being low. That was the main reason why district schools as shown in Table 4.2 had the lowest percentage of respondents who had been exposed to in-service training opportunities by the time this study was conducted.

The study further established from 145 (72.1%) of the 201 respondents who had attended some in-service training courses that SBTE was one of the topics during the in-service courses. Through probes, 26 (89.7%) of the 29 headteachers, 15 (83.3%) of the 18 senior teachers and 41 (93.2%) of the 44 HoDs who had attended the in-service courses and had indicated that SBTE
was one of the topics further revealed that the focus was on peer teacher evaluation. According to them, peer teacher evaluation like other topics during the in-service training course was handled in only one hour which could not have equipped them with enough knowledge and skills on how to go about it.

When probed to find out why SBTE especially peer teacher evaluation was one of the topics, the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs who had indicated that it was one of the topics provided varied reasons as shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Reasons why Peer Teacher Evaluation was One of the Topics of the In-service Training Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Hts n=26</th>
<th>STs n=15</th>
<th>HoDs n=41</th>
<th>Total n=82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplements DQASE officers whose visits are rare</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37 (45.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances efficiency in running of the Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the teaching of mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17 (20.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the teaching of science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifies and improves SBTE practice SBTE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14 (17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the teaching of English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures proper curriculum implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be always prepared incase DQASE officers come</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightens teachers on teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To conform with changes in Curriculum practice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ht – Headteachers  
ST – Senior Teachers  
HoDs - Heads of Departments  
n – Number of respondents  
Figures in brackets are percentage scores

The need to supplement DQASE officers since they were rare was the most outstanding reason provided by the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs as shown in Table 4.3 to show why peer teacher evaluation was to be initiated in schools. This was in agreement with studies by McCormick (1989) and Hopkins (1990) who observe that it is impossible for any education system to have enough DQASE officers to oversee curriculum implementation in schools.
That is why many education systems are investing resources in school-based-evaluation of the curriculum. In Kenya, some education commissions as already noted have recommended for the need to establish SBTE practice in secondary schools because of inadequate manpower from the DQASE.

The need to initiate peer teacher evaluation for efficiency in the running of the schools was the next popular reason though provided by only 23 (28%) headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs as shown in Table 4.3. Though many studies including the Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions [in Kenya] suggest that the main purpose for SBTE practice should be for the professional development of teachers, it was one of the single reasons provided by 11 (13.4) headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs. The fact that the reasons provided to show why peer teacher evaluation was to be initiated schools were quite varied with none of them being provided at least by 50 percent and more of the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs was an indication of lack of mutual understanding why peer teacher evaluation was to be initiated in schools. This in turn may be attributed to lack of focus of the in-service training courses provided. Though the respondent may have attended the in-service training courses at different times, there should have been one to three reason(s) provided by at least over 50 percent if not all respondents to show why peer teacher evaluation was to be initiated in schools. This confirms a study by Wanzare (2002) ‘Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in the Third World: The Case of Kenya’ which cites lack of clear purposes teacher evaluation is meant to serve as one of the problems of teacher evaluation in Kenya.
Though it was not part of this study to examine if respondents were competent enough to conduct effective evaluation of teachers, one of the suggestions made by most of the respondents for the improvement of SBTE practice was an indication that there may be a problem related with competency. Thirty-three (97.1%) of the headteachers, all the 33 senior teachers, 65 (97%) of the HoDs and 353 (92.9%) of the teachers suggested that in-service training courses on SBTE targeting all teachers should be organized. It may, therefore, be logical to conclude that such a suggestion was made based on the fact that the respondents realized there was a need with regards to their training. The problem of incompetence may be attributed to the length of time accorded to the in-service training courses for SBTE practice and also lack of focus of the training courses.

4.2.4 Organization of Resources for SBTE Practice
One important consideration when organizing resources for the practice of SBTE is programming it so that it becomes part of the school routine. Programming involves scheduling when analysis of professional tools and observation of teachers during instruction by management and through peer teacher evaluation will be conducted. Incase of peer teacher evaluation, it will show who observes who during instruction. All the 514 respondents were used to establish whether or not analysis of professional tools of teachers was programmed. The 130 respondents from schools where observation of teachers during instruction by management and through peer teacher evaluation were practiced were also used to determine if the two modes of SBTE were also
programmed. Where analysis of professional tools of teachers and observation of teachers during instruction were not programmed, head-teachers, senior teachers and HoDs were expected to explain why they were not programmed.

The findings revealed that observation of teachers during instruction by management followed by analysis of professional tools of teachers was the least programmed. One Hundred and four (80%) of the 130 respondents and 404 (78.6%) of the 514 respondents as reflected in Table 4.4 indicated that observation of teachers by the management teams and analysis of professional tools of teachers respectively were not programmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4: Programming of the Types of SBTE</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer teacher evaluation</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(87.7)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Professional Tools</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td>(78.6)</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of Teachers by Management</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>(4.6)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the contrary, only 20 (15.4%) and 95 (18.5%) of the respondents reported that observation of teachers by management and analysis of professional tools of teachers respectively were programmed. The study established from 114 (87.7%) respondents that peer teacher evaluation was the most programmed mode of SBTE. The findings were further confirmed by the researcher through
analysis of the term programmes. Observation of teachers during instruction by management was programmed in only one out of the eight schools that conducted it while analysis of professional tools of teachers was programmed in only eight of the 37 schools that were involved in the study. Peer teacher evaluation was programmed in seven out of the eight schools that practiced it. The programmes showed when the three forms of SBTE would take place during the term. There were timetables at the departments showing who would observe who during peer teacher evaluation.

The headteacher, senior teacher and two HoDs from the only school where peer teacher evaluation was not programmed for the entire school explained that it was programmed at departmental level instead. Heads of departments identify who observes who during instruction but then it was left to individual teachers to decide when to do it in the course of the term. They, however, disclosed that the major problem encountered was co-ordination. Sometimes the term ended without some teachers being observed or even having observed other teachers and so they were contemplating programming it. With regards to observation of teachers during instruction by management, the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs of the seven schools where it was not programmed explained that if programmed, it would be mechanical, amount to cheating and also be seen as a sign of rigidity. They explained that they normally inform the teacher to be observed a day or two in advance or they even just go to the class without any prior notice.

Fifteen headteachers, 17 senior teachers and 36 HODS of school where analysis of professional tools of teachers was not programmed explained that
analysis of professional tools was viewed as an obvious practice and so there was no need of programming it. They also explained that teachers may look at programming of analysis of professional tools as a sign of rigidity. Analysis of professional tools was sometimes conducted on impromptu basis especially when there were complaints from students about some subject(s) or when the performance in the continuous assessment tests and schools internal examinations was wanting.

Failure by most schools to programme SBTE practice and more especially analysis of professional tools of teachers and observation of teachers during instructions by management may partly be one of the reasons why those forms of SBTE are conducted on less frequent basis as compared to peer teacher evaluation as will be noted later on. Though a few studies, for example, Stein (1992) suggests for the need to make frequent informal visits to classrooms for instructional observation, most studies as already noted in the literature review stress the need to programme SBTE practice. According to Elliot (1979), formalization of time for teacher evaluation will not only ensure that tasks are accomplished but will lend them status and encourage the acceptance of evaluation as a routine part of professional practice in the schools. Therefore, the view that programming of analysis of professional tools of teachers and observation of teachers during instruction by management will be a sign of rigidity was an indication that the purpose of programming and procedures of SBTE are not understood. Programming for any form of SBTE apart from providing it status and making it routine part of professional practice
in schools, it may help curb incidents of suspicion and fear than when it is done on impromptu basis as preferred by some of the schools.

4.2.5 Implementation and Institutionalization of SBTE Practice

4.2.5.1 Introduction

To establish the extent to which SBTE practice had been implemented and institutionalized in the schools of study, the researcher sought to find out: the frequency of the practice in schools; if pre- and post- teacher evaluation conferences are held; if any criteria are used during the evaluation of teachers; if schools have storage systems for SBTE records and if there is administrative support for SBTE practice.

4.2.5.2 Frequency of SBTE Practice

To establish the frequency of SBTE practice in schools, all the 514 respondents were expected to indicate how often the professional tools of teachers (records of work covered, schemes of work and learners' exercise books) were analyzed by choosing from alternatives that ranged from weekly basis to once a year. Consequently, the 130 respondents from schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted were expected to indicate the number of times they had been observed in the past one year by the time this study was conducted by choosing from alternatives that ranged from none, once to more than three times. There were also none and undecided alternatives. The data was analyzed and presented according the type of schools (provincial, district, private, schools where observation of teachers was and was not conducted).
The finding revealed that there was no analysis of lesson plans because according to reports from the respondents, lesson plans were not prepared. Respondents who were interviewed reported that teachers of secondary schools do not prepare lesson plans but instead use lesson notes during instruction. The way the respondents especially the HoDs who were interviewed responded when asked how often the lesson plans were analyzed kind of suggested that failure to prepare lesson plans by the teachers was an accepted and obvious practice. Most of them simply grinned and remarked that 'secondary school teachers do not prepare lesson plans'.

The findings further revealed that though analysis of professional tools was done in all schools of study, they generally were analyzed on infrequent basis in most schools. Less than 22 percent of the respondents reported that each of the tools (records of work covered, schemes of work and learners exercise books) were analyzed once a week or once a fortnight which was the most frequent practice as reflected in Table 4.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Tools</th>
<th>Frequency of Analysis of Professional Tools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Records of Work n=514</td>
<td>Schemes of Work n=514</td>
<td>Exercise Books n=514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112 (21.8)</td>
<td>87  (16.8)</td>
<td>10  (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>115 (22.4)</td>
<td>102 (19.8)</td>
<td>50  (9.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>138 (26.8)</td>
<td>133 (25.9)</td>
<td>63  (12.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>113 (22)</td>
<td>177 (34.4)</td>
<td>325 (63.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51  (9.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26 (5.1)</td>
<td>15 (2.9)</td>
<td>15  (2.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>514 (100*)</td>
<td>514 (100)</td>
<td>514 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n – number of respondents
1 – Weekly and fortnight
2 – Once a month and twice a term
3 – Once a term
4 – Twice a year and once a year
5 – None
6 – Undecided

* - Number rounded to the nearest whole number
Figures in brackets are percentage scores

On the contrary, more that 34 percent of the respondents as shown in the table indicated that schemes of work and learners’ exercise books apart from records of work covered were analyzed twice and once a year which was the most infrequent practice. Learners’ exercise books were least analyzed with only two percent of the respondents reporting that they were analyzed once a week or once a fortnight. On the less frequent practice, majority of the respondents represented by 325 (63.2%) reported that they were analyzed twice and once a year. There were even cases where learners’ exercise books were not analyzed at all as reported by 51 (9.9%) of the respondents. Observation of Table 4.5 shows that, generally the percentage of respondents increased with the decrease in the frequency of analyzing the three types of tools.
Analysis of data according to different types of schools (provincial, district and private) revealed that professional tools for teachers were analyzed on less frequent basis in private and district schools and schools where observation of teachers during instruction was not conducted as seen in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6: Frequency of Analysis of Professional Tools according to Type of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>67 (45)</td>
<td>56 (37.6)</td>
<td>16 (10.7)</td>
<td>8 (5.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>149 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of Work</td>
<td>49 (32.9)</td>
<td>47 (31.5)</td>
<td>26 (17.4)</td>
<td>24 (16.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>149 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Books</td>
<td>7 (4.7)</td>
<td>27 (18.1)</td>
<td>24 (16.1)</td>
<td>87 (58.4)</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>3 (1.9)</td>
<td>149 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>6 (14.2)</td>
<td>9 (21.4)</td>
<td>11 (26.2)</td>
<td>14 (33.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (4.8)</td>
<td>42 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of Work</td>
<td>7 (16.6)</td>
<td>9 (21.4)</td>
<td>10 (23.8)</td>
<td>13 (31)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (7.1)</td>
<td>42 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Books</td>
<td>1 (2.4)</td>
<td>5 (11.9)</td>
<td>6 (14.3)</td>
<td>26 (61.9)</td>
<td>3 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (2.4)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>50 (15.5)</td>
<td>70 (21.7)</td>
<td>111 (34.4)</td>
<td>70 (21.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 (6.8)</td>
<td>323 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of Work</td>
<td>41 (12.7)</td>
<td>59 (18.3)</td>
<td>92 (28.5)</td>
<td>122 (37.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (2.8)</td>
<td>323 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Books</td>
<td>2 (0.6)</td>
<td>18 (5.6)</td>
<td>33 (10.2)</td>
<td>212 (65.6)</td>
<td>46 (14.2)</td>
<td>2 (0.6)</td>
<td>323 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>44 (33.8)</td>
<td>41 (31.5)</td>
<td>24 (18.5)</td>
<td>15 (11.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (4.6)</td>
<td>130 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of Work</td>
<td>39 (30)</td>
<td>38 (29.3)</td>
<td>31 (23.8)</td>
<td>18 (13.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Books</td>
<td>6 (4.6)</td>
<td>24 (18.5)</td>
<td>24 (18.5)</td>
<td>70 (53.8)</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>79 (20.6)</td>
<td>94 (24.5)</td>
<td>114 (29.7)</td>
<td>77 (20.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20 (5.2)</td>
<td>384 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of Work</td>
<td>58 (15.1)</td>
<td>77 (20.1)</td>
<td>97 (25.3)</td>
<td>141 (36.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (2.9)</td>
<td>384 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Books</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>26 (6.8)</td>
<td>39 (10.2)</td>
<td>255 (66.4)</td>
<td>47 (12.2)</td>
<td>13 (3.4)</td>
<td>384 (100*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Weekly and fortnight  
2 - Once a month and twice a term  
3 - Once a term  
4 - Twice and once a year  
5 - None  
6 - Undecided  

RWC - Records of Work Covered  

A - Schools where observation of teachers is conducted  
B - Schools where observation of teachers is not conducted  

* - Number rounded to the nearest whole number  
Figures in Brackets are percentage score
Less than 20 percent of the respondents from private and district schools against 67 (45%) and 49 (32.9%) from provincial schools as reflected in Table 4.6 reported that records of work covered and schemes of work respectively were analyzed on weekly and fortnight basis. Analysis of learners’ exercise books was done on very infrequent basis in all the three category of schools. Additionally, more that 30 percent of the respondents from the private and district compared to 8 (5.4%) and 24 (16.1%) from provincial schools indicated that records of work covered and schemes of work respectively were analyzed twice and once a year. Less than five percent of the respondents from the three categories of schools reported that learners’ exercise book were analyzed on weekly and fortnight basis while more than 58 percent reported that they were analyzed twice and once a year.

Further analysis of the data according to schools where observation of teachers was conducted established that more respondents represented by 30 percent and above by from schools where observation of teachers was conducted reported that records of work covered and schemes of work were analyzed on weekly and fortnight basis as shown in Table 4.6. Less than 21 percent of the respondents from schools where observation was not conducted reported that the two types of tools were analyzed on weekly and fortnight basis. On the less frequent side, less than 15 percent of the respondents compared to over 20 percent from schools where observation of teachers during instruction was and was not conducted respectively indicated that the two types of tools were analyzed twice and once a year. All the two categories of schools (schools where observation of teachers during instruction was and was not
conducted) again had less than five percent of the respondents reporting that learners’ exercise books were analyzed on weekly and fortnight basis. More than 53 percent reported that the learners’ exercise books were analyzed twice and once a year. It was therefore concluded that apart from the learners’ exercise books whose analysis was infrequent in the two categories of school, analysis of the other tools (records of work covered and schemes of work) was more infrequent in schools where observation of teachers was not conducted than where it was conducted as shown in Table 4.6.

The findings revealed that observation of teachers by peers was done on more frequent basis than observation by management. Eighty-eight (67.7%) of the respondents compared to fifty-four (41.5%) reported that they had been observed by peers and management respectively three times and above in the past one year by the time this study was conducted as shown in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Observation</th>
<th>Observation by Management</th>
<th>Observation by Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (8.5)</td>
<td>7 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 (21.5)</td>
<td>8 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 (18.5)</td>
<td>23 (17.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54 (41.5)</td>
<td>88 (67.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>13 (10)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
<td>130 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n – number respondents
1 – None
2 - Once
3 – Twice
4 – Three times and above
UD – Undecided
Figures in brackets are percentage scores
Additionally, less than seven percent compared to more than 20 percent of the respondents indicated they had been observed once by peers and by management respectively in the past one year by the time this study was conducted. Analysis of data according to the type of schools (provincial, private and district) revealed that observation of teachers both by management and by peers was most frequent in provincial schools than the private and districts. Whereas 46 (52.3%) of the respondents from provincial schools reported that they had been observed by management three times and more in the past one year by the time this study was conducted, less than 25 percent of the respondents from the private and district schools had been observed the same number of times within the same period as reflected in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Frequency of Observation of Teachers during Instruction according to Type of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Management</td>
<td>5 (5.7)</td>
<td>13 (14.8)</td>
<td>16 (18.1)</td>
<td>46 (52.3)</td>
<td>8 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Peers</td>
<td>2 (2.3)</td>
<td>3 (3.4)</td>
<td>15 (17)</td>
<td>66 (75)</td>
<td>2 (2.3)</td>
<td>88 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Management</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>7 (43.8)</td>
<td>3 (18.8)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Peers</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>3 (18.8)</td>
<td>9 (56.3)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
<td>16 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Management</td>
<td>4 (15.4)</td>
<td>8 (30.8)</td>
<td>5 (19.2)</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Peers</td>
<td>4 (15.4)</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>5 (19.2)</td>
<td>13 (50)</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>26 (100*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - None 2 - Once 3 - Twice 4 - Three times and above  UD - Undecided

* - number rounded to the nearest whole number
Figures in brackets are percentage scores
Additionally, 75 percent of the respondents from provincial schools compared to 50 percent from private and district schools reported that they had been observed by peers three times and above in the past one year by the time this study was conducted.

During interview sessions, headteachers and HoDs from private and district schools where analysis of professional tools of teachers were analyzed once a term to once a year and those where observation of teachers during instruction was not conducted cited understaffing as the main reason for the situation. A scrutiny of the TSC Staff Establishment Statistical Return Forms in provincial and district schools underscored the reports by headteachers about the staffing position. The form normally has a section that shows the number of over-staffed and under-staffed teachers in each school. Heads of Departments from private schools were also used to determine the staff establishment for the departments because the forms are for public schools under which provincial and district schools fall. All schools where this study was conducted had some staffing problems though they were pronounced in district and private schools as shown in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.9: Schools Understaffed with Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n-number of schools TT- Total number of teachers > more than
Ave - Average
District schools had the highest shortage of an average of 3.9 teachers followed by private schools with an average of 3.3. Majority of the district schools represented by 16 schools had a shortage of four teachers each. In fact in one of the districts schools, it was reported by a senior teacher that one of the teachers had a workload of 64 lessons a week. In Kenya, the maximum number of lessons a teacher can teach in a week is 50. This is based on the assumption that the teacher has no free lessons, lessons start at 8.00 am and end at 4 pm with only one tea break of 20 minutes and a lunch break of one hour. Therefore, a teacher having a workload of 64 lessons a week was a pointer to the acuteness of the staffing problem in the school especially in the subject area of the teacher.

One of the questions of the study sought to find out from the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs if they encountered any problems in relation to the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Thirty-one (91.2%) of the head-teachers, 30 (90.9%) of the senior teachers and 61 (91%) of the HoDs cited heavy workload due to understaffing as the major problem undermining SBTE practice. Consequently, 26 (76.5%) of the headteachers, 24 (72.7%) of the senior teachers, 54 (80.6%) of the HoDs and 292 (76.8%) of the teachers suggested the need to increase teachers in schools as one of the measures to improve SBTE practice. Such a suggestion was made because there was a problem with staffing of teachers. Activities prior, during and after an evaluation especially observation of teachers require extra time apart from the time for the actual instruction. Therefore, when a school is understaffed, those charged with the responsibility of supervising and coordinating teacher
evaluation activities may fail execute them effectively because of heavy workload. Also teachers to be evaluated may not have time for the pre- and post teacher evaluation conferences if they have a heavy workload. To curb such a problem, Sawa (1995) recommends that substitute teachers should be hired to: enable school administrators visit classrooms; to permit teachers visit each others' classrooms and also to allow time for pre-and post-teacher evaluation conferences.

Though senior teachers and HoDs noted that there was a problem with the frequency of SBTE practice in general mainly because of understaffing, 21 senior teachers and 46 HoDs in confidence cited failure by headteachers to lead in the implementation and enforcement especially of observation of teachers during instruction in their schools. They reported that headteachers just mention the need to conduct observation of teachers during instruction by management and the need to initiate peer teacher evaluation but never take the initiative to ensure that they are implemented.

Another factor that was found to be hindering SBTE practice and more especially observation of teachers during instruction was lack of or very little backing and commitment by the Ministry of Education. The Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions (Republic of Kenya, 2000) is very categorical that schools are expected to use the Individual Teacher Observation Schedule: Schedule 8 for professional planning before the [external] inspection takes place. Apart from it's use in [external] inspection, it can also be used by college principals and heads of schools for monitoring of teachers or by teachers observing each other. A report of findings based on internal
evaluation will be one of the audit and review reports during the [external] inspection. This is in agreement with what other studies, for example, by Worthen and Sanders (1987) and Nevo (1995) observe about the role of the external evaluator in SBTE practice. According to them, the external evaluator is very important and indispensable in SBTE practice because s/he is supposed to come in as an evaluator and advisor of the practice. From the findings, however, it was established that only three of the 37 schools that were involved in the study had the Handbook of Inspection of Educational Institutions. The rest had no idea that such a document was in existence. This is a weakness on the part of the DQASE because it is supposed to make sure that schools are not only aware of the document but also are in possession of it and know how to use it. It was, therefore, not surprising that among the several suggestions made by the respondents for the improvement of SBTE practice, the need for a clear government policy about SBTE practice and more especially peer teacher evaluation was ranked among the top three suggestions.

4.2.5.3 Pre- and Post-Teacher Evaluation Conferences in SBTE Practice

To establish if pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences were held as one of the strategies for the institutionalization of SBTE, all the 514 respondents of the study were expected to indicate/report if any pre- and post- teacher evaluation conferences were held. The 380 teachers who were involved in the study were expected to show if they supported the idea of pre- and post- teacher evaluation conferences and why they supported or did not support it.
The findings revealed that no conferences were held before any form of SBTE. All the 67 HoDs who were interviewed explained that the only time the issue of SBTE was addressed before the actual exercise was during departmental meetings for the purpose of allocating teachers to prepare schemes of work for the various classes and to agree on who would observe who during peer teacher evaluation for schools that practiced it. No discussions were held after the analysis of professional tools of teachers. In schools where peer teacher evaluation was practiced, teachers were encouraged to meet on individual basis to agree on when the observation exercise would take place so long as it was within the programmed period.

Post-teacher evaluation conference after observation of teachers during instruction especially through peer teacher evaluation was found to be mandatory in seven of the eight schools where it was practiced. One hundred and fourteen (87.7%) of the 130 respondents from the schools where observation of teachers was conducted reported that there were some discussions held after observation of teachers. Six (4.6%) reported that sometimes there were discussions especially when there was need. When requested to explain what was meant by ‘when there was need’ the respondents who were interviewed and had given the kind of response explained that discussions were only held when there were glaring problems with individual teachers who had been observed.

The findings further revealed that 256 (67.4%) of the 380 teachers were for pre-teacher evaluation conferences while 88 (23.2%) were against it. Two hundred and eighty-one (73.9%) supported post-teacher evaluation conferences
while only 57 (15%) were against it. Teacher evaluation as already cited in the literature is used for many purposes, for example, retention or dismissal from service in some countries. Such purposes can be very threatening to teachers. That is why conferencing before any form of teacher evaluation is very important because it is during that period that the purpose is clearly spelt out and agreed upon, a reason provided by 155 (60.5%) of the 256 teachers who supported pre-teacher evaluation conferences as shown in Table 4.10.

**Table 4.10: Reasons for Pre- and Post-Teacher Evaluation Conferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=256</td>
<td>n=281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help teachers improve especially if weaknesses are pointed out with humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276 (98.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can lead to school improvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260 (92.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents incidents of suspicion</td>
<td>176 (68.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will make teachers understand its purpose</td>
<td>155 (60.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is another way of learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106 (37.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make the exercise focused and Objective</td>
<td>134 (52.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can lead to harmonious relationship</td>
<td>120 (46.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>70 (27.3)</td>
<td>49 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>49 (19.1)</td>
<td>41 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of respondents

Figures in brackets are percentage scores

Understanding the purpose of a teacher evaluation activity will also help curb incidents of fears and suspicion, a reason provided by 176 (68.8%) of the teachers who supported pre-teacher evaluation conferencing. Pre-teacher
evaluation conferencing apart from being used as a session for laying down procedures of the evaluation exercise, also makes the exercise objective and focused because it is a session in which teachers in consultation with the evaluator agree on the instructional goals (Mayness et al 1995). Table 4.10 shows that 134 (52.3%) of the teachers supported pre-teacher evaluation conferences because it will make the exercise focused and objective.

Any evaluation activity without the availability of an opportunity to discuss the findings serves no purpose. Haefele (1993) observes that the purpose of post-teacher evaluation conferencing is to provide feedback to teachers regarding strengths and weaknesses relative to their performance, a reason provided by majority of the teachers who supported some discussions after their evaluation. Two hundred and seventy-six (98.2%) of the 281 teachers who were for the post-teacher evaluation conferences were of the view that it could lead to their improvement especially if weaknesses are pointed out with humour as reflected in Table 4.10. This consequently, may translate into school improvement another reason provided by 260 (92.5%) of the teachers to show why they supported post-teacher evaluation conferences.

A lot of commitment seemed to be the main reason for most of the 124 and the 99 teachers who were against pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences respectively. One hundred and eleven (89.5%) and 72 (72.7%) of the teachers did not support pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences respectively because they were already overburdened. The fact that most teachers were against the idea of holding pre-teacher evaluation conferences because they were already over-burdened was again an indication of lack to
time. Fourteen (11.3%) and 15 (15.2%) of the teachers were even more direct in observing that they did not support any pre- and post teacher evaluation conferencing respectively because there was no time. Holding of pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences can only be done during the free time of both the evaluate and the evaluator. No meaningful discussions may be held in schools where there is understaffing of teachers because of lack of time. That is why Sawa (1995) recommends that substitute teachers should be hired to free teachers for post-teacher evaluation conferences to be held during school hours.

One of the main reasons for pre-teacher evaluation conferencing in SBTE especially in preparation for observation is for enlightenment of the evaluator about the content and also coming to an agreement on strategies of the instruction both by the evaluator and teacher (evaluatee) (Mayness et al 1995 and Nevo, 1995). Post-teacher evaluation conferencing on the other hand is used to provide feedback to teachers about their strengths and weaknesses so that measures can be undertaken to address the weaknesses for improvement purposes (Wise et al, 1984; Hafaele, 1993 and Sawa, 1995). Some of the reasons provided by some of the teachers who were not for pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences were an indication that such teachers do not understand the role, nature and procedures of SBTE. Forty-five (36.3%) of the 124 teachers did not support pre- teacher evaluation conferences because it would lead to cheating. Twenty-seven (21.8%) and 15(15.1%) of the teachers did not support pre- and post-evaluation conferences respectively because they would serve no purpose. Fourteen (11.3%) and 11(11.1) of the teachers gave
other varied reasons to show why they would not support pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences respectively.

School-based-teacher-evaluation is supposed to be formative in nature according to Reynolds and Reynolds (1988) and so it should never be seen/used as a vindictive tool. Consequently, it is only when weaknesses of teachers are identified through evaluation exercises that measures for improvement can be undertaken as indicated by teachers who support post-teacher evaluation conferences. Therefore, when some teachers view pre-teacher evaluation conferences in relation to cheating, it means that they do not understand the role of SBTE and also pre-evaluation conference as a procedure of SBTE. Such misunderstanding as already reported may be attributed to lack of well planned awareness programmes and focused in-service training courses on SBTE that could have been used as forums to discuss and agree on the purpose of SBTE.

4.2.5.4 Use of Evaluation Criteria/Guides in SBTE Practice

To establish if any criteria/guides were used in SBTE practice, the 34 headteachers, 33 senior teachers and 67 HoDs were involved. They were also expected to provide information about the source of the criteria. It was established from 31 senior teachers that the responsibility of analysis of the professional tools mainly lay with the headteachers and HoDs. Senior teachers participated in the analysis of the professional tools only when requested by the head-teachers, for example, when there were complaints from students about some subject(s). The findings revealed that all the schools of study did not use
any criteria or guides when analyzing the professional tools of the teachers. Instead they used methods as shown in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.11: Methods Used to Analyze the Professional Tools of Teachers</th>
<th>Hts n=34</th>
<th>HoDs n=67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counter-checking of schemes of work against records of work covered</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided by remarks made in the remarks column by Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-checks the tools against learners' exercise books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of the above three methods</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen headteachers and 37 HoDs as shown in Table 4.11 reported that they counter-checked schemes of work against records of work covered with learners' exercise books. They were also guided by remarks made by the teachers in the remarks column of the schemes of work and records of work covered. Twenty-seven headteachers and 59 HoDs explained that they made their remarks in the documents after analyzing the tools while very sensitive remarks were written on separate papers and handed to the relevant teachers.

Thirty-seven schemes of work and 37 records of work covered for first term 2005 in five subjects that comprised of English, Mathematics, Biology, Christian Religious Education and Agriculture were analyzed by the researcher to determine the kind of remarks made by the teachers, headteachers and HoDs.
in the documents. The findings revealed that most remarks made by the teachers were not informative at all. For example, a remark like 'lesson taught', which was the most popular remark was made 1163(58.1%) and 102(7.9%) times by the teachers in the schemes of work and records of work covered respectively as reflected in Table 4.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Tools Covered</th>
<th>Schemes of Work</th>
<th>Records of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson taught</td>
<td>r=2002</td>
<td>r=1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1163 (58.1)</td>
<td>102 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tick</td>
<td>501 (25)</td>
<td>563 (43.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>190 (9.1)</td>
<td>269 (20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>93 (4.6)</td>
<td>256 (19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson well taught</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson postponed</td>
<td>21 (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed behaviour</td>
<td>34 (1.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remark does not show whether learning took place or instructional objective(s) were achieved. The next popular remark was the ‘tick’ which again did not say anything about the lesson. Remarks made in relation with the learners' expected observed behaviour to show if learning actually took or did not take place or if the instructional objectives were or were not achieved appeared 34 (1.7%) times in the schemes of work only as shown in Table 4.12. No remarks in relation with learners' observed behaviour were made in the
records of work covered. A remark like ‘lesson postponed’ which appeared 21 (1%) is irrelevant, because the remarks in the remarks column are supposed to provide evaluative information about an instructional session that actually took place.

Despite the flaws that were noted in the kind of remarks made by teachers in the schemes of work and records of work covered, headteachers and HoDs did not take note of them when analyzing the tools. For example, only 11 (4%) citations of weaknesses and 17 (5%) advisory comments had been made by the headteachers and HoDs respectively in the schemes of work only as observed in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Remarks made by Head-teachers and Heads of Departments in the Schemes of Work and Records of Work Covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Tools</th>
<th>Schemes of Work</th>
<th>Records of Work covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hts r=315</td>
<td>HoDs r=382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hts r=383</td>
<td>HoDs r=412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen</td>
<td>44 (14)</td>
<td>77 (20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218 (56.9)</td>
<td>170 (41.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>35 (11.1)</td>
<td>76 (19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165 (43.1)</td>
<td>223 (54.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>197 (51.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved for use</td>
<td>139 (44.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed</td>
<td>76 (24.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary remarks</td>
<td>10 (3.2)</td>
<td>15 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of weaknesses</td>
<td>11 (3.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory remarks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r – remarks
Ht – Headteachers         HoDs – Heads of Departments
Figures in brackets are percentage scores
It appeared as if schemes of work and records of work covered were simply seen, checked, certified, approved for use and endorsed by headteachers and HoDs as reflected in Table 4.13 without ascertaining if the objectives were properly stated and also corresponded with the content and if remarks made by teachers as a way of evaluating the learning process were appropriate. The remarks also showed that analysis of professional tools is just done as a routine and thus not playing any evaluative role. This problem may partly be attributed to lack of the use of an evaluation criterion which would have guided them on what to look for when analyzing the professional tools. Failure by the schools to use evaluation criteria or guides especially when analyzing the professional tools may also be attributed to lack of any clear teacher evaluation policy both at the national, local or school levels. The findings of this study confirmed a study by Wanzare (2004) which notes:

Another problem regarding the present teacher evaluation system in Kenya is lack of a clearly written comprehensive government policy that is known to teachers and which specifies among other things, the purpose of evaluation; evaluation practices and procedures; teacher evaluators; the criteria for evaluation and the provision of evaluation feedback and follow-up plan; the frequency of evaluation and legal concerns. Because of lack of an evaluation policy, there is a great deal of confusion especially regarding the purpose served by teacher evaluation. (p.220-221)

An evaluation criterion guides the evaluator to make systematic evaluation, on what to look for during the evaluation session and thus making the exercise focused. Evaluation without the use of an evaluation criterion may result into making face value judgements based on impression and thus serving no purpose. It was not surprising that some of the teachers as will be seen later
made remarks such as 'analysis of professional tools of teachers was unnecessary because it has nothing new to offer'. Such remarks may have been made because of the kind of comments made in their professional tools by the headteachers and HoDs such as 'checked', 'seen', 'certified among others.

On the other hand, the study established that evaluation criteria or individual teacher observation guides were used in all the schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted whether by management or through peer teacher evaluation. All headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs who were interviewed reported that the observation guides were a modification of the universities’ teaching practice observation guide shown in Appendix VI. A sample of one of the individual teacher observation schedule used by one of the schools of study is shown in Appendix V. A comparison of the individual teacher observation schedules used by the schools with the one used by Kenyatta University during teaching practice revealed that 85 percent of the items on the two guides were similar. It was also established by 100 percent that the schedules were utilized. Most of them had fairly detailed comments, some citing areas of weaknesses, complimenting and even making suggestions for improvement. There were, however, a few cases noted with vague comments such as 'okay'. Files with copies of utilized teacher observation schedules were kept at the departments.

4.2.5.5 Storage Systems of SBTE Records

A school with a well established SBTE programme is expected to have a good storage system of the SBTE records (Nevo, 1995). The records are very
important for reference, follow-up and accountability purposes. All the 34 headteachers, 33 senior teachers and 67 HoDs were used to establish the availability of storage systems for the SBTE records in the schools. A total of 84 (62.7%) of the 134 headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs who were interviewed reported that analyzed and certified copies of the schemes of work and records of work covered were centrally kept as reflected in Table 4.14.

### Table 4.14: Storage of Teacher Evaluation Records by Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Records</th>
<th>Professional tools</th>
<th>Observation Guides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=134</td>
<td>n=26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67.9)</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.7)</td>
<td>(37.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n – Number of respondents
Figures in brackets are percentages

Fifty (37.3%) of the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs reported that they were not centrally kept but instead were returned to individual teachers after the analysis. The schemes of work records were kept in files while work covered for every subject was recorded in a counter-book and kept at the departments. Provincial schools were better organized with regards to the storage of records of professional tools of teachers as depicted in Table 4.14. Twenty-one (75%) of the head-teachers, senior teachers and HoDs from provincial schools against
58 (60.4%) and five (50%) from district and private schools respectively reported that the tools were centrally kept.

All the 26 headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs from schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted also reported that copies of used individual teacher observation schedules were centrally kept in files by either the HoDs, senior teachers or the headteachers. Analysis of files for records of SBTE reports confirmed that utilized individual teacher observation schedules were centrally kept as was reported.

4.2.5.6 Administrative Support for SBTE Practice

To establish if headteachers support SBTE practice, the 33 senior teachers and 67 HoDs were asked if they received any support from the headteacher with regards to supervision and evaluation of teachers, and if any, what kind of support was provided. Sixteen (48.5%) and 27 (40.3%) senior teachers and HoDs respectively from schools where analysis of professional tools of teachers was the only form of SBTE reported that they got support from the headteachers. On the other hand, all the five senior teachers and 14 of 15 HoDs from schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted reported that they got support from the headteachers. It was, therefore clear from the findings that there was more support for senior teachers and HoDs by the headteachers from schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted than those from schools where analysis of professional of teachers was the only form of SBTE.
A total of 46 senior teachers and HoDs reported that headteachers provided resources necessary for the supervision and evaluation of teachers such as stationery, teaching-learning aids and textbooks. Other support consisted of: sponsoring them for seminars, reported by 35 senior teachers and HoDs; encouragement, 25; showing concern in their work, 22; attending departmental meetings, 16 and handling of difficult teachers reported by 12 senior teachers and HoD. A head of department from one of the schools where peer teacher evaluation was conducted made the following remark to show how the active involvement of the headteacher in the practice of peer teacher evaluation was a motivation to the teachers:

You know the good thing about peer teacher evaluation is that everyone participates in it as an observer and an observed. Even the headteacher who never used to teach in the past has no alternative but also to participate in teaching if he has to lead by example. This is very motivating to the teachers because we operate at the same level. In fact this idea of management observing teachers during instruction is fizzling out because it is being overtaken by peer teacher evaluation.

Senior teachers and HoDs are very important in the running of the schools as far as curriculum implementation is concerned. Therefore, their motivation to execute their duties with diligence is very important. All headteachers have no alternative but to give them total support.

4.2.6 Perceptions About the Purpose of SBTE Practice

To establish the teachers’ perceptions about the purpose of SBTE practice, all the 514 respondents were asked if analysis of the professional tools of teachers
and observation of teachers during instruction by management and by peers were very necessary, necessary or unnecessary. They were also expected to provide reasons to show why they viewed SBTE practice either very necessary/necessary or unnecessary.

The findings revealed that generally most of the respondents had a favourable view of SBTE practice. Over 72% of the respondents were of the view that each of the modes of SBTE (analysis of professional tools of teachers, observation of teachers by management and peers) was very necessary and necessary as shown in Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>V/NEC</th>
<th>UNNEC</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Professional Tools</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(90.3)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Peers</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td>(100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Management</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>(16.1)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
<td>(100*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*V/NEC – Very necessary/necessary  UNNEC – Unnecessary
UD – Undecided

Figures in brackets are percentage scores
* - Number rounded to the nearest whole number

Analysis of professional tools of teachers had more respondents represented by 464 (90.3%) respondents indicating that it was very necessary and necessary. It was followed by observation of teachers by peers represented by 427 (83%) respondents and lastly observation of teachers by management represented by 374 (72.7%) as reflected in Table 4.15. Less than 20% of the respondents who
apparently were only HoDs and teachers were of the view that each of the modes SBTE was unnecessary.

Further analysis of the data according to designation, gender, professional status, departments and type of schools of the respondents revealed that generally: all head-teachers and senior teachers; teachers with a Masters of Education degree (93.3%); respondents from provincial schools (91.3%); respondents from the Language department (86.9%) and male respondents (84.7%) had the most favourable view of the practice of SBTE as seen in Table 4.16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Designation</th>
<th>VN/N</th>
<th>UNNEC</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior teachers</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td>58 (91)</td>
<td>9 (13.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>297 (78.2)</td>
<td>52 (13.7)</td>
<td>31 (8.22)</td>
<td>380 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>288 (84.7)</td>
<td>32 (9.1)</td>
<td>21 (6.2)</td>
<td>340 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134 (77)</td>
<td>30 (17.2)</td>
<td>10 (5.8)</td>
<td>174 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Education</td>
<td>14 (93.3)</td>
<td>1 (6.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>24 (88.9)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>90 (88.2)</td>
<td>6 (5.9)</td>
<td>6 (5.9)</td>
<td>102 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Graduate</td>
<td>44 (84.6)</td>
<td>6 (11.5)</td>
<td>2 (3.9)</td>
<td>52 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>230 (80.1)</td>
<td>38 (13.2)</td>
<td>19 (6.6)</td>
<td>287 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained teachers</td>
<td>19 (63.3)</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>86 (86.9)</td>
<td>5 (5.1)</td>
<td>8 (8.1)</td>
<td>99 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>83 (86.5)</td>
<td>7 (7.3)</td>
<td>6 (6.3)</td>
<td>96 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>98 (85.2)</td>
<td>13 (11.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.5)</td>
<td>115 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>80 (76.2)</td>
<td>20 (19)</td>
<td>5 (4.8)</td>
<td>105 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Creative Arts</td>
<td>75 (75.8)</td>
<td>16 (16.2)</td>
<td>8 (8.1)</td>
<td>99 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>136 (91.3)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>7 (4.7)</td>
<td>149 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>254 (78.6)</td>
<td>48 (14.9)</td>
<td>21 (6.5)</td>
<td>323 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32 (76.2)</td>
<td>7 (16.7)</td>
<td>3 (7.1)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VN/N – Very necessary/necessary  UNNEC – Unnecessary  PGDE – Post Graduate Diploma in Education
On the contrary, teachers, female respondents, untrained teachers, respondents from the Technical/Creative Arts department and private schools had the least favourable view of the practice. Untrained teachers represented by eight (26.7%) led in indicating that SBTE practice was unnecessary.

As already revealed, teachers, respondents from the Technical/Creative Arts and Humanities departments, respondents from private schools and then district schools had least been exposed to in-service training opportunities by the time this study was conducted. A study by Agezo (2005) observes that workers [teachers] who are slated for training come back to the school more rejuvenated to offer quality service and improve productivity because they see the school as being responsible for their development and upward mobility and they are motivated to work hard and remain in it. On the contrary, workers [teachers] who are not exposed to training opportunities may lack the morale to be committed to their professional responsibility of implementing the curriculum and other activities related to it like teacher evaluation. Teachers, respondents from the Technical/Creative Arts and Humanities department, respondent from the private and district schools may have had the least favourable view about SBTE practice not because there was a problem with the practice but partly because they were demoralized.

Frequent SBTE practice, pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences, awareness programmes and active involvement of the DQASE in SBTE practice were all found to be in effect in most provincial schools. There is likelihood that the way SBTE is practiced in provincial schools has a bearing on the way respondents in those schools view the practice as Nevo (1995) and others
observe that the way SBTE is implemented and institutionalized has a bearing on the way teachers view it.

The respondents were expected to give a maximum of three reasons each to show why they were of the view that SBTE was very necessary, necessary or unnecessary. The information provided was expected to help the researcher establish how the respondents who had observed that SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary understood the role of the practice. Table 4.17 shows some of the reasons provided by the respondents to show why they viewed SBTE practice either very necessary or necessary.
Table 4.17: Reasons for the Support of SBTE Practice by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of SBTE</th>
<th>Analysis of Professional Tools</th>
<th>Observation by Management</th>
<th>Observation by Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>n=464</td>
<td>n=374</td>
<td>n=427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an administrative responsibility</td>
<td>431 (92.9)</td>
<td>244 (65.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a strategy for monitoring curriculum implementation</td>
<td>275 (59.3)</td>
<td>170 (45.5)</td>
<td>170 (39.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/lead (s) to school improvement</td>
<td>97 (20.9)</td>
<td>81 (21.7)</td>
<td>166 (38.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/lead(s) to effective curriculum implementation</td>
<td>40 (8.6)</td>
<td>80 (21.4)</td>
<td>156 (36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/lead(s) to cordial relationship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/build(s) confidence in the teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>137 (32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors hardly come</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103 (27.5)</td>
<td>133 (31.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/help(s) the teacher improve professionally</td>
<td>39 (8.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122 (19.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes/can make me know the problem of teachers</td>
<td>112 (24.1)</td>
<td>93 (28.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>60 (12.9)</td>
<td>61 (16.3)</td>
<td>105 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14 (3)</td>
<td>14 (3.7)</td>
<td>22 (5.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n – Number of respondents

Figures in brackets are percentage scores
Apart from analysis of professional tools and observation of teachers during instruction by management which are seen as an administrative responsibility and also as strategies for monitoring curriculum implementation by over 50 percent of the respondents as reflected in Table 4.17, most of the other reasons were provided by less than 50 percent of the respondents. Even when analysis of professional tools and observation of teachers during instruction by management are viewed as an administrative responsibility, that does not really explain why, for example, the professional tools have to be analyzed or observation of teachers has to be conducted by the academic management teams of schools.

Contrary to the observation by a number of studies that the main purpose of SBTE should be viewed in relation with teachers’ professional development and improvement (Hopkins, 1989; Millman and Hammond, 1990 and Nevo, 1995), less than 30 percent of the respondents appeared to have that understanding as shown in Table 4.17. In fact, none of the headteachers and senior teachers viewed analysis of professional tools as an activity that could lead to professional development of the teachers. Also none of the respondents were of the view that observation of teachers during instruction by management could lead to professional development of the teachers.

Though majority of the respondents were of the view that SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary, the variation in reasons provided by respondents as reflected in Table 4.17 to show why it was either very necessary or necessary showed lack of mutual understanding of the role of the practice. This was more evident during interview sessions where most of
the respondents who were interviewed did not give spontaneous responses. Sometimes the researcher had to wait for a minute or two before the respondents responded to the questions. That was an indication that they were not very much abreast about the role of the SBTE practice. Lack of mutual understanding of the role of SBTE practice may be attributed to lack of meaningful forums organized to discuss about the role or purpose of SBTE practice and also to come up with a mutual reason, for example, on why professional tools of teachers have to be analyzed and why teachers have to be observed during instruction. The variation in reasons provided to show why SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary confirmed an observation by Wanzare (2002) that one of the problems of Kenyan teacher evaluation system is the confusion over the purposes it serves. That is why Nevo (1995) stresses that awareness programmes to discuss the purpose of teacher evaluation are very important and should be a continuous activity. In the school system, it is important that those involved in SBTE practice discuss and agree on why it is practiced. If that is done, variations on why it is conducted may be minimized and the practice becomes more focused (Wanzare, 2002).

One of the suggestions provided by 99 (26.1%) of the teachers for the improvement of SBTE practice was that SBTE practice should be evaluated. An evaluation of an SBTE practice may not only provide a feedback to the schools about it’s success and also shortcomings of the practice so that relevant remedies can be undertaken for its improvement. It may also be used as a forum for participants of an evaluation process to remind themselves about the purpose of the evaluation. Despite the lack of shared understanding of the
purpose of SBTE by most respondents, it may be possible in future to focus more clearly on professional development of the teachers and school improvement as the main goals of SBTE and also to intensify and strengthen it more so because most of the respondents were of the view that it is very necessary or necessary.

The HoDs and teachers who were of the view that SBTE practice was unnecessary were also expected to give a maximum of three reasons to show why they felt that SBTE practice was unnecessary. One of the main reason as reflected in Table 4.18 why they were of the view that SBTE practice was unnecessary was because it adds/would add nothing new to what they already knew.
## Table 4.18: Reasons Against SBTE Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of SBTE Analysis of Professional Tools</th>
<th>Observation by Management</th>
<th>Observation by Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trs</strong></td>
<td><strong>HoDs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=26</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It adds nothing to what we already know</td>
<td>17 (65.4)</td>
<td>4 (57.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are trained and qualified</td>
<td>12 (46.2)</td>
<td>3 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoDs/teachers are already over-burdened</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will/lead(s) to witch-hunt and conflicts</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td>3 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I doubt their competence</td>
<td>10 (38.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be /is unnecessary burden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can/encourage(s) animosity</td>
<td>9 (34.6)</td>
<td>1 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undermines the teacher’s autonomy</td>
<td>11 (23.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14 (30.4)</td>
<td>5 (71.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3 (6.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ttrs – teachers

HoDs – Heads of Departments

n – number of respondents

Figures in brackets are percentage scores
Twenty-five (54.3%) of the teachers were of the view that analysis of their professional tools added nothing to what they already knew. This comment may partly be influenced by the kind of comments made by headteachers and HoDs in the schemes of work and records of work covered as already noted elsewhere in this study such as ‘checked’, ‘seen’ ‘approved for use’ which meant nothing to them. Four (57.1%) of the HoDs and 28 (36.8%) of the teachers as shown in Table 4.18 were also of the view that observation of teachers by management adds/would add nothing to what they already knew. Additionally, four (80%) of the HoDs and 21 (47.8%) of the teachers were of the same view that observation of teachers by peers adds/would add nothing new to what they already knew.

Other reasons given to show why the analysis of professional tools, observation of teachers by management and by peers were unnecessary as shown in table 4.18 were: teachers are trained and qualified; it encourages/would encourage witch-hunt; it is/will be unnecessary burden; teachers are already overloaded; it can encourages/would encourage animosity and undermines/would undermine teachers’ autonomy. Most of the reasons provided by the HoDs and teachers may be attributed to the fact that there are no proper awareness programmes organized in the schools to address and discuss the purpose of SBTE and also because very few teachers as compared to the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs had been exposed to in-service training opportunities by the time this study was conducted. As a result they lack proper understanding about the purpose of SBTE practice. Probably if all HoDs and teachers were exposed to continuous awareness programmes and in-
service training opportunities, they would view learning as a process and also translate it into action rather than having a favourable view of the practice of SBTE and yet what goes on practice at the schools is wanting.

4.3 External Related Factors that Influence SBTE Practice

4.3.1 Introduction
This section presents the finding of the study on role of the DQASE is in SBTE practice in secondary schools and the respondents’ perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice. All the 514 respondents were used to establish the extent to which the DQASE is involved in SBTE practice and their perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice.

4.3.2 The Role of the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in Education SBTE Practice
To establish the extent to which the DQASE was involved in SBTE practice in secondary schools, teachers were asked to show how many times they had been observed during instruction by the DQASE officers in the last four years by the time this study was conducted. They were to choose from alternatives that ranged from none to more than three times. Headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs were asked if they get any support from the DQASE and if did, what kind of support.

The findings revealed that 290 (76.3%) of the 380 teachers had not been observed at all by DQASE officers in the last four years by the time this study was conducted as reflected in Table 4.19.
Table 4.19: Frequency of Observation of Teachers by DQASE Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Observation</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>Thrice</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (n=68)</td>
<td>48 (70.6)</td>
<td>11 (16.2)</td>
<td>3 (4.4)</td>
<td>3 (4.4)</td>
<td>3 (4.4)</td>
<td>68 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (n=69)</td>
<td>50 (72.5)</td>
<td>10 (14.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>7 (10.1)</td>
<td>69 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (n=84)</td>
<td>61 (72.6)</td>
<td>10 (11.9)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>3 (3.6)</td>
<td>8 (9.5)</td>
<td>84 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (n=78)</td>
<td>63 (80.8)</td>
<td>10 (12.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (6.2)</td>
<td>78 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/CA (n=81)</td>
<td>68 (84)</td>
<td>8 (9.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (6.2)</td>
<td>81 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (n=121)</td>
<td>83 (68.6)</td>
<td>19 (15.7)</td>
<td>4 (3.3)</td>
<td>7 (5.8)</td>
<td>8 (6.6)</td>
<td>121 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (n=227)</td>
<td>180 (79.3)</td>
<td>27 (11.9)</td>
<td>2 (0.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (7.9)</td>
<td>227 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=32)</td>
<td>27 (84.6)</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
<td>32 (100*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n \) = number of respondents

*Figures in brackets are percentage scores

*Number rounded to the nearest whole number
A total of only 62 (16.3%) of the teachers had been observed once to three times. None of the teachers had been observed more than three times. Analysis of the data according to departments and type of schools revealed that 68 (84%) and 27 (84.6%) of the teachers from the Technical/Creative Arts department and private schools respectively had not been observed at all in the last four years by the time this study was conducted as shown in Table 4.19. Only eight (10.3%) and three (9.4%) of the teachers had been observed once. The Language department and provincial schools on the other hand had the highest percentage of teachers though still minimal represented by a total of 17 (23%) and 30 (24.8%) of the teachers respectively who had been observed at least once to three times in the last four years by the time this study was conducted.

With regards to support given to the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs by the DQASE, 41 (30.6%) and 39 (29.1%) of the 134 headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs as reflected in Table 4.20 reported that they got and sometimes got support respectively.

### Table 4.20: Support given to Management Team of Secondary Schools by DQASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers (n=34)</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>11 (32.4)</td>
<td>16 (47.1)</td>
<td>24 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior teachers (n=33)</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
<td>18 (54.5)</td>
<td>33 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoDs (n=67)</td>
<td>27 (40.3)</td>
<td>20 (29.9)</td>
<td>20 (29.9)</td>
<td>7 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=134)</td>
<td>41 (30.6)</td>
<td>39 (29.1)</td>
<td>54 (40.3)</td>
<td>134 (100*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n – number of respondents  
* Numbers rounded to the nearest whole number  
HoDs – Heads of Departments  
Figures in brackets are percentage scores
Fifty-four (40.3%) of the headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs reported that they did not get any support at all. Analysis of the data according to the designation of the respondents revealed that more HoDs represented by 27 (40.3%) as compared to the 7 (20.6%) headteachers and 7 (21.2%) senior got support from the DQASE as shown in Table 4.20. In the secondary school system in Kenya, the responsibility of HoDs of the formal curriculum revolve around the implementation of the curriculum. Headteachers depend on them very much in relation to the implementation of the curriculum in the various departments because they are expected to be better informed about the curriculum content of subjects that fall under their respective departments than the headteachers. Therefore, it is a positive gesture on the part of the DQASE when it places more attention on the HoDs because curriculum implementation is the core function of any learning institution.

Through probes it was established that 12 of the 16 headteachers who reported that they did not get any support from the DQASE were from schools that had not been visited by the DQASE officers for over five years. The other four headteachers just felt that the officers did not offer much whenever they visited their schools. According to them, the officers seem to go to those schools for fault finding. The findings also revealed that visits to the schools by the DQASE officers for routine evaluation were not evenly distributed. All the provincial schools that were involved in the study had been visited at least twice in the last four years by the time this study was conducted. On the contrary, only three of the 24 district schools that were involved in the study had been visited twice, eight had been visited once while 13 had not been
visited at all. Additionally only one of the four private schools that were
involved in the study had been visited once. Six of the headteachers in
confidence explained that DQASE officers seem to target provincial schools
most probably because those schools are rich financially and so by the time the
officers leave the schools, they will have made some financial gains.

It was further revealed that visits by DQASE officers to schools take
only one day for each school. According to the HoDs, evaluation by DQASE
officers is done haphazardly because there is a lot to be done within a short
time. The sporadic and scanty visits by the officers to schools explains why
only 62 (16.3%) of the 380 teachers as already reported had been observed once
to three times in the last four years by the time this study was conducted.

The findings revealed a discrepancy between the laid down procedures
by the DQASE pertaining to the routine/panel evaluation of schools and the
actual practice. The Handbook of Inspection of Educational Institutions
observes that educational institutions should be panel evaluated every three
years and the duration should at least be two days for each institution if the
evaluation has to be thorough (Republic of Kenya, 2000). However, as already
reported, 16 schools had not been visited at all in the last four years by the time
this study was conducted. For those that had been visited the evaluation by
DQASE officers lasted only one day for each school.

Generally, the support provided by the DQASE did not show much
involvement in teacher evaluation which should be one of the areas focus with
regards to quality assurance and standards in education (Republic of Kenya,
2000). The most highly rated support a total of 44 (64.7%) of the headteachers,
senior teachers and HoDs reported to receive from the DQASE as shown in Table 4.21 was enlightenment on developments in education.
### Table 4.21: Kind of Support provided to Management Teams in Secondary Schools by the DQASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Hts</th>
<th>STs</th>
<th>HoDs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightens us on developments in education</td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td>14 (77.7)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>44 (64.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows concern in the functioning of the office</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>22 (68.8)</td>
<td>36 (52.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows concern in the running of the school</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>15 (46.9)</td>
<td>27 (39.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter checks the professional tools of teachers</td>
<td>8 (44.4)</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>12 (37.5)</td>
<td>24 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advices where necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides on how to supervise teachers</td>
<td>12 (66.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>22 (32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides guidance on school management</td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides on how to handle teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>10 (14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports in fighting for our rights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>3 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td>5 (27.8)</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>16 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hts – Headteachers  STs – Senior teachers  HoDs – Heads of Departments  n – Number of respondents

Figures in brackets are percentage scores
The next highly rated support as reported by total of 36 (52.9%) of the sixty-eight headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs was showing concern in the functioning of the office. Counter-checking of professional tools of teachers and guidance on how to supervise teachers that have a direct link with SBTE were only rated fourth and fifth respectively. Through probes 22 HoDs reported that checking of professional tools of teachers was done haphazardly in most cases. According to them, most of the officers were only interested in seeing the rubber stamp and signature. They never bother to read through the content. Others were interested in seeing the files which they did not even open to see what was inside. Worthen and Sanders (1987) and Nevo (1995) observe that the role of the external evaluator is indispensable in SBTE practice. S/he is expected to play the role of an advisor. The external evaluator, therefore, can only provide advisory services to the HoDs after a thorough examination of what goes on in the departments including thorough scrutiny of the professional tools of the teachers and not just seeing the file, the rubber stamp and signature.

When probed to establish whether the DQASE showed any concern if observation of teachers during instruction was conducted in the schools, only 14 (41.2%) headteachers and 17 (25.4%) HoDs commented that sometimes. The Handbook for Inspection of Education Institutions states that schools will be expected to use the nine schedules in it which includes the Individual Teacher Observation Schedule: Schedule 8 for internal evaluation before the external evaluators come to the schools. The schools’ internal audit and review reports resulting from the findings of the evaluation through the use of the schedules will be submitted to the team of the external evaluators (Republic of
Kenya, 2000) hopefully to compare notes eventually. Failure by officers to show concern if observation of teachers was conducted, therefore, did not reflect what is contained in the handbook.

In one of the private schools managed by non-Africans, the senior teacher and HoDs interviewed decried poor working conditions. The HoDs reported that the remunerations of the teachers were very, very low despite the school having very good physical facilities. They explained that the school at one time was among the best performing schools in the province academically but the standards had consistently continued to decline because the teachers were demoralized since the management did not care. According to them, the management used to care when there were Asian students in the school. However, that ceased with the end of the Asian students in the school. They further reported that the school was hardly visited by DQASE officers though they had a feeling the officers were intercepted by the managers whenever they made attempts to come to the school who gave them huge bribes so that they could write a good report about the school even without entering it.

4.3.3 Perceptions about the Role of the DQASE in SBTE Practice

To establish the teachers' perceptions about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice, all the 514 respondents were asked to indicate if the role of the DQASE was very necessary, necessary or unnecessary. They were also expected to provide reasons to show why they viewed the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice either very necessary/necessary or unnecessary. The findings revealed that the respondents generally had a favourable view of the role of the
DQASE in SBTE practice with 318 (61.9%) indicating that it was very necessary and necessary. One hundred and forty-six (28.4%) were of the view that it was unnecessary as observed in Table 4.22.
Table 4.22: Perceptions about the Role of the DQASE in SBTE Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>VN/N</th>
<th>UNNEC</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior teachers</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td>56 (83.6)</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>195 (51.3)</td>
<td>135 (35.5)</td>
<td>50 (13.2)</td>
<td>380 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>67 (67.7)</td>
<td>22 (22.2)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>99 (100*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>63 (65.6)</td>
<td>23 (24)</td>
<td>10 (10.4)</td>
<td>96 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>74 (64.3)</td>
<td>30 (26.1)</td>
<td>11 (9.6)</td>
<td>115 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>59 (56.2)</td>
<td>40 (38.1)</td>
<td>6 (5.7)</td>
<td>105 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Creative Arts</td>
<td>55 (55.6)</td>
<td>31 (31.3)</td>
<td>13 (13.1)</td>
<td>99 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>121 (81.2)</td>
<td>17 (11.4)</td>
<td>11 (7.4)</td>
<td>149 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>176 (54.5)</td>
<td>116 (35.9)</td>
<td>31 (9.6)</td>
<td>323 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>21 (50)</td>
<td>13 (31)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VN/N – Very necessary/Necessary  UNNEC – Unnecessary  UD – Undecided

* Number rounded to the nearest whole number  Figures in brackets are percentage scores
Analysis of the data according to designation, departments and type of schools revealed that teachers represented by 195 (51.3%), respondents from the Technical/Creative Arts department represented by 55 (55.6%) and respondents from the private schools represented by 21 (50%) had the least favourable view of the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice as shown in Table 4.22. On the other hand, all headteachers and senior teachers, respondents from the Language department and provincial schools had the highest favourable view of the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice. As already reported, majority of the teachers in general represented by 290 (76.3%), 68 (84%) and 27 (84.%) of the teachers from the Technical/Creative Arts departments and private schools respectively had not had been observed at all in the last four years by the time this study was conducted. The rarity of the teachers’ contact with officers from the DQASE in a classroom situation may explain why they had the lowest view of the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice as depicted in Table 4.22.

The respondents were expected to provide a maximum of three reasons each to show why they were of the view that the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary. Though the respondents were generally found to have a favourable view about the role of the DQASE as the external evaluator in SBTE practice, they lacked mutual understanding of the role. This was made evident through the many varied reasons they gave as reflected in Table 4.23.
Table 4.23: Reasons for Support of the Role of the DQASE in SBTE Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Hts</th>
<th>STs</th>
<th>HoDs</th>
<th>Trs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps monitor curriculum implementation</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
<td>16 (28.6)</td>
<td>90 (46.2)</td>
<td>122 (38.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts teachers on their toes</td>
<td>6 (17.6)</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
<td>14 (25)</td>
<td>66 (33.8)</td>
<td>93 (29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks on effectiveness of the teachers</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>13 (23.2)</td>
<td>42 (21.5)</td>
<td>77 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to school improvement</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
<td>15 (26.9)</td>
<td>38 (19.5)</td>
<td>74 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is their professional responsibility</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
<td>12 (21.4)</td>
<td>38 (19.5)</td>
<td>64 (20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can update us on developments in education</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
<td>11 (33.3)</td>
<td>17 (30.4)</td>
<td>19 (9.7)</td>
<td>59 (18.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to effective curriculum implementation</td>
<td>11 (32.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>16 (28.6)</td>
<td>18 (9.2)</td>
<td>55 (17.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For quality assurance in education</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td>10 (17.9)</td>
<td>32 (16.4)</td>
<td>52 (16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can lead to professional development</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td>9 (16.1)</td>
<td>14 (7.2)</td>
<td>35 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can never trust teachers</td>
<td>2 (5.6)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>4 (7.1)</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>10 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes teachers more committed</td>
<td>4 (11.8)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>4 (7.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boasts internal evaluation</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>3 (5.4)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>9 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8 (23.5)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
<td>16 (28.6)</td>
<td>41 (21)</td>
<td>74 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44 (22.6)</td>
<td>44 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ht – head-teachers*  
*STs – Senior Teachers*  
*HoDs – Heads of Departments*  
*Trs – Teachers*  
*n - number*  
*Figures in brackets are percentage scores*
Failure by majority of the respondents to have a clear and mutual understanding of the role of DQASE in SBTE practice again confirms Wanzare (2002) who cites lack of clear purposes teacher evaluation is meant to serve as one of the problems of teacher evaluation in Kenya.

Involvement of the DQASE in SBTE practice should be viewed in relation to professional development of teachers according to Millman and Hammond (1990) and Nevo (1995) unless the evaluation is conducted for other reasons like registration, promotion and response to incidents like massive failures in examinations by students or strikes. Apparently this reason was provided by only 35 (12.8%) of the respondents as reflected in Table 4.23. In other words as much as most of the respondents have a favourable view of the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice, very few of them view it in relation to the professional development and improvement of the teachers.

Consequently, studies by Worthen and Sanders (1987) and Nevo (1995) stress that as much as SBTE is very important, the role of the external evaluator and for this case the DQASE is indispensable because the external evaluator comes in as an advisor and is also expected to be more objective than the internal evaluator. None of the respondents viewed external evaluators as advisors. Instead, monitoring curriculum implementation and putting teachers on their toes were the most highly rated reasons provided by 122 (38.4%) and 93(29.2%) respondents respectively to show why the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary as reflected in Table 4.23. Lack of theoretical knowledge about the role of the DQASE in the practice of SBTE may be attributed to lack of forums to discuss about the role
of the DQASE in SBTE practice. Consequently, lack of personal encounter by majority of the teachers with the DQASE officers may be one of the reasons making respondents not to have a clear understanding of role of DQASE in SBTE practice.

The 146 HoDs and teachers who were of the view that the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was unnecessary as depicted in Table 4.18 were also expected to provide a maximum of three reasons to show why they were of the view. One hundred and twenty-one (82.9%) and 72 (49.3%) of the HoDs and teachers were of the view that the role of the DQASE was unnecessary mainly because the DQASE officers only went to the schools to witch-hunt and also their presence causes tension and anxiety among teachers respectively as depicted in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24: Reasons against the Role of the DQASE in SBTE Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>HoDs</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They only come to witch-hunt</td>
<td>8 (72.7)</td>
<td>113 (83.7)</td>
<td>121 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their presence causes tension and anxiety</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>66 (48.9)</td>
<td>72 (49.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are trained and qualified</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>59 (43.7)</td>
<td>65 (44.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are incompetent</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>46 (34.1)</td>
<td>50 (34.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are known to have been classroom failures</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>42 (31.1)</td>
<td>45 (30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have nothing to offer</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>15 (11.1)</td>
<td>17 (11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who evaluates them also</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (4.4)</td>
<td>6 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>9 (6.7)</td>
<td>12 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (6.7)</td>
<td>9 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HoDs – Heads of Departments  
n – number of respondents
Figures in brackets are percentage scores
The HoDs and teachers also strongly felt that the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was unnecessary because teachers are trained and qualified and also because the DQASE officers are incompetent as reflected in Table 4.24.

During the interview sessions, eight of the HoDs especially from district schools observed that the DQASE officers went to some schools with pre-conceived opinion about those schools. An HoD in one of the district schools narrated an experience where some DQASE officers went to the school for routine evaluation and found when one of the teachers had not completed preparing his professional tools. The teacher was mishandled despite his efforts to explain why the tools were not ready. The HoD observed that most teachers in the school were disgusted with the way the teacher was handled because according to them the teacher was one of the best in the school. His subject always produced the best results in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary of Education examinations
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The main purpose of the study was to analyze the factors influencing SBTE practice in selected secondary schools of selected districts of Western Province, Kenya with the purpose of making suggestions that will help bring about improvement in the practice in order to strengthen it in schools. The study endeavoured to identify management and external related factors that influence SBTE practice such as: awareness strategies for the implementation of SBTE; in-service training provisions; organization of resources; implementation and institutionalization strategies for SBTE practice and perceptions of the role of SBTE practice; the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice and perceptions about the role of DQASE in SBTE practice. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher collected information using headteachers, senior teachers, selected HoDs and selected teachers from the schools of study using interview schedules, a questionnaire and a document analysis guide. The findings presented and discussed in chapter four have given some insight of the factors that promote and hinder SBTE practice in secondary schools. The following is the summary, conclusion and recommendations of this study.

5.2 Awareness Strategies for SBTE Practice

The study established that awareness which is one of the key strategies for SBTE practice was an activity that was ignored especially with regards to analysis of professional tools of teachers. The issue of professional tools of
teachers was only addressed in relation to the allocation of classes to teachers for the purpose of preparing schemes of work, when giving reports about syllabus coverage and also when reminding teachers who may not have handed in their tools for analysis. No discussions were held about the purpose of analysis of professional tools of teachers. On the other hand, observation of teachers during instruction especially through peer teacher evaluation was an issue that was extensively discussed every term by schools that practiced it. Apart from examining how it was conducted and how successful it was, the purpose of the practice was an issue that was frequently addressed.

Though some schools had made attempts to organize some special sessions to address the issue of SBTE and more especially peer teacher evaluation through visits to schools that had been identified to be practicing it, they seemed not to be clear about the objective of those sessions. The respondents who were interviewed gave varied reasons that were even noted among respondents of the same school. Consequently, their responses were not spontaneous. Only one of the schools that practiced peer teacher evaluation had well stated and typed objectives of the practice that were displayed on the staff notice board.

5.3 In-service Training Provisions for SBTE Practice

The study established that less than 40 percent of the respondents had received some in-service training course by the time this study was conducted whereby SBTE was one of the topics of the courses. Major disparities were noted in the provision of the in-service training opportunities when the data was analyzed
according to stratification of the respondents such as designation, department and type of school. Teachers represented by less than 30 percent had least been exposed to in-service training opportunities by the time this study was conducted. On the other hand, headteachers led with over 85 percent reporting that they had received some in-service training course. They were followed by senior teachers and then HoDs. The researcher opines that this is a weakness on the Ministry of Education and heads of schools because teachers are key to curriculum implementation and so should be granted first priority with regards to provision of training. Consequently, respondents from the Technical/Creative Arts and Humanities departments, district and private schools had least been exposed to in-service training opportunities than those from the Language, Mathematics, Science departments and provincial schools.

Though SBTE was one of the topics during some of the in-service training courses, the respondents seemed not to have grasped why it was one of the topics. They gave varied reasons to show why it was one of the topics, an implication that the in-service courses lacked focus. Respondents who were interviewed were not spontaneous in their responses. It was reported that the topic like other topics was handled in only one hour. None of the schools had made any initiatives to organize some in-service training courses internally. They relied on those organized by the provincial and district education offices. Though none of respondents cited lack of know how as one of the problems they encounter in SBTE practice, it was very evident that it was one of the problems. Provision of in-service training was one the outstanding suggestions they provided for the improvement of SBTE practice. More than 90 percent of
the respondents suggested the need to launch in-service training courses targeting all teachers as a way of improving the practice of SBTE in schools.

5.4 Organization of Resources for SBTE Practice

One major activity considered in the organization of resources for SBTE practice is programming the activity. Programming of the practice makes it part and parcel of the school routine and also helps in preventing incidents of suspicion. Only 12 schools had term school programmes. Peer teacher evaluation was the most programmed form of SBTE while observation of teachers during instruction by management was the least programmed. Most headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs where analysis of professional tools and observation of teachers during instruction by management were not programmed were of the view that programming would lead to cheating and would be a sign of rigidity, reasons which showed that they did not understand the procedures of SBTE.

5.5 Implementation and Institutionalization of SBTE

Teacher evaluation is a process that entails among others: self-teacher evaluation, analysis of professional tools of teachers; observation of teachers during instruction; evaluation of teachers by an external evaluator, evaluation of teachers by students; evaluation of teachers by the parents and the community among others. Despite the researcher confining the study to analysis of professional tools of teachers and observation of teachers during instruction, it was established that the most common form of SBTE in schools
was the analysis of the professional tools. Observation of teachers during instruction was a rare practice conducted in only eight out of the thirty-seven schools of study. Basing teacher evaluation on analysis of their professional tools almost solely can be deceptive. A well prepared and maintained tool, for example, schemes of work does not guarantee that it was utilized in a classroom situation. And even if it was utilized it may not guarantee that learning actually took place. That is why observation of teachers during instruction is very important.

According to most headteachers, senior teachers and HoDs, observation of teachers during instruction was not conducted because of lack of time as a result of understaffing. This may have been partly true because out of the eight schools where observation of teachers was conducted, five were provincial schools. A scrutiny of the TSC Staff Establishment Statistical Return Forms that was used for sampling the HoDs and teachers revealed that staffing in most provincial schools was fair when compared to the district and private schools. Consequently, most senior teachers and HoDs in confidence blamed the headteachers for failure to initiate and enforce the practice of observation of teachers during instruction.

Some of the characteristics of an established and institutionalized teacher evaluation whether internally or externally conducted are: regular evaluations; pre-and post-teacher evaluation conferences, systematic collection and analysis of data using a specified criterion or evaluation guide; a well maintained storage system for teacher evaluation records and administrative support of the practice. The above characteristics were used to establish and
conclude the extent to which SBTE practice had been institutionalized in the schools. The following were established:

1) Though analysis of professional tools of teachers was the most common form of SBTE in schools, it was done on infrequent basis in most of the schools. The findings revealed that this was due to lack of time as a result of understaffing. This again was partly true because analysis of data according to the type of schools revealed that analysis of professional tools of teachers was more frequent in provincial schools which were better staffed than the district and private schools. Out of the eight schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted, five were provincial schools. The observation was conducted once a term in six of the schools which is quite reasonable considering that the observer uses her/his free time to carry out the exercise.

2) The study established that there were no pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferences for the analysis of the professional tools of teachers in all the schools. The exercise, therefore, lacked focus. This failure was attributed to lack of know how and lack of time because pre- and post-teacher evaluation conferencing is supposed to be done during the free time of the evaluator and evaluate and so if teachers are already overloaded, they may not have time for the exercise.

3) In schools where peer teacher evaluation was practiced, teachers were encouraged to meet on individual basis to agree on when observation of teachers during instruction would be conducted. Post-teacher evaluation
conferencing was mandatory after observation of teachers. Teachers met after observation to discuss on the strengths and weaknesses noted during the observation. The discussions were extended to departmental, senior management team and staff meetings to address common problems and to make an assessment of the practice.

4) There were no criteria or guides used when analyzing the professional tools of teachers in all the schools of study and so the exercise was not focused. A combination of strategies such as counter-checking of schemes of work against records of work covered with learners’ exercise books and also being guided by remarks made by teachers in the remarks columns of the schemes of work and records of work covered were used to analyze the professional tools of teachers. Analysis of the schemes of work and records of work covered revealed that the headteachers and HoDs used face value to analyze the tools. Very few advisory, corrective and complimentary remarks were made. The most recurring remarks were ‘seen’ and ‘checked’. It was no wonder that some of the teachers were of the view that analysis of professional tools of teachers was unnecessary because it added nothing new to what they already knew. Others noted that teachers were trained and qualified while others doubted the competence of the headteachers and HoDs. Schools that conducted observation of teachers during instruction had individual teacher observation schedules which were properly utilized with exception of a few cases where some remarks were vague such as ‘okay’.
5) Thirty-four of the schools had storage systems of the teacher evaluation records. The utilized schemes of work, those in use and the individual teacher observation schedules were kept in files at the various departments. Work covered was entered into a counter book that was also kept at the departments.

6) Less than 50 percent of the senior teachers and HoDs from schools where analysis of professional tools of teachers was the only form of SBTE reported that they got support from the headteachers. On the contrary, most senior teachers and HoDs from schools where observation of teachers during instruction was conducted reported to get support from their headteachers. Headteachers were reported to be part of the team. They were observed during instruction like any other teacher during peer teacher evaluation which was very motivating to the teachers.

5.6 Perceptions about the Purpose of SBTE Practice

The study established that the respondents generally had a favourable view about SBTE practice. Over 82 percent of the respondents were of the view that SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary. Analysis of the data according to gender, professional status, departments and type of schools of the respondents revealed that teachers, female respondents, untrained teachers, respondents from the Humanities department and private schools had the lowest favourable view about SBTE practice. On the other hand, headteachers and senior teachers; male respondents; respondents with Masters of Education
degree; respondents from the Language department and provincial schools had the highest favourable view about SBTE practice.

As much as most respondents had a favourable view about SBTE practice, they seemed not to have a clear and mutual understanding of its purpose. They gave many varied reasons, a variation that was noted even among respondents of the same school to show why they were of the view that SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary. Consequently, most of the respondents who were interviewed were not spontaneous in their responses. Among the several suggestions given by the respondents for the improvement of SBTE practice was the need of a clear government policy about its purpose. This was also an indication that the respondents were not very sure of the role of SBTE practice.

5.7 The Role of DQASE in SBTE Practice

The study established that the DQASE plays a very minimal role in SBTE practice. Most of the teachers had not been observed during instruction by DQASE officers in the last four years by the time this study was conducted. Analysis of the data according to departments and type of schools revealed that the Technical/Creative Arts and Humanities departments, district and then private schools had the least percentage of teachers who had been observed by DQASE officers by the time this study was conducted. On the contrary, Language, Mathematics and Science departments and then provincial schools had the highest percentage of teachers who had been observed within the same period. The findings further revealed that most headteachers, senior teachers
and HoDs do not get support from the DQASE. Analysis of the data according to the designation and type of school of the respondents established that senior teachers followed by headteachers and then respondents from the district and private schools receive the least support from the DQASE than HoDs and respondents from provincial schools.

5.8 Perceptions about the Role of the DQASE in SBTE Practice

The study established that the respondents generally had a favourable view about the role of DQASE in SBTE practice. Slightly over 60 percent of the respondents were of the view that the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary. However, analysis of the data according to departments and type of schools revealed that apart from teachers, Technical/Creative Arts department and private schools had the lowest percentage of respondents who were of the view that the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was very necessary or necessary. Apart from headteachers and senior teachers, the Language department and provincial schools on the contrary had the highest percentage of respondents who were of the same view.

Though the respondents generally had a favourable view about the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice, the reasons they provided to show why they were of the view that the role of the DQASE in SBTE practice was either very necessary or necessary were an indication that they did not have a clear and shared understanding of the role of DQASE. The reasons were varied even among respondents of the same school and respondents who were interviewed were not spontaneous in their responses.
5.9 Conclusion

From the findings it can be concluded that indeed there is a problem with SBTE practice in secondary schools in Kenya. Apart from a few schools where observation of teachers during instruction is conducted by members of the senior management teams and through peer teacher evaluation, there is no meaningful SBTE going on in most of the schools. This study established that poor practice of SBTE in most schools and more especially the district and private schools which were the majority in the study was partly attributed to factors such as: lack of time due to understaffing; poor economical status of most schools; lack of know how; failure by most headteachers to initiate and implement especially the practice of observation of teachers during instruction and less involvement of the DQASE in SBTE practice. Most likely that is why recommendations have been made by some of the education commissions in Kenya that SBTE should be established in schools as one of the remedies to the ineffective role of the DQASE and yet it is supposed to be an on-going practice.

Some element of effective SBTE, however, were found in provincial schools. For example, there was frequent analysis of professional tools in most provincial schools of this study. Observation of teachers was found to be common in most of the provincial schools as opposed to the district and private schools. The observations were consistent and programmed, evaluation guides were used during the observation and post-teacher evaluation conferences after the observations were held. This was partly attributed to good academic staff establishment in the provincial schools, headteachers' initiative in the
implementation and enforcement of the practice, economical endowment of the provincial schools and more active involvement of the DQASE in SBTE practice in provincial schools.

Despite the general shortcomings of SBTE practice, focus can be placed on strengthening it in schools by encouraging peer teacher evaluation but only after schools have been empowered with knowledge and skills and relevant resources provided. This is possible considering the favourable attitude towards SBTE practice that was noted among most of the respondents.

5.10 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings, this study recommends the following steps be undertaken in order to address the problems facing SBTE practice not only in the schools of study but in all the schools in the country:

1) Headteachers should be impressed upon to take a leading role in SBTE practice and more especially the implementation of observation of teachers during instruction. They should make supervision and evaluation of the school curriculum which includes teacher evaluation their first priority.

2) Awareness programmes and in-service training courses on SBTE and more especially peer teacher evaluation targeting all teachers regardless of the subjects they teach should be organized. Headteachers should be more initiative to organize some awareness programmes and in-service training courses internally where the issue of the purpose of SBTE can be revisited instead of just relying on the ones organized by the local
education offices. This can help cut down on the costs and at the same time involve many teachers. The courses will also focus on established needs of the schools. Facilitators for the in-service training courses can be identified and invited by the schools from the education office or relevant lecturers from the universities. The courses should be given ample time to address the purpose of teacher evaluation and also some basics on procedures of teacher evaluation process.

3) The MoE should subsidize if not all, part of the costs for in-service training courses so that teachers from economically disadvantaged schools can also get the opportunity to attend the courses.

4) The government through the TSC should make sure that all schools are properly staffed with teachers. This will lead to reduction of the workload of the teachers so that they can have ample time to embark on meaningful and frequent SBTE practices especially observation of teachers during instruction which is core to curriculum implementation. Availability of ample time will also enable teachers to hold pre-and post-teacher evaluation conferences.

5) The MoE should come up with a clear policy about the practice of SBTE and more especially peer teacher evaluation. It should clearly spell out among other things the purpose and criteria of conducting it. Consequently, the MoE should ensure that all schools are in possession of the Handbook of Inspection of Educational Institution and are also guided on how to use it.
6) The MoE through the DQASE should be more involved in SBTE practice by evaluating the practice and at the same time advise the schools internal academic personnel on the procedures of SBTE. This should be done without discrimination of certain subject areas and type of schools.

7) Model schools should be identified among those practicing especially peer teacher evaluation so that they can be used as points of reference. Schools that intend to establish and practice it can also learn from them.

5.11 Suggestions for Further Research

Kenya is divided into eight provinces administratively and educationally. It has over one hundred districts at the moment and has almost five thousand secondary schools. This study was conducted using only thirty-seven secondary schools from three selected districts of one province. Findings of this study have been used to conclude and reflect the situation of SBTE practice in the whole country. Similar studies should be conducted in secondary schools from other parts of the country so that the problem of SBTE can viewed and addressed on a wider perspective.

In order to carry out an in-depth study, the researcher focused on the formal dimension of the school curriculum while analyzing the factors that influence SBTE practice. Consequently, the researcher concentrated on two forms of SBTE that were analysis of professional tools and observation of teachers during instruction. Similar studies should be conducted but focusing on the non-formal and informal dimensions of the school curriculum.
Consequently, similar studies should be conducted on the other modes of teacher evaluation such as teacher self-evaluation, evaluation of teachers by students and evaluation of teachers by the parents and the community. The findings if utilized may help the education system to come up with a conclusive picture with regards to SBTE practice and then take appropriate measures where necessary.

The study revealed that peer teacher evaluation in schools where it is practiced fulfilled almost all the characteristics of a successful and effective teacher evaluation as outlined in the background of the study. There is more preference for peer teacher evaluation than observation of teachers by management in schools that practice it. Since peer teacher evaluation is a rare practice in most schools, it would be worthwhile to conduct case studies in schools identified to be successful in the practice. Such studies may provide more information on other factors promoting the success of the practice which in turn can be utilized by other schools to implement the practice in their schools.

This study revealed that as much as there was a problem with SBTE practice in general, provincial schools portrayed fairly successful SBTE practices when compared to the district and private schools. This study only identified economical endowment and good teacher establishment as two factors promoting fairly good practices of SBTE in the provincial schools. There may be other factors which this study recommends that other studies may be conducted to identify. Knowledge of those factors may be important for the promotion of good SBTE practices in other schools also.
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This research is being carried out to analyze factors influencing secondary School-Based-Teacher-Evaluation (SBTE) normally referred to as internal inspection in our school system. SBTE involves checking of professional tools of teachers by the management team, observation of teachers during instruction and peer teacher evaluation among others.

This questionnaire should take you between 15 and 35 minutes to respond to the items. Try to complete it independently without consulting your colleagues. Your first thoughts are usually the best. Even if you feel some items do not apply to you directly, do not ignore them. Your responses are essential in building an accurate picture of the issues that are important to improving the education system. Kindly read the instructions in bold before you start each section. I hope you find completing this questionnaire enjoyable.

All the information you provide will be treated with the strictest confidence

Section A: Demographic Data

INSTRUCTION Respond to all items under this section by ticking [✓] the most appropriate response to you from the alternatives.

1) Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐

2) Professional Status:
   Untrained ☐ Diploma/Sl ☐
   Approved Graduate ☐ Bachelor of Education ☐
   Master of Education ☐
   Post Graduate Diploma in Education ☐
3) Your Department(s): .................................................................

4) Your Teaching Subjects?
   a) .............................................................................................
   b) .............................................................................................

Section B: Analysis of Professional Tools of Teachers  
(Schemes of Work, Lesson Plans, records of work covered and learners' exercise books)

**Instruction**  
Respond to all items under this section by ticking [✓] the most appropriate response to you from the alternatives.

5) How often are your schemes of work analyzed by the headteacher/deputy?
   Weekly basis □ Once a fortnight □
   Once a month □ Twice a term □
   Once a term □ Twice a year □
   Once a year □ None □

6) How often are your schemes of work analyzed by the senior teacher?
   Weekly basis □ Once a fortnight □
   Once a month □ Twice a term □
   Once a term □ Twice a year □
   Once a year □ None □

7) How often are your schemes of work analyzed by your HOD?
   Weekly basis □ Once a fortnight □
   Once a month □ Twice a term □
   Once a term □ Twice a year □
   Once a year □ None □

8) How often are your lesson plans/guides analyzed by the headteacher/deputy?
   Weekly basis □ Once a fortnight □
   Once a month □ Twice a term □
   Once a term □ Twice a year □
   Once a year □ None □

9) How often are your lesson plans/guides analyzed by the senior teacher?
   Weekly basis □ Once a fortnight □
   Once a month □ Twice a term □
   Once a term □ Twice a year □
   Once a year □ None □

10) How often are your lesson plans/guides analyzed by your HOD?
    Weekly basis □ Once a fortnight □
11) How often are your records of work covered analyzed by the head-teacher/deputy?
- Weekly basis
- Once a month
- Once a term
- Once a year
- Twice a term
- Twice a year
- None

12) How often are your records of work covered analyzed by the senior teacher?
- Weekly basis
- Once a month
- Once a term
- Once a year
- Twice a term
- Twice a year
- None

13) How often are your records of work covered analyzed by your HOD?
- Weekly basis
- Once a month
- Once a term
- Once a year
- Twice a term
- Twice a year
- None

---

Please indicate by ticking YES or NO in items 14 and 15 whether you hold any discussion before and after the analysis of your professional tools with the person(s) who analyzed them

14) Discussion before analysis the tools
   - YES
   - NO

15) Discussion after analysis the tools
   - YES
   - NO

16) If your response to items 14 and 15 is NO, would you wish that you hold a discussion before and after the analysis of you professional tools?
   - YES
   - NO

17) Please briefly write the reason(s) for your kind of response to item 16 in the space provided below.
   a) ..............................................................
   b) ..............................................................

18) Is analysis of professional tools for teachers in this programmed?
   - YES
   - NO

19) Please tick from the alternatives the most appropriate for you if you feel that analysis of your professional tools is necessary or unnecessary.
20) Please briefly write 3 reasons for the kind of response you provided in item 19 in the space provided below
a) 

b) 

c) 

21) Have you ever received any in-service training course?
YES □  NO □

22) If your response to item 21 was YES, was SBTE one of the topics of the in-service training course?
YES □  NO □

Section C: Observation of Teachers by Management during Instruction

23) Are teachers of this school observed during instruction by the management team?
YES □  NO □

Only those who responded with a YES to item 23 are expected to respond items 24 – 31.

Please indicate by ticking [✓] in the □ the number of times you have been observed during instruction by the following people in items 24-26 in the last one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>twice</th>
<th>three</th>
<th>More than three times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24) Head-teacher/deputy</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Senior teacher</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Head of Department</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate by ticking YES or NO in items 27 and 28 if you hold any discussions before and after the observation with the person(s) who observe you.

27) Discussion before the observation
YES □  NO □

28) Discussion after the observation
YES □  NO □
29) If your response to items 27 and 28 is NO, would you wish that you hold a discussion before and after observation by management team?

YES □ NO □

30) Please write the reason(s) for your kind of response in item 29 in the space provided below.

a) ............................................................................................................................

b) ............................................................................................................................

31) Is observation of teachers during instruction by the management programmed?

YES □ NO □

32) Please tick from the alternatives the most appropriate for you if you feel that observation of teachers during instruction by the management is necessary or unnecessary.

VERY NECESSARY □ NECESSARY □ UNNECESSARY □

33) Please write the reason(s) for your kind of response to item 32 in the space provided below.

a) ............................................................................................................................

b) ............................................................................................................................

c) ............................................................................................................................

34) Please indicate by ticking the number of times you have been observed by inspectors of schools during instruction in the last four years?

None □ Once □

Twice □ Thrice □

More than Three times □

35) Please tick from the alternatives the most appropriate for you if you feel that observation of teachers during instruction by the DQASE officers is necessary or unnecessary.

VERY NECESSARY □

NECESSARY □

UNNECESSARY □

36) Please write reasons for your response to item 35 in the space provided below.

a) .............................................................................................................................
Section D: Peer Teacher Evaluation

Peer teacher evaluation is whereby teachers evaluate each other, for example, through observation during instruction.

37) Is peer teacher evaluation practiced in this school?
   YES □ NO □

Only those who responded with a YES to item 37 are expected to respond to items 38–47.

38) Please indicate by ticking the number of times you have been observed by a fellow teacher or fellow teachers during instruction in the last one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>Thrice</th>
<th>More than Three times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate by ticking [✓] in the □ the number of times you have observed the following people in items 39–42 in the last one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>Thrice</th>
<th>More than Three times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39) Head-teacher</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Senior teacher</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) Head of department</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) Fellow teacher(s)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate by ticking YES or NO to items 43 and 44 if you hold any discussions before and after the observation during instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45) If your response to items 43 and 44 is NO, would you wish that you hold discussions before and after observation by management team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46) Please write 2 reason(s) for your kind of response in item 45 in the space provided below.

a) .................................................................


b) .................................................................

47) Is peer teacher evaluation programmed?
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Respond to items 48 – 50 whether or not peer teacher evaluation is conducted in this school

48) Please tick from the alternatives the most appropriate for you if you feel that peer teacher evaluation is necessary or unnecessary.

- VERY NECESSARY
- NECESSARY
- UNNECESSARY

49) Please write the reasons to the kind of response you provided in item 48 in the space provided below

a) ............................................................
b) ............................................................
c) ............................................................

50) Please make suggestions can you make for the improvement of School-Based-Teacher-evaluation?

a) ............................................................
b) ............................................................
c) ............................................................
APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

Section B: Demographic Data

1) Name of School: .................................................................

2) Gender: Female □ Male □

3) Professional Status
   - Untrained □
   - Diploma/SI □
   - Approved Graduate □
   - Bachelor of Education □
   - Master of Education □
   - Others: .................................................................

4) Your Teaching Subjects
   a) .................................................................
   b) .................................................................

Section B: Analysis of Professional Tools of Teachers

5) How often do you analyze the schemes of work?

6) How often do you analyze the lesson plans?

7) How often do you analyze the records of work covered?

8) How often do you analyze the learners’ exercise books?

9) Do you use any criteria to guide you when analyzing the professional of the teachers?

10) Do you hold any discussions with the teachers before and after analyzing the tools?

11) How is analysis of professional tools organized?

12) Do you keep a record of the findings after analyzing the professional tools of the teachers?

13) Has the issue of analysis of professional tools of teachers been addressed at any forum(s)?

14) Do you encounter any problems with regards to analysis of the professional tools of teachers?
15) According to you, is analysis of professional tools for teachers very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

Section C: Observation of Teachers by Management during Instruction

**Alternative One**

For HoDs who observe departmental members during instruction.

16) How often do you observe members of your department during instruction?

17) Do you use any criteria to guide you when observing the teachers?

18) Do you hold any discussions with teachers before and after the observation?

19) Are the findings of the observations preserved for future reference?

20) Has the school ever organized any special session whether internally or externally targeting SBTE?

21) Have you ever received any in-service training course as head of department? If YES, was SBTE one of the topics?

22) Do you get any support from the head-teacher as far as the supervision and evaluation of members of your department is concerned.

23) In your own opinion, is the observation of teachers by the management team very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

24) Do you get any support from the DQASE as far the supervision and evaluation of members of your department is concerned?

25) In your own opinion, is the role of the DQASE in the practice SBTE very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

26) Do you encounter any problems with regards to observation of teachers during instruction?
Alternative Two

For HoDs who do not observe departmental members during instruction.

27) Do you ever observe your departmental members during instruction?

28) Has the school ever organized any special session whether internally or externally targeting school-based-teacher-evaluation?

29) Have you ever received any in-service training as a head of department? If YES, was SBTE one of the topics?

30) Has the need for management to observe teachers ever been addressed by the head-teacher?

31) Do you get any support from the administration as far as the supervision and evaluation of members of your department is concerned.

32) Do you think observation of teachers by management is very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

33) Do you get any support from the DQASE as far as the supervision and evaluation of members of your department is concerned?

34) In your own opinion, is the role of the DQASE in the practice SBTE very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

Section D: Peer Teacher Evaluation

Alternative One

For heads of departments of schools where peer teacher evaluation is practiced.

35) How often is peer teacher evaluated conducted

36) How is the practice of peer teacher evaluation organized?

37) Are you also observed by other teachers during instruction?

38) Do the teachers use any criteria to guide them when they are conducting peer teacher evaluation?

39) Do teachers hold any discussions before and after the practice of peer teacher evaluation?
40) Are findings of the peer teacher evaluation preserved for any future reference?

41) According to you is the practice of peer teacher evaluation very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

42) Do you encounter any problems with regards to the practice of peer teacher evaluation?

43) What suggestions can you make for the improvement of SBTE?

**Alternative Two**

For HoDs of schools where teachers do not practice peer teacher evaluation.

44) Do teachers of this department observe fellow departmental members during instruction?

45) Has the issue of peer teacher evaluation ever been addressed at any other level other than the school?

46) Has the need to practice peer teacher evaluation ever been addressed by the head-teacher?

47) According to you, is the practice of peer teacher evaluation very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

48) What suggestions can you make for the improvement of SBTE
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE HEAD-TEACHERS AND SENIOR TEACHERS

Section A: Demographic Data
1) Name of School: .................................................................
2) Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐
3) Designation: ........................................................................
4) Professional Qualification: .................................................
5) Your Teaching Subjects: .......................................................  

Section B: Analysis of Professional Tools of Teachers
6) How often do you analyze the schemes of work?
7) How often do you analyze the lesson Plans?
8) How often do you analyze the records of work covered?
9) How often do you analyze the learners' exercise books?
10) Do you use any criteria or guide when analyzing the tools?
11) Do you discuss with the teacher before and after analyzing the tools?
12) How is analysis of professional tools organized?
13) Do you keep records of the findings after analysis of the professional tools of the teachers?
14) Is the issue of analysis of professional tools of teachers addressed at any forum(s)?
15) According to you is the analysis of professional tools of teachers very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?
16) Do you experience any problems with regards to analysis of the professional tools of the teachers?
Section C: Observation of Teachers by Management during Instruction

**Alternative One**

*For senior teachers and head-teachers where observation of teachers is done during instruction.*

17) How often do you observe the teachers during instruction?

18) Do you use any criteria to guide you when observing the teachers?

19) Do you hold any discussions before and after observation of teachers?

20) Are the findings of the observations preserved for future reference?

21) Has the school ever organized any special session whether internally or externally targeting SBTE?

22) Have you ever received any in-service course as a head/senior teacher?

23) *(For senior teacher)* Do you get any support from the administration with regards to the supervision and evaluation of teachers?

24) Does the school have the Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions?

25) In your own opinion, is the observation of teachers by management very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

26) Do you get any support from the DQASE with regards to the supervision and evaluation of teachers?

27) In your own opinion, is the role of the DQASE in the practice SBTE very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

28) Do you experience any problems in relation to observation of teachers during instruction?
Alternative Two

For senior teachers and headteachers of schools that do not observe teachers during instruction.

29) Do you ever observe the teachers of this school during instruction?

30) Has the school ever organized any special session whether internally or externally targeting school-based-teacher-evaluation?

31) Have you ever attended any in-service training course as a senior/headteacher? If YES, was SBTE one of the topics?

32) (For senior teacher) Do you get any support from the administration with regard to the supervision and evaluation of teachers?

33) (For senior teacher) Has the need for management to observe teachers ever been addressed by the headteacher?

34) Does the school have the Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions?

35) In your own opinion, is the observation of teachers by management very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

36) Do you get any support from the DQASE with regards to the supervision and evaluation of teachers?

37) In your own opinion, is the role of the DQASE in the practice SBTE very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?

Section D: Peer Teacher Evaluation

Alternative One

For senior teachers and headteachers of schools where peer teacher evaluation is practiced.

38) How often is peer teacher evaluation conducted?

39) How is the practice of peer teacher evaluation organized? i.e

40) Are you also observed by teachers during the instructions?

41) Do the teachers use any criteria to guide them when they are observing fellow teachers during instruction?
42) Are any discussions held before and after the observations of teachers?
43) Are the findings of peer teacher evaluation preserved for future use?
44) In your own opinion, is peer teacher evaluation very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?
45) Do you encounter any problems in relation to the practice of peer teacher evaluation?
47) What suggestions can you make for the improvement of SBTE?

**Alternative Two**

For senior teachers and heads of schools where peer teacher evaluation is not practiced.

48) Do teachers of this school observe fellow teachers during instructions?
49) Has the issue of peer teacher evaluation ever been addressed at any other level other than the school?
50) Has the need to practice peer teacher evaluation ever been addressed by the head-teacher?
51) According to you, is the practice of peer teacher evaluation very necessary, necessary or unnecessary?
52) What suggestions can you make for the improvement of SBTE?
## APPENDIX IV
### DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE

Section A: Professional Tools of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes of work</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Does the format show the main components? i.e Week, Lesson, lesson objectives, content, learning experiences, teaching/learning aids, reference and remarks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Does the scheme show the breakdown of lessons per week</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Are the objectives stated in learners’ behavioural terms?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Are the remarks/comments made by the teacher appropriate</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Are schemes of work checked by the HOD?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) If YES to item 5, are the comments/remarks appropriate/informative?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Are the schemes of work checked by the headteacher?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) If YES to item 7 are the comments/remarks appropriate/informative?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9) Do the lesson objectives correspond with those in the schemes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Does the lesson plan show a variation of activities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Are the remarks/comments made by the teacher appropriate/informative?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Are lesson plans/guides checked by the HOD?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) If YES to item 12, are the comments/remarks appropriate/informative?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Are lesson plans/guides checked by the headteacher?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) If YES to item 14, are the comments/remarks appropriate/informative?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Records of Work Covered**

16) Does the record of work covered show the break down of the lesson per week? □ □

17) Are the teachers' remarks/comments appropriate/informative □ □

18) Are the records of work covered checked by the HOD? □ □

19) If YES, to item 18, are the comments/remarks appropriate/informative? □ □

20) Are records of work covered checked by headteachers? □ □

21) If YES to item 20 are the comments/remarks appropriate/informative □ □

**Section B: Internal Individual Teacher Observation Schedule**

**Introduction**

22) Introduction linked to the learners' experience □ □

23) Introduction Arousing □ □

**Lesson Development**

24) Learners' participation □ □

25) Variation in activities □ □

26) Mastery of content □ □

27) Content coverage □ □

28) Teachers' language □ □

29) Flow of information □ □

30) Questioning techniques □ □

31) Reinforcement □ □

32) Evaluation □ □

33) Class control □ □

34) Learning atmosphere □ □

**Conclusion**

35) Review of content covered □ □
36) Use of the chalkboard
37) Use of resources e.g. textbooks
38) Use of T/Aids e.g. charts

Personality
39) Confidence
40) Competence
41) Voice projection
42) Dressing

Feedback
43) Teacher’s self evaluation
44) Evaluator’s feedback

Utilization of the Schedule
45) Is the observation schedule utilized?
46) Are the comments adequate?
47) Are the comments informative?
48) Are the comments learner focused?

Section C: School’s Term’s/Yearly Programme
49) Term’s programme
50) Yearly programme
51) Is SBTE one of the activities?
52) Does the programme clearly show when SBTE will take place?
53) Did SBTE actually take place?
54) Does the programme show how the SBTE will take place?

E.g. If all teacher or only the administration will be involved as evaluators.
Section D: SBTE Storage Systems

55) Does the school have samples of the SBTE evaluation guides? □ □
56) Does the school have records of SBTE reports of the last two to three years? □ □
57) Are the records filed? □ □
58) Are the records computerized? □ □
59) Are the records of SBTE kept at the department? □ □
60) Are records centrally kept? □ □

Section E: School Development Plan

61) Does the school have a SDP for last five years? □ □
62) Is staff development one of the tasks of the plan? □ □
63) Is in-service training for SBTE one of the objectives for staff development? □ □
64) Were the teachers actually trained on SBTE? □ □
65) Does the school plan show the objective of SBTE? □ □
APPENDIX V

SAMPLE OF SCHOOL’S INTERNAL EVALUATION GUIDE

Kegoye Secondary School

DATE: .................................................................
TIME: ........................................................................
DEPARTMENT: ..........................................................
SUBJECT: ..................................................................
TEACHER: ..................................................................
INSPECTOR: ............................................................
CLASS: ......................................................................
TOPIC: ......................................................................

PUNCTUALITY
STUDENTS: ..........................................................
TEACHER: ..............................................................

PREPARATION
Schemes of work/lesson plan/Records of Work Covered/lesson notes.
(Comment on whether available, update, utilization and frequency of use)
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
.............................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
........................................................
...................................................................................................

OBJECTIVES: (Comment on whether they are precise, clear and well stated)
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................

LESSON DEVELOPMENT
INTRODUCTION
Arousing Interest
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
...................................................................................................
Link with Learner’s experience

Learner’s Participation

Use of Groups

Varied Activities

Content

Teacher’s language/Questioning techniques/Reinforcement/Feedback

CONCLUSION

RESOURCE UTILIZATION

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

Inspectors Name:
Signature: 
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KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
TEACHING PRACTICE OBSERVATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REG. NO.</th>
<th>STUDENT'S NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM/CLASS</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS AND ADVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE PROFILE (TICK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PREPARATION (20)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Scheme of work, Lesson Plan, Objectives Org. Of TP file)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. INTRODUCTION (10)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Exciting, Linking with prior Knowledge Voicing, Teacher outlook etc.)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. LESSON DEVELOPMENT (50)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>learning activities, mastery of Content, Class management, feedback Personality, use of a variety of skill, Questioning technique and Reinforcement</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 USE OF RESOURCES (10)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ability to integrate relevant resources in activities; improvisation; use of the the Writing Board (WB))</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CONCLUSION (10)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(summary of the main parts; assignment; Further reading)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors Name: ........................................
Signature: ........................................

Percentage  
Marks
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Figure 3.1 Map of Western Province, Kenya

Source: Macmillan Primary School Atlas