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ABSTRACT

The success of educational organisations is dependent upon the quality, commitment and performance of the people who work for them. Effective performance appraisal is one system aimed at improving teacher performance. This research set out to evaluate current teacher appraisal documentation and practice in the researcher’s own school, a large South/East Auckland co-educational secondary school, and to collaboratively implement changes that lead to improved practice. Following the implementation, the improvements were evaluated and a model of improved teacher appraisal established.

This research utilised action research methodology based on the Problem Resolving Action Research Model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002), involving reconnaissance, implementation and evaluation cycles. Action research was an appropriate methodology for conducting research in the educational setting as it provided a framework to work within, on the grounds that both action and research were intended outcomes. The qualitative research analysed existing teacher appraisal related documentation at both the school and government level. Additional qualitative data were gathered from a staff questionnaire and a focus group interview as part of the reconnaissance cycle. Changes to the appraisal practice were implemented as part of the intervention cycle and then assessed with staff through an evaluation questionnaire.

The key findings revealed that the implemented changes led to improved appraisal practice as perceived by the staff however, specific areas within the reviewed practice were highlighted as requiring further development. The recommendations arising from this research relate to these areas and comprise of amendments to the appraisal policy, professional development for staff on the appraisal process including specific training for appraisers and appraisees, and dedicated time to complete the process to acknowledge the value of appraisal as one means of improving the quality of teaching and learning. For appraisal to be effective, it is important that staff have ownership of the process and are collaboratively involved in the ongoing review of policy and procedure associated with appraisal.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNGPMS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO</td>
<td>Education Review Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGs</td>
<td>National Administration Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGs</td>
<td>National Education Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTC</td>
<td>New Zealand Teachers Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMAS</td>
<td>Performance Management Appraisal System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAR</td>
<td>Problem Resolving Action Research Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Registered Teacher Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION
The reform of the education administration in the late 1980’s significantly changed the educational landscape in New Zealand. With the introduction of Tomorrow’s Schools, (Government of New Zealand, 1988) the era of self-managing schools was established placing accountability for teacher performance at local level with the Board of Trustees (Board). The specific appraisal related requirements and responsibilities for the Board were set out in the State Sector Amendment (Government of New Zealand, 1989a). Performance appraisal is a system intended to benefit both the individual teacher and organisation through improving performance (Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). Performance Management for New Zealand principals and teachers became a mandatory requirement in 1997 (Ministry of Education, 1999).

The challenge of what constitutes an effective appraisal system has been explored by many authors (Fitzgerald, 2001; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Piggot-Irvine, 2003). Piggot-Irvine (2003) writes that an effective appraisal system “is underpinned by a relationship of respect and has outcomes directly linked to improving learning and teaching, that is, of an educative process. Effectiveness is linked to appraisal processes and information that have clarity, objectivity and high integrity” (p. 172). The challenge is how the Board and principal develop and implement an effective appraisal system that maintains the culture of positive, collegial relationships and balances the tension between accountability and professional development.

Effective appraisal is at the centre of this research project. This chapter continues with a background of the research site and is followed by the rationale for this research project. This is followed by an outline of the research aims and questions used to guide the research process. The chapter concludes with an overview of how the thesis is structured.
RESEARCH SITE

Pukeko is a large co-educational learning community situated in Auckland, New Zealand. The school was founded early this century and opened with 327 year 9 students and 17 teachers. It has since grown to full capacity with over 1800 students and 106 teachers. It is classified as a decile 10 school (the decile of a school is based on the socio-economic rating of the community based on a number of key indicators determined by the Ministry), and is representative of a wide range of cultures, typical of schools in this area. The vision for the school includes reference to the professional and highly motivated staff who provide intellectual challenge through quality teaching and learning programmes within a safe, supportive environment (Pukeko High Vision, 2009). The quality of relationships that are developed among all the participants within the learning community is also at the heart of the school’s philosophy.

The Education Review Office is the audit agency responsible for monitoring and reporting the overall performance of schools in New Zealand to their Boards and the Government. The most recent ERO report (2009) for the school stated “high expectations of staff, combined with close, encouraging monitoring of professional performance, help to provide a collaborative environment in which teachers are valued and in which the board’s commitment to developing the school as a learning organisation is endorsed” (Education Review Office, 2009). Despite this positive view there were concerns as to whether the existing appraisal practice aligned with the 21st century philosophy of the school, the explicit teaching of thinking skills, information communication technology, mentoring and the integration of these three key pillars into teaching practice.

RESEARCHER’S ROLE IN THE SCHOOL

Undertaking research in one’s own school had specific challenges that needed to be addressed. As a member of the senior leadership team leading appraisal practice in the school, particular actions as set out in the ethical considerations of Chapter three were adhered to, to prevent any ‘power relations’ developing during the data collection, analysis or reporting stages and to assist in attending to the ethical dilemmas for this action researcher.
RESEARCH RATIONALE

This focus of this research project is on effective teacher appraisal. For the purpose of this project the term ‘teacher’ refers to all teaching staff excluding senior managers. The identified issue, teacher appraisal, which is site specific to the research school, is due to two inter-related concerns. These concerns are:

1. that there has been a perceived lack of collaboration and consultation with staff and the senior leadership team in the development and implementation of performance appraisal processes; and
2. that only the policy for Performance Management Appraisal has been reviewed by management since the school opened, but not the associated procedures.

A feature unique to new schools, which grow progressively each year until they reach full capacity, is that what worked in the first year regarding systems, policies and procedures does not work in the subsequent year as the staff and student body double in size, nor in the subsequent years of growth. A new school has a large volume of documentation and systems developed in the start-up phase that could initially fall for review at the same time. A solution to accommodate work-load issues, demands on staff and provide sufficient time for collaboration with appropriate stakeholders, is to stagger the requirements of self-review over a longer period of time, thus creating a more balanced cycle. Of concern is ensuring that the review of current teacher appraisal practice is undertaken with a collaborative approach. This should be complimented by best practice and is more than just compliance based; which is significant to this research project.

There have also been several recent developments within New Zealand education and the profession of teaching that has relevance to this research. The findings of the Teacher Professional Learning and Development Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (Timperley, Wilson, Barrar and Fung, 2007) resulted in a shift of focus to an inquiry-based approach. The shift was also influenced by the implementation of the revised New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) and the recent changes to teacher registration (New Zealand Teachers council, 2010).
With the development of the school and the significant growth of staff during the establishment phase, the lack of consultation and review of current appraisal practice meant there was little, if any, ownership of the process by current staff. Anecdotally staff suggested current practice was weak, a 'tick-box' compliance based approach that did not meet all the needs of fundamental programmes within the school.

The rationale for the research project is supported by literature (Fitzgerald, Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003; Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 2005) which informs us that appraisal is more effective as a means of professional growth and development if staff are collaboratively involved in the review of associated policies and procedures. With the school now at full capacity, this research project is well timed in terms of evaluating and collaborating to establish a culture of effective teacher appraisal based on best practice as one mechanism for ensuring teacher practice is focused on improving teaching and learning, and raising student achievement.

METHODOLOGY

Action research is the chosen methodology for this research project. It is an appropriate methodology when conducting research in educational settings as it provides a framework to work within on the grounds that both action and research are intended outcomes. Action research is a particularly defensible approach for undertaking research within my own organisation as the intent of this preferred methodology is for the ‘teacher as researcher’ to develop understandings of practice based on concrete experiences. Action research is a tool for change aimed towards improvement beyond the mere collection of data and is transformative. For the latter reason alone, the approach was suitable for this project.

The systematic cyclic process of action research involves steps of planning, acting, observing or reflecting and evaluating. The process involves an investigation to analyse the problem (reconnaissance), the introduction of an action to bring about change (intervention), followed by the evaluation of the action as a basis for further planning. This project adopted the Problem Resolving Action Research (PRAR) Model (Piggot-Irvine, 2003) as a framework to guide the Teacher Appraisal Professional Learning Group (TAG) through the collaborative process. This is in
keeping with the latest thinking presented by Timperley et al., (2007) which supports the adoption of an inquiry-based approach for staff professional learning and development.

RESEARCH AIMS AND QUESTIONS
The aim of the research project was to evaluate existing teacher appraisal documentation and practice and to collaboratively implement changes that lead to improved practice. Following the implementation, the interventions were evaluated and a model of improved teacher appraisal established with recommendations for the future.

The research questions were linked to the appropriate key phase of action research: reconnaissance, implementation and evaluation.

The guiding research questions for the reconnaissance phase were:
Q.1 What does the literature suggest about effective teacher appraisal?
Q.2 What examples exist of current exemplary teacher appraisal practice?
Q.3 What appraisal related documentation exists at Pukeko High and how does it align with current perceptions of effective teacher appraisal?
Q.4 What are teachers’ perceptions of the current appraisal practice at Pukeko High?

The guiding research question for the implementation phase was:
Q.1 What changes need to be planned and made to current practice?

The guiding research question for evaluation phase was:
Q. 1 What are the teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the implemented changes?

ORGANISATION OF THESIS
The thesis is organised into seven chapters, which follow this first introductory chapter that outline the rationale, context, research aims and questions for this research project.
Chapter Two examines current literature relevant to the research topic and considers features essential for effective appraisal practice. The effectiveness criterion established was used to assist in the documentary analysis in chapter four.

Chapter Three provides the methodology of action research and outlines how it was applied to this research based on the Problem Resolving Action Research Model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002). An outline of the three qualitative data gathering methods used is also provided and the issues of reliability, validity and ethical considerations are considered.

Chapter Four outlines the reconnaissance cycle based on the Problem Resolving Action Research (PRAR) model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002), and examines what constitutes effective appraisal and evaluates the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The chapter also provides an analysis of the data collected from the documentary analysis, questionnaire and focus group interview used to establish the status of the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High.

Chapter Five reports on the intervention cycle based on the PRAR model and involves the development and implementation of a plan of action based on the key findings of the previous cycle to improve the existing appraisal process.

Chapter Six details the evaluation cycle based on the PRAR model and includes the assessment of the interventions implemented in the previous cycle and evaluates how effective the changes have been. The chapter provides an analysis of the data collected from the evaluation questionnaire and compares the results with those from the reconnaissance cycle.

The final chapter is a synthesis of the key themes and issues that emerged from this research and presents them for final discussion against the key research questions. A set of recommendations are proposed to address the issues that have been highlighted in this research project. Possible limitations of this research are also examined.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW ON APPRAISAL

INTRODUCTION
This chapter provides a literature review on teacher appraisal, or as it is often referred to, performance appraisal. The focus will be on the appraisal of teachers, a significant component of the broader performance management system in New Zealand schools. There were significant themes that arose from the literature review and these have been used as sub-headings in this chapter. The review commences by defining appraisal terminology and is followed with an historical overview of appraisal in New Zealand including relevant legislation and the mandatory appraisal requirements for appraisal. The next section of the review focuses on the multiple purposes of appraisal. This is followed by an exploration of accountability and development, including the integrated approach of appraisal. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the features required for effective appraisal practice, culminating in the distillation of effectiveness criteria for teacher appraisal.

APPRaisal TERMINOLOGY
There are a number of terms associated with the concept of appraisal, performance management being one of them. Performance management may be viewed as a series of "organisational activities that are aimed at strategic organisational ends" (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005, p. 20). Middlewood and Lumby (1998) write that "educational organisations depend for their success on the quality, commitment and performance of people who work there" (p. 5). However performance management is the overarching system of which appraisal is a component. Originating from the field of Human Resource Management, performance management includes a range of associated human resource activities that contribute to the success of the organisation (Rudman, 2002). In the context of education, performance management relates to "the policies and procedures which ensure that teachers and staff of schools provide education and services that fully meet the needs of students" (Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 1). It incorporates the range of personnel
management policies that include recruitment, appointment, professional development and discipline of staff as well as their appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997). Piggot-Irvine and Cardno define the coordination of processes that make up performance management as, “an integrated and diverse set of organisational activities that are aimed at achieving strategic organisational aims” (2005, p. 20). Appraisal is but one component of the performance management system that determines how well an individual teacher has performed over a period of time.

The Education Review Office’s report Managing Staff Performance In Schools (Education Review Office, 1995) defines appraisal as an element of performance management:

between the entry and exit of staff to and from a school is a wide and complex area of performance and management relating to their appraisal, supervision, control and professional development. This area of performance management is concerned with a board’s understanding of what its staff should know and do, what they do know and do, the quality standards they are expected to meet, and the board’s ability to define and bridge this gap. (p. 6)

The Ministry of Education defines appraisal as “an evaluative and developmental activity in the framework of professional accountability” (Ministry of Education, 1997, p.5). A more expansive description is offered by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno who write teacher appraisal is “an evaluative activity …. intended to benefit both the individual and organisation by leading to affirmation that performance expectations are being met, and to the identification of areas for improvement (2005, p. 12). The evaluative activity espoused by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) involves qualitative judgements being made about performance “once competency is established” (p. 15). The description provided by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno, clearly links appraisal to all levels of organisational planning and individual developmental action plans.

HISTORY AND LEGISLATION RELATING TO APPRAISAL
All New Zealand schools must comply with educational legislation and mandated requirements. In 1988 the Fourth Labour Government, with the purpose of reforming
administration in New Zealand schools, introduced *Tomorrow’s Schools* (Government of New Zealand, 1988). It was anticipated that through the reform with increased requirements for schools to demonstrate accountability to a growing number of government agencies, public confidence in the “professional accountability and the quality of teaching” would be restored (Cardno, 1999, p 87). Cardno (1999) also asserted that the other concern at the time “was to make education more cost-effective in a period of stern economic rationalisation” (p. 87). Quality education became a growing concern for the New Zealand public (Grootenboer, 2000). Linked to the notion of quality education was the need for quality teachers and a focus on the accountability of teachers came about.

Through the ‘*Tomorrow’s Schools*’ educational reforms that were legislated as the *State Sector Act* (1988) and the *Education Act* (1989b), self-managing, autonomous, schools were created. Schools were now governed by a locally appointed Board of Trustees (Board) comprised of elected representatives of parents and staff. The *State Sector Act* (1988) required Boards as good employers to ensure “opportunities for the enhancement of the abilities of individual employees” (Section 79, 2e).

With the arrival of elected school Boards, the Department of Education was disbanded nationally. Up until this time, the Department of Education had been responsible for the inspection and assessment of teachers in New Zealand (Fitzgerald, 2008). Inspectors appointed by the regional boards of education not only examined and graded teachers but also “provided a mechanism of support for teachers and schools” (Fitzgerald, 2008, p. 116). The Education Review Office (ERO) was established in place of the Department of Education as the audit agency to monitor and report overall school performance to the Board and the Government. As part of the audit process, ERO have the responsibility to confirm that all staff are annually appraised and that the mandated professional standards (Ministry of Education, 1997), as part of the performance management system, are being implemented. The Teacher Registration Board (TRB) was established in 1989 and all teachers were now required to be formally registered with the TRB.

The *National Education Guidelines* (1993) outline the obligations and requirements that New Zealand schools must meet and are contained in two parts:
The National Education Guidelines (NEGs), which are statements of desirable achievements by schools; the National Administration Guidelines (NAGs), which are statements of desirable codes or principles of conduct or administration (Education Review Office, 1994, p. 5).

The ten NEGs specify curriculum and administration requirements. The NAGs set out six major responsibilities that fall upon the school’s Board; curriculum requirements, employer responsibilities, financial and property management, documentation and self-review, health and safety, and administration related to the best management practice for all schools. In particular to this topic, NAG 2 as part of the NEGs issued in 1993, required Boards to “promote high levels of staff performance” (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 20).

In 1995 the Draft Guidelines for Performance Management in Schools (DNGPMS) were published by the Ministry and became statutory (legalised) requirements for assessing the performance of all teachers from 1996 onwards. The main purpose of the requirements was to improve the quality of teaching and, in turn, learning in New Zealand Schools. The compulsory requirements for implementing appraisal systems in New Zealand school as published in the New Zealand Gazette (12 December, 1996, pp. 724-25), gave Boards the flexibility to develop appraisal systems appropriate to their organisation “within a minimum quality assurance and accountability framework” (Ministry of Education, 1997).

Board of Trustees were now responsible for ensuring that policies and procedures for the appraisal of teachers were part of an integrated performance management system, developed in an open, consultative manner with teachers and contained a professional development component to name a few of the required features. Appraisal therefore is positioned as an essential element of performance management and contributes to managing the performance of an organisation and the individuals within it (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997). Armstrong and Baron (1998) present a view that also integrates the needs of the organisation and individual when the write “performance management is a strategic and integrated approach to delivering sustained success for organisation by improving the performance of
people who work in them and by developing the capabilities of teams and individual contributors” (p. 7).

While performance management incorporates all aspects of personnel management, three inter-relating functions identify the scope of performance appraisal: the induction of staff; the appraisal of staff; and the professional development of staff. They are pivotal and characteristic of an effective performance management system (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005).

During 1997 the Ministry issued to all schools a series of guidelines (*Performance Management in Schools* booklets), on performance management, detailing the mandated requirements. These guidelines provided Boards, principals and teachers with an overview of performance management, the prescribed requirements for teacher appraisal in schools, and guidance for the development and implementation of a performance appraisal system, elaborating on the former DNGPMS (1995). The guidelines explicitly expressed the need for balance between accountability and development in appraisal (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005).

For the secondary sector in 1998, the Government introduced nationally prescribed Professional Standards as a strategy to develop and maintain high quality leadership in schools and improve learning outcomes for students (Ministry of Education, 1999). The Ministry defined Professional Standards as the critical knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to perform a particular role effectively. The standards described the key elements of performance rather than provide an exhaustive list of responsibilities (Ministry of Education, 1999). They were to form part of the Performance Management System in each school.

The intention of the *Professional Standards* (Ministry of Education, 1999) was to provide a framework for teacher appraisal, a focus for identifying development priorities to enable a stronger link between performance and remuneration (salary progression), and to ensure a consistent approach to Performance Management within the teaching profession. However, the introduction of the standards was seen as another means to further tighten the control on the teaching profession (Fitzgerald et. al., 2003; Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2008), increasing the level of bureaucratic control.
Grootenboer (2000) describes an appraisal system in a bureaucratic organisation as “teachers required to perform designated tasks”, with a performance management system required to “evaluate their performance” (p. 122). Several authors (Fitzgerald, 2001; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Piggot-Irvine, 2000) assert that the bureaucratic approach to appraisal impacted negatively on the previously valued developmental aspects of appraisal. This is supported by Mather and Seifert (2011) who write that tighter controls over teacher performance “turn these workers into waged labour, undermining collegial, high trust relations and the educational autonomy that professionals at the chalk face (the point of production) might reasonably expect” (p. 30). The era of reform intended to address the concerns of teacher quality through increased accountability, overlooked the interpersonal practices required and the complex nature of problems involved in appraisal (Cardno, 1999).

This era of educational reform is critically described by Fitzgerald (2001) as “the journey from inspection prior to 1986 to appraisal from 1997 to the introduction of professional standards in 1999 can be viewed in the light of increasing centrality of control on teachers’ professional activities” (p 113). According to Fitzgerald (2001), this resulted in the polarisation of appraisal and professional development due to underlying tensions, in particular, concern over appraisal being part of teacher competency and disciplinary action (O’Neill, 1997).

Tension within an organisation is more likely to be highlighted when the Board devolves responsibility for appraisal to the manager (principal) and in many cases it is devolved further within a school from the principal to middle managers. For a manager, the tension between meeting the demands of the organisation and maintaining collegial relationships has the potential to be challenging due to the complex interpersonal problems that can occur (Cardno, 1999). Cardno (1999) calls this the ‘leadership dilemma’. Fitzgerald et. al. (2001) assert that the “bureaucratic system has placed teacher-appraisers (and middle managers in particular) in a contradictory relationship with their colleagues” (p. 93). There is the potential for tension to arise from the conflicting relationship a middle manager holds when they are the appraiser on one hand and the professional colleague on the other (Fitzgerald. et. al., 2003). This may occur for example, when information gathered is
used for identifying both strengths and weaknesses, and judging performance for other purposes, such as attestation (pay progression) for example.

There is considerable support for the notion that the bureaucratic approach to teacher appraisal negates the emotional dimension of teaching, creating tension and anxiety for both the manager and the teacher (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Middlewood, 2001b).

Recently in 2006, the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC) commenced a review of the Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions which resulted in the formulation of the Registered Teacher Criteria (RTC). The RTC describe “the criteria for the quality teaching that are to be met by all fully registered teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010). A consultation process was undertaken with the education sector over a two year period (2007 – 2008) prior to the criteria being piloted in 2009. Feedback from the consultative process and pilot programme were used to finalise the RTC. The NZTC espoused that the new criteria would “update and bring the registration criteria in line with current thinking and research about quality teaching practice” (NZTC, 2010, p. 1).

With the RTC’s, the bicultural nature of our nation is explicit; there is a strong emphasis on critical reflection and a clearer connection to teachers’ professional practice and professional relationships. The RTC are related to the Professional Standards Dimensions (Ministry of Education, 1999) which are currently still mandatory. The RTC’s are also interconnected and overlapping with the Professional Standards Dimensions. During the appraisal process, by demonstrating the key indicators for Registered Teachers, a teacher is also demonstrating the relevant professional standards are met.

During 2010 (at the time of writing this research), the focus has been on the development and distribution of resources for the implementation of the RTC and the delivery of training for facilitators supporting the implementation of the criteria. As of 2011 the RTC are “mandatory for all teachers renewing or reapplying for a practising certificate” (NZTC, 2010, p. 6), including teachers who will be commencing an induction programme in New Zealand. An implementation timeline has been
published by the NZTC to ensure that by 2013, the remainder of teachers will be using the RTC to gain full registration, renewing registration or reapplying for a practising certificate.

As mentioned earlier, the NAG’s set out six major responsibilities that fall upon school Boards. NAG 1 requires Boards to raise student achievement by providing teaching and learning programmes which integrate The National Curriculum (1993). A recent development that has implications for teacher appraisal in New Zealand is the introduction of the revised *New Zealand Curriculum* (NZC) released in 2007 by the MINISTRY following the review of the former curriculum during 2000 – 2002. The former curriculum focused on what the MINISTRY wanted students to know and to be able to do (Ministry of Education, 2007). The revised NZC is a holistic document that takes into account the changing nature of society, ever-changing technological advances and the needs of the workplace. The NZC clearly sets out what is deemed important in New Zealand education (Ministry of Education, 2007). It contains a vision for young people of New Zealand, includes a set of guiding principles on which to centre curriculum decision-making and places an emphasis on lifelong learning through the promotion of values and key competencies.

The recent implementation of the NZC, combined with the findings from the Teacher Learning Professional Development BES that focus on inquiry-based approaches shifts appraisal away from a teacher-centric activity to one that should link to student learning and improving student outcomes.

**PURPOSE OF APPRAISAL**

The Ministry of Education states the key purpose of appraisal is to provide “a positive framework for improving the quality of teaching and learning in our schools” (1997, p. 1). In contrast to this, several authors (Cardno, 1999; Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Gratton, 2004; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001) write about the dual purpose of appraisal, that is, the bureaucratic accountability used for competency and promotion, and the targeting of developmental needs. Cardno (1999), who supports this more diverse view of appraisal, argues that it makes for an effective appraisal system requiring activity that is “both evaluative and developmental” (p. 93).
The dual purposes of appraisal, accountability and development, relate to not only the individual but the organisation thereby potentially producing positive outcomes for both parties integrating the elements of accountability and development (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). These elements operate at various levels within the educational system, the organisation and the individual at both the personal and professional level. An appraisal system intended to impact at both the organisational and individual level as suggested by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) would have the school’s strategic goals reflected in both the agreed performance expectations and in the development objectives set by the individual teacher.

**Accountability and Development**

One approach to obtaining effective appraisal practice is the integrated approach espoused by Middlewood and Cardno (2001) encompassing both accountability and developmental aspects placing appraisal mid-point along a continuum, as shown in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1: Continuum: accountability – development](source: Middlewood & Cardno, 2001, p. 5)

The balanced, integrated approach to appraisal is also supported by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005). Their interpretation of the integrated approach espouses that the focus should be on teachers and on the organisation being accountable for their performance and their development, to the mutual benefit of the individual and organisation.

An integrated appraisal system involves the following process elements: shared accountability between the manager and the teacher; an individual performance agreement based on agreed expectations for both accountability and development; identified development needs aligned with all levels within the system (individual, learning area and organisation) supported by a mentor and formal data collected...
through a range of activities (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1997) also recommend that procedures for salary review (attestation) and teacher competence for example, should sit outside the teacher appraisal process so as to not move to the accountability end of the continuum and jeopardise the integrated system.

Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) present a model for the integrated approach to appraisal (Figure 2.2) which reflects the appraisal process in practice and also meets the Ministry of Education Guidelines. This model illustrates the three main components of the process; the initial appraisal meeting, development and monitoring activities, and the appraisal interview. In my opinion, the visual impact of the model presented in the cyclic format reminds us that appraisal should be ongoing, continuous in practice and in learning, and is more than just an activity undertaken annually in isolation from other school activities.
The “critical challenge for schools is how they go about achieving links between the evaluation of practice and its development, through, for example, performance appraisal and school self review” (Cardno, 2005, p. 294).

An ‘holistic’ model for professional development is presented by Cardno (2005), which meet the needs of both the individual and the organisation. As shown in Figure 2.3, professional development is planned for with appraisal placed at the centre surrounded by four development themes which link to achieving the strategic goals of the organisation underpinned by the positive values of educational leadership. Cardno (1996) contends that for an effective professional development programme it must consist of the three fundamental factors (strategic management and planning, educational leadership at all levels and an effective performance appraisal system) and the four components of development.

![Figure 2.3: A model of holistic professional development](image)

Source: Cardno, 1996, p. 25

At the core of the model shown in Figure 2.3 is performance appraisal, the means by which we identify areas for improvement before we look at the opportunities or make decisions on how improvements will be achieved. Organisational support is also needed for a culture of continuous improvement focused on improving learning, support for an integrated approach to development which reinforces its importance to a strategic approach to performance management including teacher appraisal.
Over the last decade the term ‘professional learning” has been used synonymously by educational professionals with the term ‘professional development’. However one of the recent Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration’s (BES) Teacher Professional Learning and Development (Timperley, Wilson, Barrar and Fung, 2007) distinguishes between these two interconnected terms. As cited in the BES, Guskey (2000) defines ‘professional development’ as “those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students” (p. 16). The term ‘professional learning ’ as described in the BES implies that it is “an internal process through which individuals create professional knowledge” and as such is considered to be an umbrella term under which professional development of the ‘delivery’ kind is just one part” (Timperley et. al., 2007, p. 3).

One of the findings from the Teacher Professional Learning and Development BES was that “opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning and development can have a substantial impact on student learning” (Timperley et.al., 2007, p. xxv), although there is still little known evidence that extended opportunities to learn are any more effective than the one-off workshops or inspirational speakers. Timperley et. al., (2007) assert that professional learning with its associated conditions and principles impacted significantly on student outcomes and:

- required teachers to engage with new knowledge that involved theoretical understandings – typically pedagogical content and assessment knowledge – and the implications of these for practice. The focus of this new knowledge was on the links between teaching and its impact on student learning (p. xlv).

Professional learning which focuses on the importance of teacher learning and the impact on student outcomes are not evident in the integrated appraisal process model (Figure 2.2) and the holistic professional development model (Figure 2.3). These models clearly focus on the organisation and the teacher as the individual; however the outcomes of the recent Teacher Professional Learning and Development BES highlight the importance of including a focus on student learning. The emphasis on improving student outcomes as part of the professional learning process and as an essential part to identifying professional development priorities is
also supported in a recent ERO report *Managing Professional Learning and Development in Secondary Schools* (2009). The report states that “on-going professional learning and development is therefore critical to maintaining and improving teacher quality” (ERO, 2009, p. 10). Improving teacher quality is a decisive process which Moreland (2011) asserts “ultimately enhances the learning experience for all students” (p. 21).

The literature (Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005) informs us that appraisal is more effective as a means of professional growth and development if staff are collaboratively involved in its review. With Pukeko High now at full capacity, this research project is well timed to keep the school focused on improving learning and teaching utilising effective teacher appraisal as one mechanism to achieve this.

**EFFECTIVE APPRAISAL**

‘Effectiveness’ as described by Piggot-Irvine (2003) occurs when “appraisal interactions are non-controlling, non-defensive, supportive, educative and yet confidential” (p. 172). This final section considers the key features required for effective appraisal practice.

Effective appraisal transpires when the dual purposes of appraisal, accountability and professional development are balanced. However, a range of authors write that in addition to the integrated approach, a number of other features are required for an effective appraisal system. This section explores these features.

Through three individual pieces of research undertaken by Piggot-Irvine between 1996 and 2001, a range of elements were identified as being key features effective appraisal. These key features are described as: an integrated development and accountability approach; based on objective and informative data; confidential and transparent processes; the setting of deep objectives; well resourced with training and time; clear guidelines; separation of discipline processes from appraisal; an educative process; mutual respect and trust (Piggot-Irvine, 2003).
Middlewood’s research of six schools in the United Kingdom identified that while there were a range of factors influencing the effectiveness of appraisal the underpinning factor was the ethos of trust (2001). See Figure 2.4 below. Ethos can be used synonymously with culture (West-Burnham, 2001) and I would argue that it is a vital element of establishing a learning organisation. Silins, Sarins and Mulford (2002) refer to learning organisations as schools that:

- employ processes of environmental scanning;
- develop shared goals;
- establish collaborative teaching and learning environment;
- encourage initiatives and risk taking;
- regularly review of all aspects related to and influencing the work of the school;
- recognise and reinforce good work; and,
- provide opportunities for continuing professional development (p. 24).

![Figure 2.4: Factors influencing the effectiveness](source: Middlewood, D, 2001a, p. 137)

Research undertaken by Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) identified that a sample of New Zealand teachers consider collegiality and participation in the appraisal process as important as professional development. A culture, built on respect and trust would therefore benefit the process. To foster an ethos of trust, the appraisal system must be perceived as non-threatening and managed fairly by those in managerial positions (Middlewood, 2001a). Trust is also one of the key features Piggot-Irvine (2003) asserts as being essential for effective appraisal and writes, “respectful, trust-based open relationships are at the core of appraisal effectiveness” (p.176).
To maintain the development of trust and openness, separate personnel should conduct appraisal and disciplinary proceedings if required. Several authors (Cardno, 1999; Rudman, 2002; Fitzgerald et al. 2003) have identified potential tensions that exist for managers and leaders as appraisers when they are placed in a conflicting relationship with their colleagues. For example, as "judge and helper" where Rudman (2002, p. 437) claims that it may be difficult to play both roles credibly. Another example is the tension that can arise between doing what is best for the organisation whilst maintaining a positive relationship with colleagues.

Fundamental to the process is the development of personal and interpersonal skills to enable staff to give and receive feedback which may involve having difficult conversations and conflict resolution (Cardno, 2005; Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Middlewood, 2001a). Strong interpersonal skills are required to move the appraisal process beyond a technical, checking of minimum criteria, where the appraisee and appraiser engage in open and honest dialogue about performance (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001).

Several authors (Fitzgerald, 2004; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2002) advocate appraisal training as an essential feature of effective appraisal. A small scale research project undertaken by Fitzgerald (2004) concluded there is a need for on-going training to develop and increase the skills and confidence of appraisal participants across the range of appraisal activities. This outcome supports earlier work undertaken by Cardno (1999) and, Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1997). Piggot-Irvine (2003) states the training should cover the elements of appraisal elements, for example, values, purpose, objective setting, observation skills, data-gathering skills, interviewing and report writing" (p. 176). Lack of expertise and training in staff appraisal is an issue for some managers (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Rudman, 2002).

A further feature of effective appraisal supported by several writers (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2001) is the establishment of development goals or objectives for improvement that are ‘deep’ and challenging in format. The development plan for improvement should include indicators for assessing the achieving of the development objectives. It is essential these
objectives are linked with identified professional development required to support them.

Piggot-Irvine’s ‘State of Play’ four year study (1996-1999) indicated appraisers and appraisees avoided gathering objective information (Piggot-Irvine, 2000). For effective appraisal, it is vital that objective information is gathered (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 2005; Fitzgerald et. al., 2003; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Timperley & Robinson, 1996), so that discussions between the appraiser and the appraisee are based on factual and objectively collected data. In relation to this feature for effective appraisal is the requirement for confidential and transparent processes (Cardno, 1996; Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). It is important for the appraiser to ensure that all information gathered and provided remains unadulterated and that the appraiser maintains confidentiality when working with the information.

The Secondy Teacher Workload Study conducted by the Australian Council for Educational Research on behalf of the New Zealand MINISTRY in 2005, raised concern about the degree to which both middle managers and teachers perceived the manageability of their workload and the detrimental effect workload pressures were impacting on the quality of their teaching. One finding from the study was that a main factor related to perceived manageability and a ‘potential stressor’ was the amount of paperwork required. This is supported by Mather and Seifert (2011) who suggest that the “professional element of teaching is systematically and strategically replaced by non-professional tasks” (p. 28).

Principals involved in the workload study reported simplified compliance requirements would make workloads more manageable for everybody (Ingvarson, Kleinhenz, Beavis, Barwick, Carthy and Wilkinson, 2005). One finding pertinent to this study was that participating teachers “did not perceive performance reviews as stressful or too time consuming” however, participating middle managers reported “they did not have enough time to carry out performance review to their satisfaction” (Ingvarson et. al., 2005, p. 9).

If appraisal is to be implemented effectively and be an effective process, it must be prioritised within the vast array of management tasks undertaken within the
organisation. This means making and taking sufficient time to conduct the appraisal process (Cardno, 1996; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2002; Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003). This requires time to be allocated to leaders with specific appraiser responsibilities.

With regards to the effective implementation of appraisal, a key feature of effectiveness, is that the performance management policy and related procedures for the organisation should be clearly set out and clarify all associated guidelines and criteria (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). The appraisal should also be well publicised within the organisation.

Several writers (Cardno, 2005; Fitzgerald et. al., 2003; Timperley & Robinson, 1996) agree that an effective appraisal system is one that staff are committed to, value and have been involved in the development of it for their organisation. Fitzgerald et. al. (2003) write “the involvement of teachers in developing school-level appraisal systems is pinpointed as fundamental to the long-term success of appraisal in New Zealand schools.

CONCLUSION
While the integrated approach to appraisal combining accountability and development, meets not only the needs and goals of the individual and the organisation there are other features required for an effective appraisal system. From the examination of literature on teacher appraisal and, in particular, literature linked to effectiveness in appraisal, the following criteria were distilled as being features for an effective appraisal system: an integrated development and accountability approach, based on objective informative data; confidential and transparent processes; the setting of deep objectives; well resourced with training and time; clarity; separation of discipline processes from appraisal; an educative process; and, high trust.

This literature review informs the reconnaissance cycle (Chapter 4) in determining and distilling effective appraisal criteria. The next chapter examines action research, the chosen methodology for this research project and the methods of data collection employed.
CHAPTER THREE
ACTION RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

INTRODUCTION
The aim of this research project was to examine and improve current teacher appraisal practice in the researcher's school. Action research is an appropriate methodology when conducting research in educational settings as it provides a framework to work within on the grounds that both action and research are intended outcomes. Action research provides a framework for not only improving teaching and learning in the classroom but it can also be used to improve the management of schools and issues outside of the classroom, such as teacher – parent communication and pastoral care system. Kemmis and Henry (1984) state:

In education, action research has been employed on school-based curriculum development, professional development, school improvement programs, and systems planning and policy development (cited in Forward, 1989, p. 29).

This chapter begins with a critical examination of action research methodology selected for the study. This is followed by the identification of the data gathering methods employed and the sampling methods used to select participants. Strategies for analysis of data are also outlined including issues of triangulation, validity and reliability. The final section concludes with a discussion of how potential ethical issues were addressed within the research project.

DEFINING ACTION RESEARCH
The word action in action research is significant. Practitioner-researchers are involved in making or implementing change rather than just researching or investigating an issue. Action research projects put their research into action by implementing a new initiative or improving current practice. Cardno supports this by writing, “action implies that the researcher will not accept the status quo but will intervene – take action - to change it” and proceeds to concisely describe the word research as the “systematic investigation into a subject in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions” (2003, p. 1). The word research is also important as
practitioner-researchers must make informed decisions about what and how they are going to implement change by working through the cyclical process of action research (Piggot-Irvine, 2002).

A concise definition of action research is provided by Elliott (1991): “the study of a social situation with a view to improving the quality of action within it” (p. 69). Elliott states that in action research ‘theories’ are validated through practice and are constructive in assisting people “to act more intelligently and skilfully” (p. 69). This concept of improvement is also evident in Calhoun’s (2002) description of action research: “a continual disciplined inquiry conducted to inform and improve practice” (p. 18).

The theme of people working collaboratively is supported in Cardno and Piggot-Irvine’s (1996) interpretation of action research, “an applied approach for resolving organisational problems collaboratively” (p. 20). They go on to write, “action research is an educative and developmental process and is effective when reflective practice is data-based, multiple perspectives are acknowledged and critique is based on explicit norms and theories of action” (1996, p. 20).

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) describe action research as a tool for change and improvement at local level. It can be used in almost any setting where issues involving people, tasks and procedures require a solution or where a change within the existing situation could produce a more desirable outcome. This notion of improvement is also supported by Calhoun (2002) who describes action research as “a continual disciplined inquiry conducted to inform and improve our practice” (p. 18). Cardno (2003) asserts that there are two main aims of action research, “to enquire into professional practice and to use the knowledge and understandings thus gained for developmental purposes” (p. 21).

While the literature contains a wide range of definitions for action research, there is no single accepted definition. Many writers, for example, Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1996), Elliot (1991), Kemmis & McTaggart (1988), agree that action research can be used by practitioners to not only improve their own practice but to shape their learning and teaching experiences. McNiff (1990) writes “teachers …. are taking on
the personal challenge of attempting to find ways in which they can improve and develop both themselves and the situations in which they live” (p. 52).

A BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF ACTION RESEARCH

Kurt Lewin, a social psychologist, first developed the concept of action research in the 1940’s (Elliot, 1991; Mills, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008) as an approach to change and improve social situations. O’Brien (1998) characterised Lewin’s work as a “comparative research of the conditions and effects of various forms of social action and research leading to social action, using a process of a spiral of steps, each of which is composed of a circle of planning, action, and fact-finding about the result of the action” (p. 12).

In the 1950’s Steven Corey, a researcher from Columbia University’s Teacher’s College encouraged Lewin’s concept of action research to be adopted by educationalists in the United States. Corey promoted that educational practitioners could change or improve their own practice by undertaking action experiences. The emphasis was not on obtaining generalised scientific knowledge but on obtaining precise knowledge for a specific situation and research purpose. Corey (1953) writes that “we are convinced that the disposition to study …. the consequences of our own teaching is more likely to change and improve our practices than is reading about what someone else has discovered of his teaching” (p. 70).

It was in the area of group dynamics and human relations that Lewin’s action research approach thrived. In the United States, national training laboratories were developed and offered training in group problem solving. It was this interest in collaborative group work that initiated research into the organisational improvement of whole school districts, and through this work the concept of organisational development transferred to the education arena (Elliot, 1991, UNITEC 2000).

In the 1960’s interest in educational action research re-emerged under the direction of Lawrence Stenhouse who applied this method of research in the Humanities Curriculum Project. Research undertaken by Stenhouse and Elliot was responsible for leading the ‘teachers as researchers’ movement, whereby practitioners developed
their practice in the classroom through a reflective approach (Elliott, 1991, Piggot-Irvine-Bartlett, 2008). This approach sought to bring the practising teacher into the research process as the most effective person to identify problems and find solutions thereby taking ownership of seeking to improve their understanding of specific problems so as to increase the effectiveness of their practice.

RESEARCH PARADIGMS
Numerous approaches have been developed to describe research paradigms (Cohen et. al., 2007; Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The most commonly classified paradigms are positivist, interpretivist, and critical and action research is more frequently associated with the interpretivist and/or the critical approach (Piggot-Irvine, 2009).

Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1996) assert that practitioners involved in action research “adhere to the principles of a non-positivist, or alternative, interpretative research paradigm, in which practitioner understanding of problems is given prominence” (p. 20). More recently, Piggot-Irvine (2009) writes that action research is more aligned with the interpretivist and/or critical paradigms than the positivist due to the positivist’s traditional rigidity.

The action research approach challenges the natural science and the interpretative research models as it aims to promote change in specific situations rather than to discover ‘truth’ and derive general laws. Therefore, it cannot be classified as belonging to one particular paradigm (Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008). In educational action research, the aim is for practitioners to develop understandings of practice based on concrete experiences. The concept of ‘concrete experience’ is included in Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning model for understanding how learning works. Kolb (1984) describes the process as “a four stage cycle involving four adaptive learning modes: concrete experience; reflective observation abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation” (p. 40). The experiential learning cycle is evident in many of the action research models (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1996; Kolb, 1984).
Alongside the paradigms there are typologies in which approaches to action research may be classified (French, 2009; Gay & Airasian, 2006; Piggot-Irvine, 2009). There is close association between the three identified typologies: technical, practical and emancipatory. Associated with these typologies are three commonly described paradigms: positivist, interpretivist and critical (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). Technical action research can be described as a “particular form of problem-solving … aimed at functional improvement” (Cardno, 2003, p. 27) to achieve “effectiveness / efficiency of educational practice” (Perry & Skerritt, 1991, p. 77). In practical action research, practitioners are encouraged to participate and self-reflect by the researcher (French, 2009) to isolate potential problems and solutions. Emancipatory, also known as critical action research, “aims to help practitioners develop a critical and self-critical understanding of their situation” (Cardno, 2003, p. 24).

Piggot-Irvine (2009) writes that not all action researchers recognise such descriptions and personally believes that action research “embraces the overlapping and interweaving simultaneously operating features of each of the typologies” (p. 22).

Grundy (1987) contends that technical action research is intended to “render an existing situation more efficient and effective” (p. 154). Research at a local level carried out by an individual within the situation they are working in, may be described as technical action research (Kember, 2000). This research project has been conducted at a reasonable technical and practical level as applied in the life of an exceptionally busy school and a member of the senior leadership team. The emphasis has been more on the ‘how to’, that is, practical approach rather than theory-based.

FEATURES OF ACTION RESEARCH

There are several features common to action research that collectively distinguish it from other research methodologies making it the ideal framework to work within for this research project. The section briefly outlines the common features of action research.
**Context specific**

The definitions provided earlier demonstrated how action research was concerned with, and takes place within, social situations of a given context (Kember, 2000; Mills, 2003). Perry and Zuber-Skerritt (1992) review action research in the management context as:

> Involving groups of managers working on real problems in complex and dynamic situations where the social processes of learning about these situations is inextricably linked with the acts of changing those situations (p. 18).

This is equally applicable to education, as it is a social practice involving the interaction of teachers and groups of students.

**A systematic, cyclic process**

The systematic cyclic process of action research involves steps of planning, acting, observing or reflecting and evaluating (Cardno, 2003; French, 2009; Kember, 2000). Action research “is a systematic and deliberate process where it is vitally important to plan, act, observe, and reflect with more care, with a more systematic approach, and with more rigour” (French, 2009, p. 189) than would occur in usual daily practice. The processes involves an investigation to analyse the problem (reconnaissance), the introduction of an action to bring about change (implementation), followed by the evaluation of the action as a basis for further planning. Action research provides the flexibility and responsiveness needed for effective change and also provides a check on the adequacy of data and conclusions.

A cycle in its simplest form consists of planning, acting, observing and reflecting. Kember (2000) asserts that action research is an iterative process which would usually involve at least two cycles to implement and refine any innovative practices. Improvement is brought about through a series of cycles, building on what has been learnt through the previous cycle.

**Action oriented**

An essential characteristic of action research is that within each cycle of the spiral process, strategic action occurs that is monitored, reflected on and evaluated (Alcorn, 1986). To achieve action, action research has to respond to the emerging needs of
the situation. It must be flexible in a way that some research methods can not be. It is the cyclic nature of action research that allows responsiveness.

**Improvement oriented**

One of the most important features of action research which makes it the preferred methodology for this project is that action research is aimed towards improvement and is transformative (Calhoun, 2003; Kember, 2000; Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008). “Action researchers … claim to improve practice through the educational development of the participants and the theories that conceptualise such development” (Forward, 1989, p. 31). This is more than just interpreting the current situation. Kember (2000) asserts, “while understanding a problem is useful, solving the problem requires action” (p. 25). The explicit aim of the intervention cycle is to transform practice (Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008).

**Collaborative and participatory**

Action research is collaborative and participatory in nature (Cardno, 2003; Mills, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett). It relies on a strong link existing between the researcher and the subjects. Participation can generate greater commitment, enhance ownership and therefore action, and when change is the desired outcome, it is more easily achieved if people are committed to change (Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008). Practitioners involved in participatory action research are joined by a thematic concern, a commitment to inform a particular practice (McTaggart, 2000). The term ‘participative’ is also indicative of the importance placed on the participation of practitioners themselves.

Alcorn (1986) states: “the learning that takes place through action and reflection belongs to the group and is owned by them” (p. 35). Action research is research done by teachers, for themselves; it is not imposed on them by someone else. Therefore action research is done ‘with’ rather than ‘to’ people. Group research or research undertaken by a reflective practitioner involves collaboration at some stage. For example, the gathering of evidence on which to base reflection and plan change occurs through a collaborative process.
MODELS OF ACTION RESEARCH

A variety of models have been developed to diagrammatically represent the action research process since it was first founded by Lewin in the 1940’s. Kemmis (1980) interprets Lewin’s model of action research by ‘a spiral of cycles’. Each cycle has four steps: plan, act, observe, reflect. The reflection step, then leads on to the next stage of revised planning which is set in action and reflection. Multiple cycles of the process allow greater rigour to be achieved. The cyclic nature is intended to foster deeper understanding of the given situation. The insight gained from the initial cycle feeds into the planning of the second cycle, for which the action is modified and the research process is repeated. Kemmis representation of the spiral action is shown in Figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1: Action research model - Stephen Kemmis (1980)](source)

A number of writers in the field of action research have developed their own models; Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1996), Elliott (1991), Kemmis (1980) and more recently Piggot-Irvine (2002). While each model may differ in how they are represented and
have slight differences, there are a number of similarities across the models which provide a framework for the researcher to apply to their own action research project.

Cardno and Piggot-Irvine’s (1996) model for action research comprise three major cycles of activity. Their model displays Lewin’s cyclic approach, with each cycle incorporating steps of planning, acting, observing and reflecting. The framework for their model is shown in Figure 3.2.

![Diagram of Cardno & Piggot-Irvine's framework for action research](image)

**Figure 3.2:** Cardno & Piggot-Irvine’s framework for action research  
Source: Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1996, p. 21

This model differs from Kemmis’ interpretation of Lewin’s model and Elliot’s model in that each cycle of the spiral encompasses a different theme. Cycle one examines an existing problem (reconnaissance), cycle two implements a change to improve
practice (intervention), and cycle three evaluates the effectiveness of change (evaluation). The three cycles in their entirety complete the research approach.

While Cardno and Piggot-Irvine’s model is not as complex as Elliott’s (1991) elaborately detailed model, it allows more rigour to be achieved than Kemmis’ basic model (1980) due to the multiple cycles. The model illustrated in Figure 2.2 clearly illustrates the steps researchers must engage in during each cycle before beginning the next cycle. As King and Lonnquist (1994) state:

> The reflection of one cycle becomes the problem framing of the next cycle, so that, once initiated, action research is technically an ongoing process, distinguished from evaluation processes that end after accomplishing a given task. (p. 5)

Piggot-Irvine (2002) has since further developed the Cardno and Piggot-Irvine model (1996) resulting in the Problem Resolving Action Research (PRAR) model (see Figure 2.3) with the notable additions of the ‘spin-off cycles’ and the upward cyclical direction which suggests a continuous and ongoing improvement approach to the action research process. It is evident that this model has been influenced by the historical development of the action research model, the PRAR model however sets out the reconnaissance and evaluation as individual cycles within the overall process. It is for this reason the PRAR model was chosen to provide the framework for this research project to guide myself as the main researcher and the Teacher Appraisal Professional Learning Group (TAG) through the research process. Specific data collection points were mapped against each of the explicit cycles of the PRAR model and these are presented in Figure 3.4.
Features of the PRAR model
There are several features of the PRAR model common to other action research models for example; the cyclical nature: examining of the existing situation (reconnaissance); implementation of change (intervention); and evaluation of implementation of change (evaluation), and that it is content specific, developmental and collaborative. However there are several features unique to the PRAR model that were of particular interest to the researcher and have significant relevance to this research project; narrowing the theory – practice gap, spin-offs and problem solving and dialogical interchange.

Spin-offs
The provision of ‘spin-off cycles’ as featured in the PRAR model (Figure 2.3) recognises that unexpected issues may arise (Piggot-Irvine, 2009) during the research project that need to be addressed by the researching practitioners before
moving on to the next cycle. For this research project, the TAG, a professional learning group of volunteers interested in teacher appraisal was established as the on site research team. The spin-off cycles gave the TAG the flexibility to react to unforeseen issues and aspects that required further exploration.

Fullan (2003) reinforces that “the ideas of others will lead to alteration for the better in the direction of change” (p.187). This feature also supports the collaborative nature of action research as it allows researchers to work collectively and respond to issues that may not have been in the original plan. As the PRAR model illustrates, the “spin-offs” may take place at any time during the research process.

**Narrowing the theory-practice gap**

One of the aims of action research and of the PRAR model is to narrow the gap between espoused theory and theory in-use, enabling theory and action to develop together (Piggot-Irvine, 2009). The reconnaissance phase requires practitioners to be actively involved in both theory and research simultaneously. Piggot-Irvine (2002) writes that theory and research “inform each other and are therefore mutually independent” (p. 11). This gives practitioners time to investigate the theory, including the literature, to inform the research process.

**Problem solving and dialogical interchange**

The purpose of action research, as asserted by Stringer (1999), is “to enable groups of people to formulate mutually acceptable solutions to their problems” (p. 188). The problem solving activity relied on the main researcher, the TAG and other participants working collaboratively, challenging each other through open discussion and debate to mutually find the solution thus developing their research and critical reflection skills (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1996).

**DATA COLLECTION METHODS FOR RESEARCH PROJECT**

The most common data collection methods employed in action research are documentary analysis, questionnaires, interviews, focus groups and observation, as they can be easily and accurately applied by practitioners (Cardno, 2003). Mills
(2003) supports this and, in addition, includes direct observation, attitude scales and, new and existing records in the range of data gathering techniques.

Following the PRAR model, and from the range of data collection methods available, three qualitative research tools were identified as the most suitable for the purpose of gathering data for this research project at Pukeko High School: documentary analysis, questionnaires and a focus group interview. Figure 3.4 illustrates how the chosen data collection methods align with the various cycles of Piggot-Irvine’s PRAR model (2002). This section now summarises each method employed in more detail including how it was applied and within which cycle of the research, sampling if applicable and analysis of the data undertaken.
PROBLEM-RESOLVING ACTION RESEARCH (PRAR)

CYCLE 1
Examining an Existing Problem (Reconnaissance)

- Literature review and research questions developed

Data Collection:
- Documentation Analysis of existing Teacher Appraisal Policy and Procedures
- Questionnaire – Teaching Staff
- Focus Group Interview

CYCLE 2
Implementation of Change (Intervention)

- Implementation of changes to PMAS process:
  - PMAS Staff handbook
  - Appraisal Documentation

- TAG meetings to review collated data and collaboratively develop the interventions

CYCLE 3
Evaluation of Implementation of Change (Evaluation)

- Questionnaire issued to teaching staff to evaluate implemented changes to the reviewed appraisal process

- Review collated evaluative data
  Compare evaluative results with reconnaissance results

Figure 3.4: Data Collection Methods Aligned with the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002)
Documentary Analysis

Document analysis is where documents pertaining to the research focus, for example, legislation, regulations and policy are analysed either quantitatively or qualitatively (Mutch, 2005). Analysing existing documents provides information which is relevant to the research problem and helps establish the current situation. It is one method used “to check or explore constraints, actions or consequences” (Robinson & Lai, 2006, p. 136). Document analysis is an efficient and cost-effective method to obtain data and can “enrich a study throughout the research process” (Wellington, 2000, p. 114).

The reading of a document can be examined, analysed and interpreted through the application of an eight point checklist (Wellington, 2000). The checklist criteria are:

- authorship
- audience
- production
- presentation, appearance, image
- intentions
- style, function, genre
- content
- context or frame of reference

(p.117).

Document analysis of appraisal related documents was employed in the reconnaissance cycle of this research project to help establish the current situation at Pukeko High. Exploring the context in which appraisal documents were produced, would not only confirm the purpose of them, but who produced them and when. An analysis of the documents would identify whether there were any gaps between what was specified in the policy and the process by which the policy was being implemented.

The existing school documentation pertaining to teacher appraisal (Pukeko High Performance Management Appraisal and Development policy and Performance Management Appraisal System procedural staff handbook) were analysed against
the checklist criteria producing a table of findings. In addition to this, the appraisal documentation were also analysed against: the effectiveness criteria identified from the literature review and, two specific sections of the mandatory requirements for teacher appraisal as set out in *Performance Management in Schools Number 1, PMS1* booklet (Ministry of Education, 1997): the ‘features of the appraisal process,’ and the ‘aspects of teacher performance to be appraised,’ to identify any omissions in the documentation. As appraisal is a significant component of the professional development programme, the school’s Professional Development Policy and procedures were also analysed to check for any links to the Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy.

One of the research aims was to examine existing examples of current exemplary teacher appraisal practice. Contact was made with a secondary facilitator at Team Solutions and an educational consultant, both of whom are held in high regard by the educational profession and who work with a large number of schools, to find out who they considered had exemplary appraisal practice at secondary level and whom I could approach. Unfortunately, even though they consulted with their network of contacts, neither of them could provide me with the names of any secondary school considered to have exemplary appraisal practice.

**Questionnaires**

A questionnaire is a written form of a survey that is developed based around a series of pre-set questions, piloted and then used to collect data for analysis. It is the most common means of surveying a large sample of people. Questionnaires allow researchers to collect large amounts of data in a relatively short time and relatively cheaply (Mills, 2003, Robinson & Lai, 2006). Consideration should be given during the planning and designing phase of the questionnaire on how the responses will be later analysed. This will assist the researcher with the statistical analysis of the data and supports how planning is crucial (Hinds, 2000).

The questionnaire (Appendix A) used in the reconnaissance cycle was designed with both closed questions on a continuum, numerical rating-scale and open-ended questions based on the research questions. The questionnaire was designed in four parts: demographic information on the respondent requiring tick box responses; staff
perceptions on the philosophy and intent of the existing appraisal practice, using a five-point scale to indicate the degree of alignment with their evaluation of each statement; personal experiences with the existing appraisal practice, using multiple answer options and the provision for additional written comments; and strengths, changes or improvements for the existing appraisal practice as open ended questions.

The use of closed questions is advantageous, as the questions “can be pre-coded, thus turning the processing of data for computer analysis into a fairly simple task” (Bryman, 2008, p. 223). While using closed questionnaire items saves time, using open items allows respondents to make responses that “the survey researcher may not have contemplated” (Bryman, 2008, p. 232) or considered important. The use of rating scales makes it possible for respondents to express their attitudes and evaluations in numerical form (Robinson & Lai, 2006). Numbers can be easier to analyse and compare than written qualitative comments. Qualitative responses can only be thematically coded once the researcher has received them.

Careful consideration was given to the design and layout of the questionnaire, the instructions provided, the wording of each questionnaire item and the overall length of the questionnaire. Cohen, Manion and Morrison. (2007) write the pre-testing (or piloting) of a questionnaire is critical to its success and that the phrasing of the items is of vital importance. The questionnaire was piloted with members of the senior leadership team at Pukeko High to check the clarity of the questionnaire items, instructions and layout. No feedback was received from the senior leadership team except for positive affirming comments that it looked comprehensive.

Accompanying the reconnaissance questionnaire was a Participant Information sheet (Appendix B) on the research project, the consent form and an invitation to participate in the focus group (Appendix C).

Teachers are very busy people and to minimise the questionnaire being seen as additional work load, I used an approach that has been successfully applied in a multitude of settings. During a scheduled professional learning session, staff were issued with the reconnaissance questionnaire and time was given in the session for
those who chose to complete it. The questionnaires were distributed and collected by an independent person.

While Pukeko High had 105 teaching staff not all staff were present for a range of reasons, for example, illness, external professional development courses and school trips. Any staff member unable to attend the professional learning session had the opportunity to collect and return the questionnaire from the independent person. No selection or sampling process took place and no koha or inducement was offered.

The data from the reconnaissance questionnaire was entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and pivot tables were created for parts two and three to obtain a percentage value. The responses to the demographic information were calculated as percentages of the total number of respondents. The responses to the open questionnaire items and additional comments were post-coded (coding developed after the questionnaire had been developed, administered and answered by respondents). A frequency tally was developed for the range of responses.

**Evaluation Cycle**

The questionnaire used in the reconnaissance cycle was modified for the evaluation cycle and used with the same sample group to evaluate the effectiveness of the implemented improvements. The modifications to the questionnaire included the last three questions of the reconnaissance questionnaire being replaced with four new questions. This was to obtain data on specific implemented changes within the reviewed appraisal process. The evaluation questionnaire (Appendix D) was administered and analysed in the same manner as the reconnaissance questionnaire. Once again, no selection or sampling process took place and no koha or inducement was offered. The findings of the evaluation questionnaire were analysed as per the reconnaissance phase and reported with recommendations for future action.

**Focus Group**

A focus group is an effective method of interviewing a group of practitioners to discern trends or patterns. Creswell describes a focus group interview as a means “to collect shared understanding from several individuals as well as get views from
specific people" (2002, p. 206). The aim is to explore a specific topic in more depth to arrive at a synergy of ideas, mediated by a facilitator. This is a good way to find out what the focus area looks like from other points of view (Elliot, 1991) and supports the collaborative approach of involving relevant stakeholders. Questions are at the centre of the focus group interview; they are carefully selected and phrased in advance of the interview (Krueger, 1994) as the success of the interview is dependent on the quality of the questions.

The focus group process is founded on the “principles of self-disclosure, grounded in a comfortable environment, a particular type of questioning, and the establishment of focus group rules” (Hinds, 2000). The advantage of the focus group is that they are relatively easy and economical to conduct however the typing up and analysis of the transcript may be time consuming (Mills, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008). The content of the data obtained from the focus groups is qualitatively analysed.

The focus group in this research study was limited to eight staff with the intention to have a group with a range of teaching experience that is, beginning through to experienced teachers. The focus group was selected after the questionnaire data was obtained and analysed. The research consent form included an invitation to staff to volunteer and participate in the focus group. The independent person who distributed and collected the reconnaissance questionnaires also sorted the focus group returns into four piles by years of teaching experience as indicated on the form; less than 2 years, 2-5 years, between 5-10, and more than 10 years, and from each pile randomly drew two returns / volunteers.

Questions at the centre of the focus group interview were carefully selected and phrased in advance of the interview (refer to Appendix E) and shared with the volunteers ahead of the interview, along with the results of the reconnaissance questionnaire. The interview was held on site at Pukeko High in familiar surroundings. The focus group interview presented participants with the opportunity to add depth to their questionnaire answers and expand on some of the perceived patterns from the questionnaire results.
Permission was sought from the participants to record the hour long interview session by audio for recall and analysis by the main researcher. The transcript of the recorded interview used pseudonyms for the participants to maintain and protect their confidentiality. The main points of the transcribed discussion were summarised, thematically coded and a frequency tally table created for appropriate questions.

**RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY IN ACTION RESEARCH**

The results of action research need to be measured for validity, reliability and rigour. Davidson and Tolich espouse that “reliability refers to consistency” (2003, p. 32). This means that the same results would be achieved when repeated at a different time, situation or place (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Action research in educational settings however are often small scale projects and specific to the research site or stakeholders rather than applicable to a wider audience. This is why in qualitative research the term ‘reliability’ has been contested (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Winter, 1989) and is preferred to be linked with terms of ‘consistency’, ‘credibility’ and ‘dependability’ (Cohen et. al., 2007). According to Bogdan and Biklen (1992) reliability in qualitative research:

> “can be regarded as a fit between what researchers record as data and what actually occurs in the natural setting that is being researched, i.e. a degree of accuracy and comprehensiveness of coverage” (p. 48).

Validity is also an important consideration in research. Davidson and Tolich (2003) put forward the following definition of validity: “Validity refers to the extent to which a question or variable accurately reflects the concept the researcher is actually looking for” (p. 32). McTaggart (1998) states that establishing “some points of reference” for validity “should make participatory action research findings more defensible, more educative, more prudent and therefore more useful for all participants in examined social change” (p.11). McTaggart also suggests that validity can be improved by ensuring there is detailed transparency of method, data, including interpretation, reporting and triangulation of data.

The ethical requirement of making the findings of this action research project public will also contribute to enhancing the validity (Passfield, 1992). Piggot-Irvine (2008)
advocates that a pivotal feature in any action research is that the results must remain unaltered and not manipulated by the researcher at any stage.

**Triangulation**

The term triangulation refers to the use of multiple methods to determine the accuracy of information so that findings may be cross checked (Bryman, 2008; Cohen, et. al., 2001, Mills 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Bartlett, 2008). According to Wolcott (1988) the use of multiple methods instead of relying on a single event strengthens qualitative research. Similarly, Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1996) remind us that multiple methods are “effective when reflective practice is data-based, multiple perspectives are acknowledged and critique is based on explicit norms and theories of action” (p. 20).

During this research project multiple perspectives were acknowledged in order to verify and validate the findings. Themes emerging from the reconnaissance staff questionnaire were “unpacked” further during the focus group interview as a means of validating the outcomes. In this way each set of data was examined to see if there was congruence between the findings from varied sources. While there are several types of triangulation (Cohen et. al., 2007), for this research ‘time triangulation’ was one of the methods used. Time triangulation was employed as this research was a longitudinal study that collected data from the same group at two points in time, that is, phase one reconnaissance and phase three evaluation of the PRAR model.

If action research is to be considered as rigorous as other research approaches Piggot-Irvine (2009) believes that action research needs to focus “on a strong evidence base, triangulation of data and high accountability” (p. 22). This research project was data-based, had a multi-method approach and the findings were made public to increase accountability.

**ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The focus of research ethics is on the need to protect people from any possible harm when they take part in a study (Cardno, 2003). This is supported by Davidson and Tolich (2003), who also advocate that participation must be voluntary, protected by
ensuring anonymity and confidentiality, and that data must be shared with the participants.

Anderson (1998) espouses that “ethical responsibility begins with the individual researcher and the researcher is the main determinant of ethical standards” (p. 26). Ethical approval for this research project was sought from the UNITEC research ethics committee (UREC) as the research activities involved the participation of humans as subjects, directly or indirectly. Upon meeting their ethical requirements, I was granted ethics approval for this research project in compliance with the requirements for undertaking a Master’s thesis of study. All participants received a written Participant Information Sheet (Appendix B) which set out the essential points which any reasonable person would wish to know before agreeing to participate including what the research was about and what they were being asked to do. A consent form for staff to read, sign and return if they wished to participate in the questionnaire and additional focus group interview was made available prior to the distribution of the reconnaissance questionnaire (Appendix A) and evaluation questionnaire (Appendix D).

Participants in the research project had their rights to confidentially and anonymity protected. The returned questionnaires and focus group interview records did not include any information that would directly identify an individual or organisation. The name given to the school in this study and focus group participants were pseudonyms selected by myself.

As this action research project was being undertaken in the researcher’s own school, particular challenges needed to be addressed. According to Smith (2004) there is potential for weakness in the rigour of research undertaken within the researcher’s own organisation due to ethical and personal dilemmas that may be faced. As a practitioner researcher and a member of the senior leadership team with specific responsibilities for the appraisal of several staff, it was important that the following be adhered to:

1. that during the period of the research project I would not be responsible for the appraisal of any teacher on the staff;
2. that the purpose of the research including data collection methods be disclosed to the staff at the outset of the project;
3. participants’ anonymity and confidentiality be maintained as no names were requested on the questionnaire;
4. membership to the focus group was open to all teaching staff. No staff member who was appraised by the researcher was directly asked or expected to be a participant in the focus group;
5. a staff member who did not appraise teaching staff, for example, the guidance counsellor, was available as an intermediary between the focus group and the researcher in case there was something a focus group member did not want to bring up during an interview; and
6. the research findings were made available to the staff in the form of a report.

These actions were aimed at getting staff on board with the intent of the research, to prevent “power relations” from initiating or developing further during the data collection, analysis or reporting stages and to assist in attending to the ethical dilemmas for this action researcher.

All original documents and the digitally recorded interview were kept in secure storage within the Education Department at UNITEC and will remain secure from unauthorised access for the required period of time as directed by UNITEC (5 years following the completion of the project).

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has discussed action research, the chosen methodology for this study. This thesis used the PRAR model (Pigott-Irvine, 2002) as a framework to examine and improve the Teacher Appraisal at Pukeko High. The three qualitative methods used to examine the existing problem (cycle one – reconnaissance), implement change (cycle two – intervention) and evaluate the implemented changes (cycle three – evaluation) were outlined. To establish rigour within this research study, multiple methods and perspectives were engaged to enhance reliability and validity. Finally, considerations of the ethical issues pertaining to the study were addressed.
The next chapter focuses on the reconnaissance phase, describing the data collection activities engaged and the key findings from these methods which assisted the TAG to develop a plan of action for the next cycle.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE RECONNAISSANCE CYCLE

INTRODUCTION
This chapter outlines the reconnaissance cycle of this research based on the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002). The reconnaissance stage involves the examination of an existing problem through the gathering of data and information to identify what further action is required through the introduction of an intervention strategy. Elliott (1991) contends that the reconnaissance cycle is more than just the identification of the initial idea and the collection of data, but is also “about the analysis of data” (p.70).

The aim of the reconnaissance cycle for this research was to determine what constitutes effective appraisal and to evaluate current teacher appraisal documentation and practice at Pukeko High. The guiding research questions for the reconnaissance phase were:

- What does the literature suggest about effective teacher appraisal?
- What examples exist of current exemplary teacher appraisal practice?
- What appraisal related documentation exists at Pukeko High and how does it align with current perceptions of effective teacher appraisal?
- What are teachers’ perceptions of the current appraisal practice at Pukeko High?

The chapter commences with a distillation of effective appraisal criteria from the literature review (Chapter 2). The next section provides an analysis (based on the effectiveness criteria) of the data collected from the documentary analysis, questionnaire and focus group interview used to establish the status of the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The reconnaissance cycle overview adapted from the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002) is depicted in Figure 4.1 and illustrates the process followed. The process involved two main elements; the examination of current literature on teacher appraisal to provide a background upon which research
questions were developed and data collection and analysis. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications for the next phase, the intervention cycle.

**EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA DISTILLATION**

The review of the literature relating to teacher appraisal in Chapter 2 examined features required for effective appraisal practice. From this review ten key criteria for effective appraisal were distilled: an integrated development and accountability approach; an educative process; high trust; confidential and transparent process; set deep objectives; objective and informative data; well resourced with time; appraisal training; clarity and separation of discipline processes from appraisal. The key criteria are presented in Table 4.1 with an interpretation for each criterion and supporting sources identified. The distilled effectiveness criteria were used to assist in the examination of the existing situation at Pukeko High, in particular the analysis of the appraisal documentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Sources of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **An integrated development and accountability approach** | Balance is maintained between development and accountability in the appraisal process. | Cardno (2005)  
Fitzgerald (2001)  
Ingvarson. et al. (2005)  
Middlewood (2002)  
Piggot-Irvine & Cardno (2005)  
Timperley & Robinson (1996) |
| **An educative process**                           | A process which improves teachers own learning and development.                | Cardno (2005)  
Education Review Office (2009)  
McLauglin & Pfeiffer (1988)  
Middlewood (2002)  
Middlewood & Cardno (2001)  
| **High trust**                                     | Respectful relationships developed based on trust.                            | Middlewood (2001a)  
Middlewood & Cardno (2001)  
Moreland (2011)  
| **Confidential and transparent processes**          | The appraiser ensures that all information gathered remains unadulterated and confidentiality is maintained when working with the information. All parties contributing information are made aware of this. | Cardno (1996)  
Cardno & Piggot-Irvine (1996)  
Middlewood (2002)  
Piggot-Irvine & Cardno (2005) |
| **Setting Deep Objectives**                        | The development of specific and challenging appraisal objectives and plans for improvement, include indicators for assessing the achievement of the objectives. The objectives are linked to required professional development. | Fitzgerald (2001)  
Piggot-Irvine & Cardno (2005) |
| **Objective and informative data**                 | Appraiser and appraisee assemble factual, objective data to inform appraisal discussions. Reflective practice encouraged. | Cardno (1996)  
Cardno & Piggot-Irvine (1996)  
Fitzgerald. et al.(2003)  
Piggot-Irvine & Cardno (2005)  
Timperley & Robinson (1996) |
| **Well resourced with time**                       | Making and taking sufficient time to conduct appraisal.                       | Cardno (1996)  
Moreton (2011)  
Rudman (2002)  
Timperley & Robinson (1996)  
Youngs & Grootenboer (2003) |
| **Appraisal training**                             | Effective implementation of appraisal includes in-depth training on all aspects of appraisal, with specific development for appraisers. | Cardno (1996)  
Fitzgerald (2004)  
Rudman (2002) |
| **Clarity**                                        | The Performance Management Policy and Procedures should clarify all guidelines and criteria, and be well publicised within the school. | Piggot-Irvine (2003)  
Piggot-Irvine & Cardno (2005) |
| **Separation of discipline processes from appraisal** | To maintain the development of trust and openness, separate personnel conduct appraisal and disciplinary proceedings if required. | Piggot-Irvine (2003)  
Piggot-Irvine & Cardno (2005) |
DATA COLLECTION RESULTS

This section provides an analysis of the data gathered from the documentary analysis, the questionnaire and focus group interview using the criteria identified for effectiveness.

Document Analysis

*Exemplary teacher appraisal practice*

One of the reconnaissance research questions involved the examination of existing examples of current exemplary teacher appraisal practice documentation from the secondary sector. The purpose of this was to enable me to investigate innovative approaches to meeting both accountability and developmental requirements within the acclaimed exemplary practice and provide me with ideas for further exploration. Contact was made with a secondary facilitator at Team Solutions (a Ministry of Education-funded agency that provides professional development and support to leaders and teachers in schools) and an educational consultant to obtain the names of secondary schools they considered had exemplary appraisal practice and potentially that I could approach. Both of these people are held in high regard by the educational profession and work in a large number of schools nationally. Even though they consulted with their network of contacts, neither of them could provide me with the names of any secondary school considered to have exemplary appraisal practice documented. The implication of this was that documentary analysis of material was only completed with Pukeko High documents as detailed in the following section.

*Appraisal documentation at Pukeko High*

Document analysis was conducted on the school’s current Performance Management Policy and the Performance Management Appraisal System (PMAS) procedural handbook using the eight criteria espoused by Wellington (2000) and against the key effectiveness criteria identified earlier in this chapter (Table 4.1). Table 4.2 shows the analysis of the Performance Management Appraisal and Development policy against Wellington’s (2000) criteria and Table 4.3 shows the analysis of the PMAS Staff Handbook against the same eight criteria. Table 4.4 shows the analysis of the Performance Management Appraisal and Development policy and the PMAS Staff Handbook against the effectiveness criteria.
Following on from this is the analysis of the Pukeko High appraisal documentation against the mandated requirements for the ‘features of the appraisal process’ and the ‘aspects of the teacher performance to be appraised’ as set out by the Ministry of Education, *Performance Management in Schools Number 1, PMS1* (1997).

### Table 4.2: Analysis of the appraisal policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Criteria</th>
<th>Pukeko High Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong></td>
<td>The foundation policy was an adaptation of an exemplar obtained from another school by the foundation senior leadership team (SLT) members in 2003. The policy was last reviewed in August 2009. It was initially reviewed by the SLT, then distributed to staff for consultation before being submitted to the Board for final review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>Staff, Board, ERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td>The original policy was formulated by the SLT in October 2003, critiqued and adopted by the Board, 2004. The policy was produced by internal stakeholders of Pukeko High (staff and Board).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation, appearance, image</strong></td>
<td>The policy was presented in a manner consistent with other policies at Pukeko High, a formal document with the school logo in the top left hand corner. The policy can be located as a hard copy in the Board Policy file kept with the Principal's Assistant /Board Secretary, or electronically on the management drive of the school network, and in the staff PMAS procedural handbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentions</strong></td>
<td>The Board was responsible for ensuring that a system for staff performance management and appraisal is in place and that it incorporates the professional standards for teachers as set out by the Ministry of Education. The policy clearly stated the purposes in reference to whole school development and review, staff improvement, identification of professional development objectives, feedback to staff on performance, assessment against the professional standards and to meet the national guidelines for performance management in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style, function, genre</strong></td>
<td>To ensure the consistency of approach and format of Pukeko High policies, the Foundation Board established a <em>Policy Writing Policy</em> and a document entitled <em>Formal Procedure For Establishment of Policies</em>. The format of the appraisal policy followed the guidelines and intent of these documents, that is, the policy contained a rationale, purpose statements, guidelines, statements on confidentiality and dispute resolution. The policy was supported by procedures for implementing the policy. The tone of the document was formal and informative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>The content and language used was free of any jargon or buzz words. The performance management appraisal system was frequently referred to throughout the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context – frame of reference</strong></td>
<td>The current policy was reviewed and adopted by the Board October, 2009. The policy was last reviewed in August 2006 and is on a three year review cycle, with its next review due August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Criteria</td>
<td>Pukeko High Performance Management Appraisal System (PMAS) Policy and Procedures (Staff Handbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong></td>
<td>The foundation PMAS staff handbook was an adaptation of an exemplar obtained from another school by the foundation SLT members in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>Staff, Board, ERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td>It was produced by the foundation SLT of Pukeko High, with the Appraiser / Appraisee List updated annually by the SLT. The handbook has the date ‘2009’ on its cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation, appearance, image</strong></td>
<td>The document was printed, single sided and spiral bound. The cover contains the school logo in colour and it is formal in its presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentions and Purposes</strong></td>
<td>It was written to provide clear procedural guidelines for the Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy and stakeholders of Pukeko High.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style, function, genre</strong></td>
<td>The PMAS was a formal document, well formatted and included a contents page for easy reference and an in-depth list of appendices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>The language used was free of jargon and buzzwords however it did contain terms and language commonly found in appraisal literature. The handbook commenced with a rationale for Performance Management and was followed by a section headed ‘Policy’ however, this section did not match the current PMAS policy (August 2009), in content and layout. Key aspects of the PMAS were presented in a flow chart, followed by a timeline summary of the process. Self appraisal was outlined for staff, ahead of the detailed mandatory requirements for PMAS and details of what the appraisal report should contain. An overview detailing the attestation process for salary increments was also included. Clear guidance was provided for appraisees through a step by step flowchart of the PMAS. The next section of the handbook was dedicated to the effective indicators for appraisers taken from the Teacher Performance Management Booklet (Ministry of Education, 1999, pp 34-40) The handbook concluded with the appendices: Appraiser / Appraisee List; PMAS timeline by school terms; PMAS appraisal documents for Beginning, Classroom, Experienced and Unit Holder and Guidance Counsellors; Self review and student evaluation templates; PMAS Review for Attestation; PMAS Disputes Procedure; Attestation documentation; and sample lesson observation sheets for appraisers. While the handbook stated what the appraisal report should contain, there were no guidelines or exemplars as to the required format. An analysis of sample reports showed there was a wide range of variance in the quality, depth and information contained within the reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context / frame of reference</strong></td>
<td>The document was originally formulated in the set up phase of the school in 2003. Other than the Appraiser / Appraisee List being updated annually, the contents of the handbook had not been reviewed or changed since Pukeko High opened in 2004.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the Performance Management Policy against Wellington’s (2000) eight criteria determined the policy was consistent with the format of other policy documentation at the school and clearly communicated the requirements of performance management to stakeholders. The analysis of the appraisal procedural staff handbook against the same criteria highlighted conflicting information as the policy was not accurately duplicated in the handbook. The handbook also provided limited guidance to staff regarding the requirements for the final appraisal report. The contents and format of the handbook were the same as the 2004 edition of the handbook (except for the dated appraisee / appraiser list), suggesting the handbook had never been reviewed since it was first introduced in 2004.

Having applied Wellington’s (2000) range of questions in the eight areas identified earlier (Chapter 3), to Pukeko High’s Appraisal policy (Table 4.2) and the PMAS procedural staff handbook (Table 4.3), the analysis of the documents not only provided an historical perspective but confirmed that they were reliable and valid sources of data for this research. Next, is the analysis of Pukeko High’s appraisal documentation against the key effectiveness criteria for appraisal. The results are presented in Table 4.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy</th>
<th>PMAS Staff Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>An integrated development &amp; accountability approach</strong></td>
<td>√ Features detailed aspects of both accountability and development.</td>
<td>√ Features detailed aspects of both accountability and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An educative process</strong></td>
<td>√ The purpose statements refer to staff being encouraged and enabled to improve their performance in their professional roles.</td>
<td>x/√ The policy is replicated in the handbook. The notion of further development only is included within the rationale set out at the beginning of the handbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>x There is no reference to desired levels of trust and interpersonal interactions required to complete process.</td>
<td>x There is no reference to desired levels of trust and interpersonal interactions required to complete process or the means to develop it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidential and transparent processes</strong></td>
<td>x/√ Confidentiality is referred to in relation to the completed documentation</td>
<td>x/√ Confidentiality is referred to in relation to the completed documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x Transparency between appraisee and appraiser is not reflected in the content of the policy.</td>
<td>x No further reference to confidentiality or transparency of process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting deep Objectives</strong></td>
<td>x Identification of individual (personal) objectives within one of the purpose statements.</td>
<td>x Identification of individual (personal) objectives within one of the purpose statements. Template within appraisal documentation limits the ability to record development objectives in any depth or detail appropriate action plans as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective and informative data</strong></td>
<td>x/√ Limited examples given: self-appraisal and observation. No reference to student feedback.</td>
<td>x/√ Limited examples given: self-appraisal and observation. No reference to student feedback. Hard copy only – does not encourage staff to edit or add additional items of evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality time</strong></td>
<td>x No reference to time to manage the appraisal process.</td>
<td>x No reference to time to manage the appraisal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well resourced with training</strong></td>
<td>x No specific reference to appraisee/appraiser training.</td>
<td>x No specific reference to appraisee/appraiser training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity</strong></td>
<td>√ Clear guidelines including reference to appraisal procedures to support policy.</td>
<td>√ Clear guidelines including reference to appraisal procedures to support policy although there was duplication of information and required format of policy not adhered to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separation of discipline processes from appraisal</strong></td>
<td>x/√ No reference to discipline processes other than dispute resolution with independent arbitrator.</td>
<td>x/√ No reference to discipline processes other than dispute resolution with independent arbitrator. It was stated that there were disciplinary procedures but no reference on where to locate them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = no evidence  √ = evidence found  x/√ = minimal evidence found
The results in Table 4.4 show there was minimal alignment between the school’s appraisal documentation and the key effectiveness criteria for appraisal. There was evidence found in both the appraisal policy and PMAS staff handbook that the existing appraisal practice had an integrated development and accountability approach, with clarity provided through clear guidelines in both the policy and the procedural staff handbook. The results also confirmed the existing appraisal practice included development and improvement as being one of the purposes of appraisal; however, how a teacher could develop through their own learning did not feature in the documentation.

The analysis of the appraisal documentation against the key effectiveness criteria revealed several gaps. There was no reference made in either the appraisal policy or procedural staff handbook to the level of trust or the standard of interpersonal interactions required to support an effective appraisal system. While one of the purpose statements as stated in the appraisal policy was that staff would be encouraged and enabled to improve their performance in their professional role, it was also noted that confidentiality was only referred to in reference to the written documentation held on file, that is, the final appraisal report. Transparency of the process between appraiser and appraisee was not detailed in either set of documents. The analysis also highlighted the absence of reference to these features: the setting of ‘deep’ development objectives; provision of time; appraisal training; and the separation of discipline processes from appraisal.

The Pukeko High Professional Development policy followed the same format structure as the PMAS policy and was last reviewed by the Board in 2009. The Professional Development policy and procedures were analysed and only one explicit link was found with the school’s PMAS policy. One of the guidelines contained within the Professional Development policy stated that “each staff member’s professional development programme, whether school-wide or individual, is included within their performance management documentation” (Pukeko High, 2007). The one page procedural document for implementing the Professional Development policy clearly identified the Professional Development Committee as having responsibility for managing, responding to and monitoring the professional development needs of the staff, within the limitations of the annual budget. Staff
appraisal was acknowledged in the document as a means through which staff needs are identified.

The *Performance Management in Schools Number 1, PMS1* booklet (Ministry of Education, 1997) sets out the mandatory requirements for teacher appraisal in New Zealand schools. The appraisal documentation at Pukeko High was also analysed against two specific sections, the ‘features of the appraisal process,’ and the ‘aspects of teacher performance to be appraised’ to identify any omissions in the documentation. The following gaps were identified and are shown in Table 4.5.

### Table 4.5: Analysis of Pukeko High appraisal documentation against PMS1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement for teacher appraisal in NZ</th>
<th>Identified gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2.1 The Board is responsible for ensuring that:  
(iii) a policy for the appraisal of teacher performance is in place which is in accordance with the principles. | The existing appraisal procedures were not developed in a consultative manner with teachers (Principle 3.1(iii)). |
| 3.2.2 Boards of Trustees must have a documented policy on the appraisal of teacher performance. This policy must:  
(iii) include a statement on confidentiality. | Confidentiality is referred to in reference to written documents and the principal's appraisal. No reference is made to the confidentiality of the process between the appraiser and appraisee. |
| 3.2.3 Boards of Trustees (through the person(s) responsible) must ensure that the appraisal process includes the following elements:  
- an appraisal report prepared and discussed in consultation with the teacher. | Very brief guidelines on what the report should contain are outlined in the Procedural Staff handbook. No exemplars provided. |

The key findings of the analysis of the documentation against the mandatory requirements for teacher appraisal in New Zealand schools identified three gaps. A significant gap identified was that the existing appraisal procedures had not been developed in consultation with the teachers. Two further gaps were also identified pertaining to confidentiality and the appraisal report. Confidentiality was only referred to in reference to written documents and omitted confidentiality expectations required during the appraisal process. The final gap identified was the limited guidance for the requirements of the appraisal report. The following section outlines the data gathered through the reconnaissance questionnaire and discusses the findings.
Reconnaissance Questionnaire

The reconnaissance questionnaire was designed and aimed to collect data in four parts: demographic information of the respondents; staff perceptions on the philosophy and intent of existing appraisal practice; personal experience with existing appraisal process; and perceived strengths, and desired changes or improvements for the existing appraisal practice. Analysis of the data revealed that 15% of the respondents were new to Pukeko High in 2009 and yet to complete their first round of appraisal. This was a significant finding to keep in mind as the overall results were interpreted. The results are presented according to the four parts of the questionnaire.

**Part One - Demographic information**

The first section of the questionnaire sought demographic information on the respondents: gender; teacher registration status; number of years in the teaching profession; and whether they were currently responsible for appraising staff. Table 4.6 presents the demographic information of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.6: Demographic information of respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently appraise staff:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the teachers who responded to the reconnaissance questionnaire (82% response rate), they were predominantly female, with the majority of staff holding full teacher registration. Pukeko High has an experienced staff, with over half of the teaching staff having taught for ten years or more. This was also reflected in the high number of staff who had responsibility for appraising other members of staff. At Pukeko High, all staff who hold a position of responsibility with attached management unit(s) appraise staff within their learning area (department), subject area or Whanau (pastoral house structure).
Part Two – Staff perceptions on effectiveness of the existing appraisal practice

The second part of the reconnaissance questionnaire contained statements concerning the philosophy and intent of the existing appraisal practice. Respondents rated each statement depending on their impression of how they aligned with the evaluation of each statement. The overall results are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Response to questionnaire part two - Effectiveness of the existing appraisal practice (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>*NA/Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1. The appraisal process is well publicised and explicitly detailed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2. The purpose of the appraisal system is clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3. The intent of the appraisal process is centred on improvement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4. Appraisal is an opportunity to confirm the job description.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5. The appraisal process challenges me to set deep appraisal objectives for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6. There are clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7. The appraisal process is beneficial to career development.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8. The appraisal process is a confidential and transparent process between parties involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9. The appraisal process supports the gathering of objective, data-based information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10. The appraisal process is a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11. The process encourages objective and factual discussions between appraisee and appraiser.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12. The appraisal process enhances individual, professional improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13. The appraisal process enhances organisational improvement.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 14. The appraisal process assists staff to identify future areas of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15. The appraisal process provides staff with the opportunity for feedback on strengths.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA = Not applicable

The results indicated there were three statements that rated highly with respondents as effective features of the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The most dominant and positive result indicated respondents perceived the existing appraisal process as an opportunity for staff to provide feedback on strengths (Q.15, 82%).
Next was Q.8 (80%), where respondents confirmed the appraisal process was a confidential and transparent process between the parties involved. The third highly-ranked statement identified by respondents was Q.14 (74%), the appraisal process assists staff to identify future areas of improvement.

The results indicated four areas of weakness, with high negative scores. The highest negative result (Q.10, 51%), signified that the existing appraisal process was not a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of the staff. The next weakness perceived by respondents was that the existing appraisal practice did not support the gathering of objective, data-based information (Q.9, 40%). Two further features were indicated by the respondents, suggesting ineffective areas; the existing process did not enhance organisational improvement (Q.13, 35%) and that there were no clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives (Q.6, 34%).

**Part Three – Personal experience with existing appraisal practice**

The third part of the reconnaissance questionnaire asked respondents a range of questions to obtain data on their personal experiences with the existing appraisal practice. The question themes focused on the level of input with the review of the existing appraisal system, appraiser / appraisee training, development objectives, type of evaluative data gathered during the process, interactions with appraiser, and preferred length for the appraisal cycle. This section of the questionnaire also gathered qualitative data from the respondents, as each question had space for respondents to make additional written comments. The results are presented in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Response to questionnaire part three - personal experience with existing appraisal practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n=%</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 16. What level of input have you previously had in the review of the current appraisal system?</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>a) There has been no review in the time I have been at the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>c) A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>d) Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>e) Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraisee in the last five years?</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>a) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>b) A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>c) Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>d) Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18. Would you like to receive any training as an appraisee?</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>b) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraiser in the last five years?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>b) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>c) I have never been an appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20. If you are currently an appraiser, do you have any guidelines for your role?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>b) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>c) Currently not an appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21. Would you like to receive formal training as an appraiser?</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>b) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22. Were your development objectives for this appraisal round:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>a) linked to the strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multiple responses allowed)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>b) linked to annual plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>c) linked to Learning Area plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>d) linked to personal areas of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>e) supported by professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 23. What evaluative data do you gather during your appraisal cycle?</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>a) student evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multiple responses allowed)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>b) peer evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>c) self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>d) observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>e) documentary evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>f) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24. How often do you meet with your appraiser to discuss progress in relation to your development objectives?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>a) once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>b) at least once a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>c) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25. The feedback on your last appraisal was constructive.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>b) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>c) This is my first appraisal at Pukeko High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 26. The length of an appraisal cycle should be:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>a) One year cycle starting in February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>b) One year cycle starting mid year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>c) Two year cycle starting in February</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key findings from Table 4.8 indicated that staff had not been consulted on the existing appraisal process and had not been involved with any form of formal appraisal training in the last five years.
A further finding from Table 4.8 revealed that the majority of staff (82%) had no knowledge of a review having ever taken place, or had not been involved in the review of the appraisal practice at Pukeko High. This contrasts with the 1% of staff who indicated they had ‘adequate’ input into reviewing appraisal practice at some point.

Question 22 results revealed that development objectives are more commonly linked to personal areas of development (80% of respondents) than school or learning area goals. Several reasons for this can be drawn from the written comments gathered:

- *The documentation is inadequate to make explicit links.*
- *I was unable to locate the annual and strategic plan. I am new to the school.*
- *I would like to receive more direct support for my development objectives from my Head of Learning but I think she’s too busy or I should be able to figure them out on my own.*

The written comments suggested that it was easier for staff to limit their development objectives to personal areas of development as these could be created with limited assistance from their direct line manager or appraiser.

The most frequently collected evaluative data is gathered in appraisal through lesson observations (indicated by 85% of respondents). While collecting data from student evaluations did not score as highly as the lesson observations at 45%, the following single written comment collected referred to the personal choice in collecting data through student evaluations:

- *I personally gather student evaluations but this is not a departmental process.*

The majority of respondents (75%) indicated that feedback at their last appraisal was constructive. Two of the written comments received inferred that while the feedback was constructive, it was ‘after the event, at the end of the year’ and ‘constructive at the time but there was no follow-up’.

The results strongly indicated the majority of respondents (84%) have received little or no formal appraisee training, with only a very small proportion (8%) having received adequate training. This result is supported by the large number of respondents (69%) who indicated they would like to receive formal training as an
appraisee. The demographic data from part one of the questionnaire showed 43% of the respondents were currently appraising other staff. Question 19 results showed that only 17% of respondents had received training as an appraiser in the last five years and only 29% indicated they had guidelines for their role (Q.20) This means 26% of staff currently appraising other staff have received no formal training on their role. Written comments supporting the need for appraiser training included:

- I think it would help me to understand the process better.
- It won’t hurt to have more knowledge.

One person wrote that if the steps and outcomes were clearly outlined, there was a greater need to have training that would develop interpersonal skills.

Question 24 results showed the majority of respondents (50%), meet only once with their appraiser throughout the appraisal cycle. The preferred length for an appraisal cycle was one year, starting in February as indicated by 60% of respondents. The majority of written comments reinforced that the minimum number of meetings were held to complete the setting of development objectives, lesson observation and for the final sign off to ‘get the paperwork done.’

**Part Four – Areas of strength, change or improvement**

The final part of the reconnaissance questionnaire invited respondents to describe the strengths of the existing appraisal process and to suggest any areas that could be changed or improved upon. The responses were thematically coded and tallied and are shown in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Questionnaire part four: Areas of strength, change or improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Areas of strength</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Areas for change or improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clearly laid out with detailed expectations and guidelines</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>More time to complete process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Focus is on personal improvement /goal setting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>More training for appraisers/appraisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Opportunity for professional discussions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Increase frequency of required meetings between appraiser / appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A positive process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase number of observations / peer appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appraisee/Appraiser relationships developed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>More rigorous collection and analysis of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time to get it done, clear timeline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>More explicit links to school policy and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Constructive feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ability to choose appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Focus for professional development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>More assistance in setting challenging, appropriate goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Room to negotiate choice of appraiser</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Documentation – less jargon, clarify objectives more clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Choice of observation forms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A two year appraisal process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open for discussions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>More rigour required, too tick box, evidence of achievement of objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Involves student feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>More effective ways of measuring the achievement of goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peer observation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Incorporate Whanau systems and responsibilities into process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less PRT meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less signatures / paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observation forms - less tick boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Selection of appraisers does not take into consideration quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Want more direct help/coaching from experienced, competent teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PD available for all staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reward for positive appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>People signing off areas of appraisal need to have met throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learn to Learn and Mentoring should be part of appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explicit examples of how to implement Treaty of Waitangi and Maori protocols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data collected for part four of the questionnaire, two main strengths were evident for the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The top two strengths were the appraisal process was clearly set out with required guidelines and expectations (11 responses), and the focus was on personal improvement through goal setting (10 responses). There was a clear gap between these two strengths and the third most frequently indicated strength (5 responses), which was that the appraisal process was seen as a positive opportunity for professional discussions.

The data also revealed four areas of the existing appraisal practice that required change to improve the overall process. More time to complete the appraisal process
received the highest tally (11 responses). The data also revealed more training for both appraisers and appraisees was required to improve the overall process (9 responses), and the third highest feature revealed that respondents would like to see more frequent and compulsory meetings between the appraiser and appraisee (8 responses). A further change indicated the need to increase the number of observations and the perception that this could be undertaken with either the appraiser or with a chosen peer (6 responses).

Focus group interview

The focus group meeting commenced with a PMI (Plus, Minus, Interesting) activity where participants were asked to complete a chart on the positives, negatives and points of interest for the existing appraisal practice. Participants then discussed their responses with a partner before feeding back to the whole group. As members fed back to the group, individual members affirmed the contributions and built upon what the last person had said. The feedback results are presented in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Time, manageable process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers in charge of subjects observing their staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Range of observation sheets, choice and variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer appraisal, not just your Head of Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development gained from observing other people’s teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appraisal process encouraged me to reflect on my teaching and get involved in EOTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One lesson observation is not enough to get accurate picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You see “dressed up” lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feedback – don’t like to cause conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some people don’t take constructive criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tick box observation sheets, some appraisers don’t include written comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One observation, everything rests on it including attestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No training for appraisers and a lot of people indicated on the questionnaire they don’t want it, where did they receive their training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very different depending on years of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the appraiser have to be someone with relevant subject knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you measure the informal meetings with your appraiser?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Important to have predetermined observation objectives and observation tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of appraisers versus number of appraisees at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need PD on how to use observation sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The building of the relationship between appraiser and appraisee very important, requires high levels of trust and confidence in appraiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To build a culture of it’s OK to have people to see what I’m doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two opportunities of being observed would improve it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall feeling of the group was one of a positive attitude towards the process of appraisal. The key positive aspects identified were that the process was an opportunity for teachers with areas of responsibility to observe their staff and that observing other staff was also a professional development opportunity. The variety and choice of lesson observation sheets was also seen as a positive component of the process. The negative points exposed that one lesson observation was insufficient for gathering data; the quality of feedback for the observation varied depending on the appraiser and the giving and receiving of feedback had the potential to cause conflict. The participants were divided when it came to the issue of ‘time’ required to complete the appraisal process. The points of interest raised were wide-ranging in themes, with two of the points posed as questions which caused great discussion amongst the participants: Does the appraiser have to be someone with relevant subject knowledge? And, how do you measure the informal meetings with your appraiser? One further point of interest raised focused on the importance of the relationship between the appraisee and appraiser which requires high levels of trust and confidence in the appraiser.

The transcript of the focus group discussions was summarised against each of the pre-determined questions and results of the main emerging themes are reported below against each question.

**Question one**

*What are your thoughts about the findings of the questionnaire? Are there any results that surprised you? Are there any that you anticipated?*

An experienced teacher initiated the discussion by stating his surprise at the number of staff that met only once with their appraiser (Table 4.8, Q.24). This prompted much discussion amongst the group and one experienced teacher stated “how can we have effective appraisal if we only meet once a year.” Consensus of the group was that at least two formal meetings supported by informal meetings throughout the year should be a minimum expectation.

Next, a classroom teacher spoke about the questionnaire revealing that the majority (80%) of respondent’s goals were linked to personal areas of development and that with the required implementation of the recent New Zealand Curriculum, she thought
there would have been a greater proportion linked to Learning Area goals or the Strategic Plan. This was countered by another classroom teacher who remembered this as a difficult question to answer as he stated “your personal areas of development may actually cover your subject knowledge”.

The discussion moved on to the demographics of the current staff (Table 4.6), as an experienced teacher admitted they had never thought about it before until he saw the questionnaire results. He saw the school as having “two chunks of staff: the very experienced (10+ years) and those with intermediate experience (2-5 years)”. Members of the group wondered what the demographics for similar schools would look like. One participant felt that Pukeko High was a modern, innovative school but it had a traditional model of appraisal involving a meeting with an appraiser, the setting of some development objectives, a lesson observation, feedback and an appraisal summary report.

Several participants (3/7) were surprised and concerned that of the 37 people responsible for appraising staff, only eight claimed to have had training considered adequate or better. One participant was concerned as to what the other 29 teachers were doing.

Concern was raised by one participant, that while the data was positive relating to the clarity of the purpose of appraisal, (Table 4.7, Q.2), he felt that the biggest group was the ‘agree’ not the ‘strongly agree’ and while this was not an unexpected result, for a ‘healthy’ appraisal system he thought the numbers should be higher. He would like to see more positive results, similar to what Q.15 reported, that is, a combined total of 83% of staff affirming that the appraisal process provides staff with the opportunity for feedback on strengths.

Table 4.11: Key findings from question one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surprises for Focus Group</th>
<th>Expected results by Focus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High number of appraisee’s meeting only once with appraisers</td>
<td>Staff moderately positive about the clarity of purpose for appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominence of goals linking to personal development</td>
<td>The number of staff appraising versus the number of staff who feel they have had adequate training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff demographics – experienced staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Question two**

_How do the findings align with your personal experience of appraisal at Pukeko High?_

A classroom teacher thought there was “a general feeling that people thought it was worth doing, generally a positive thing but that there was not enough clarity and seriousness”. Following a brief discussion, the overall consensus of the group was that it was what they expected, “good but not great and manageable”. Several participants (3/7) remarked that many people appeared to have chosen “3”, the not applicable or neutral position and thought staff were fairly ambivalent and had gone for safety.

The key finding was the general consensus that the existing appraisal process was sound, manageable and positively viewed by staff, however there was room for improvement.

**Question three**

_Can appraisal impact positively on raising student achievement? If so, in what way?_

The initial response from one teacher was “Yes, most definitely”. Another participant referred to the positive data indicating that appraisal was good for promoting professional discussions. The discussion moved on and centred on the theme of student evaluations. There was agreement amongst the group that they are one of the most important tools as students get to see teachers across the school and are probably the best judges of what is happening in the classroom. An experienced teacher said that student evaluations “provide an opportunity for students to have their say on how we can improve our learning”.

The group discussed the need to explore different methods of obtaining student feedback, for example, making greater use of our learning management system and available technology. A classroom teacher stated that getting objective and anonymous student feedback can provide quality information to help us reflect on our teaching.
The next theme discussed by three participants in particular, centred on lesson observations as part of the appraisal process. An experienced teacher and current appraiser felt that short lesson observations (15-20 minutes) and not necessarily the whole lesson can be just as insightful. He felt that the way the school has been physically built with the expansive use of glass walls, teaching practice is always on show, along with the whanau philosophy (pastoral care and house structure), the sharing of rooms by teachers, many teachers frequently move in and out of each other’s classrooms and informally observe each other.

The key findings were that appraisal can impact positively on raising student achievement and student evaluations are valuable for obtaining feedback. Information communication technologies (ICT) can be used more fully to enhance various aspects of the process and formal lesson observations can be targeted, focused sections of the lesson.

**Question four**

*Do you believe your appraisal this year has had a positive effect on your performance as a teacher? If so, in what way?*

The majority of the group answered positively; with only one participant who said ‘no’, giving the reason that they could not engage with their appraiser and did not feel the appraiser knew what they were supposed to be doing. One participant then raised the issue of attestation, which created significant discussion amongst the group and concluded in the group affirming the need to ensure that attestation remains a separate process from appraisal.

The final theme raised as having a positive effect on teacher performance was the opportunity to observe and evaluate the teaching of their peers. A third year teacher spoke about the opportunities as part of the on site Provisionally Registered Teachers’ programmes to observe colleagues within their subject area, across other curriculum areas and even in other schools but the desire to maximise these opportunities reduces as you become a more experienced teacher.
The key findings were that the appraisal process should remain separate from attestation and the opportunity to observe peers’ teaching has one of the biggest, positive effects on improving teacher performance.

**Question five**
*Were there any themes not explored in the questionnaire that you believe are relevant to the review of current practice?*

The two themes that emerged from the discussion focused on the tension between attestation and appraisal and secondly that the potential of ICT was not currently utilised to enhance the current appraisal process. Suggestions for greater use of ICT included the learning management system (school intranet), the use of video and audio analysis to reflect on teaching practice.

At this point in the meeting there were about seven minutes left of the available time and the final two questions pertaining to the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the existing appraisal practice were combined. The group was asked if there was anything further anyone had to add or had everyone had the opportunity to talk about this during the PMI activity at the beginning of the session. One person spoke about the need for greater clarity on what we are trying to achieve, to be clearer with our objectives and the purpose of appraisal being to raise student achievement.

The key findings included staff awareness of the tension that can exist between attestation and the appraisal process and that ICT could be greater utilised to develop the appraisal practice.

**DISCUSSION OF RESULTS**

The results of the emerging themes from the analysis of the reconnaissance data were then summarised against the distilled effectiveness criterion for appraisal (Table 4.1).

**An integrated development and accountability approach**

The existing appraisal practice supported staff identifying their future areas of development, with opportunities to engage in individual professional development. Staff indicated that opportunities to observe peers teaching had one of the biggest,
positive effects on their performance. An area of weakness was the confirmation of the job description that should take place at the beginning of the process. It was indicated in the diagrammatic representation of the process in the procedural staff handbook, but was not evident in any other aspect of the appraisal documentation and the questionnaire results show that it is not being completed.

**Trust**

The development of relationships between appraiser and appraisee requires high levels of trust and confidence in the appraiser. While the existing appraisal practice encouraged professional discussions and provided opportunities for feedback on strengths, the building of trust-based relationships was difficult when meeting the minimum number of times to conduct the process. This is supported by the findings of Q.24 in the questionnaire (Table 4.8) that indicated the majority of respondents had one formal meeting with their appraiser and this was not considered sufficient by members of the focus group, nor an effective way of conducting appraisal.

**An educative process**

Due to the low frequency of meetings between the appraisee and appraiser as revealed in the questionnaire findings, there are limited opportunities to establish an educative process and foster good interpersonal interactions. This has made it challenging for problems to be confronted and solved within the existing practice. The confronting of problems and opportunity for staff to learn from their practice also overlaps with the previous effective criteria of creating a relationship based on trust. The results from the PMI focus group activity (Table 4.10) also indicated an absence of an educative process when members revealed that they don’t like to give feedback that may cause conflict and that some staff are not receptive to constructive criticism.

**Confidential and transparent process**

The Performance Management policy clearly set out the rationale, purpose, guideline and intent of the process. The policy was included in the procedural staff handbook, although it did not replicate the layout required by the Board and several sections of the policy were repeated in various formats. A weakness of the existing practice was that there had been no opportunity for staff to be involved in the review of the PMAS procedures. The existing policy and procedures omitted any reference to the
responsibilities of the appraiser to work confidentially and accurately with data and information pertaining to the appraisee.

**Setting deep objectives**
The existing process required staff to set goals and development objectives for improvement. The findings indicated that for just over half the staff, their goals and objectives were considered ‘deep’ in format, still leaving a significant number of staff setting objectives that were ‘surface’ in format. The objectives must include detailed indicators for the assessment and achievement of the appraisal objectives (Piggot-Irvine, 2003). The existing hard copy of the PMAS documentation restricted appraisees to complete the setting of their developmental objectives within the confines of a pre-printed template, where room to write in detail was constrained.

**Objective and informative data**
The findings for this feature were conflicted. The quantitative data from Q.11 (Table 4.7) indicated the process encouraged objective and factual discussion between appraisee and appraisers, and that data was obtained mainly through lesson observations and self-reflection. However, the qualitative comments indicated that objective data and information was not being gathered and that more rigorous data gathering was required. These qualitative comments align with the results of Q.9 which indicated only a third of the respondents believed the process gathered objective, data-based information. Overall the findings showed there was concern over the lack of pre-determined objectives for lesson observations, limited feedback given by some appraisers from lesson observations and that one formal observation was considered insufficient. There was a lack of guidance for the final appraisal reports resulting in reports that ranged in quality, and depth of feedback and feed forward.

Student evaluations are a source of valuable data though the findings from Q.23 (Table 4.8) indicated that they are not extensively used (47%). Greater utilisation of ICT, for example setting evaluations using the learning management system, could effectively administer and gather objective data from students and peers whilst maintaining confidentiality. With the use of ICT, there is the ability to have the data electronically analysed and returned to the appraisee in a timely manner, giving
almost instantaneous feedback and assists with managing any workload concerns related to the administration, collection and analysis of data.

**Well resourced with time**
Time is another theme to emerge from the results as an area that requires improvement. To make sure there is sufficient time for appraisal to take place, the incorporation of ICT practices could enhance the existing appraisal practice and make better use of the valuable resource time.

**Appraisal training**
The qualitative results from Q.18 and Q.21 overwhelmingly indicated that formal training for appraisees and appraisers was required and considered necessary for effective appraisal. This did not align with the quantitative results which indicated appraisers did not seek training (24%), although just fewer than half the staff responsible for training indicated there were no guidelines for their role. There is scope for staff to receive training to develop their interpersonal skills which would support the culture of an educative process.

**Clarity**
The appraisal documentation and questionnaire findings both suggested that the existing appraisal practice was well publicised, clearly laid out with detailed expectations and guidelines. Increasing the frequency of meetings between the appraisee and appraiser would assist with ensuring the process was focused on improvement and went beyond the tick box approach. The consensus of qualitative and quantitative data would suggested that the existing appraisal practice was positively received by staff, manageable and 'good but not great'.

**Separation of discipline processes from appraisal**
The findings indicated that respondents are aware of the potential tension if appraisal and attestation are not kept as two separate processes. The Performance Management policy referred to the use of an independent arbitrator in the event of a dispute. The PMAS Staff Handbook clearly set out the procedures for dispute resolution regarding either appraisal or attestation. Disciplinary proceedings were covered by a separate policy.
CONCLUSION
The reconnaissance cycle examined the existing appraisal documentation and the teachers’ perception of current appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The findings of the documentary analysis, the questionnaire and the focus group interview were summarised against the appraisal effectiveness criterion distilled from the literature review in Chapter Two. The summarised findings presented themes for the TAG to consider for implementation to bring about improvement in the next phase of the PRAR model. The following chapter discusses the second cycle of the PRAR model – the intervention phase.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE INTERVENTION CYCLE

INTRODUCTION
This chapter outlines the intervention cycle of this research based on the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002). The intervention stage involves the development and implementation of a plan of action based on the key findings of the previous reconnaissance cycle to improve the current situation. The aim of the intervention cycle for this research was to implement planned changes and improvements to the existing appraisal process to lead to improved appraisal practice. The guiding question for the intervention phase was:

- What changes need to be planned and made to current practice?

The chapter commences with a description of the Teacher Appraisal Professional Learning Group (TAG) which was formed as the collaborative task group. The following section details the TAG initial meeting where a plan of action was developed as part of the intervention cycle. Following this is an overview of the subsequent TAG meetings and staff forums engaged in, to implement the plan of action. The final section provides my reflections on the implemented changes of the intervention cycle. The intervention cycle overview adapted from the PRAR model is depicted in Figure 5.1 and illustrates the process the TAG followed.
INTERVENTION PLAN OUTLINED
Teacher Appraisal Professional Learning Group (TAG)
The TAG at Pukeko High was the on site research team made up of four staff volunteers interested in teacher appraisal and myself. Team members ranged in years of teaching experience, years of employment at Pukeko High and positions of responsibility held within the school. Team members committed themselves to be involved in the interpretation of the reconnaissance data and the development and implementation of an action plan to improve current appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The TAG was involved in a series of meetings throughout the intervention cycle and following is a description of what took place.

Meeting One
In preparation for the first meeting, members of the TAG were given a copy of the reconnaissance questionnaire results, the transcript of the focus group interview and a reading; an excerpt from the chapter ‘Appraisal in Practice’, from the book *Appraising Performance Productively: Integrating Accountability and Development* written by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005). They were also asked to bring along their copy of the Pukeko High Performance Management Appraisal system (PMAS) Policy and Procedures Staff Handbook for 2009.
The meeting commenced with a discussion of the data and findings from the questionnaire and focus group interview from the reconnaissance cycle. We then moved on to discuss the reading taken from Piggot-Irvine and Cardno’s (2005) book, which led us to discussing the existing appraisal documentation and process at Pukeko High. Common ideas started to emerge from the discussion and these were recorded as a brain storm on a large whiteboard.

The ideas were discussed further and distilled before the TAG decided to focus on the following specific areas for intervention: the creation of generic appraisal documentation for each position within the school; the appraisal documentation to include the generic job description incorporating the Professional Teacher Standards; to challenge staff to create ‘deep’ developmental objectives; staff to maintain their own professional learning / development log; the requirements of the final appraisal report; to increase the number of lesson observations and the number times the appraisee meets with their appraiser; and the revision of the PMAS Procedural Staff Handbook to reflect these changes. The TAG then created a plan of action based on these focus areas requiring change. The plan of action is shown in Table 5.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job description incorporating Professional Standards</strong>&lt;br&gt;Review generic job descriptions for each position and align with the Professional Teacher Standards.&lt;br&gt;Staff to critique reviewed generic job descriptions</td>
<td>• Opportunity for staff to be involved in the first, formal review of the generic job descriptions since the school opened.&lt;br&gt;• Ensure revised generic job descriptions align with the professional standards.&lt;br&gt;• Generic appraisal documentation is available for staff to download and personalise as appropriate</td>
<td>BR, HA&lt;br&gt;HA&lt;br&gt;BR, HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisal process</strong>&lt;br&gt;Add in additional meeting points with appraiser to the appraisal cycle.&lt;br&gt;Stipulate requirement for two formal lesson observations&lt;br&gt;Update the PMAS Staff handbook</td>
<td>• To improve the effectiveness of the process and move beyond a ‘one-off’, ‘tick box’ meeting.&lt;br&gt;• To improve the quality of data collected.&lt;br&gt;• Revise handbook to reflect changes to process, guiding the appraisee and appraiser on how to fulfil their responsibilities.</td>
<td>BR, HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Portfolio</strong>&lt;br&gt;Combine sections B (self-review) and C (development objectives) to create a new section 2: Developmental Portfolio which includes self review, development objectives and professional learning record.&lt;br&gt;Introduce a preparation activity for final appraisal meeting (section 3).&lt;br&gt;Include recommendations for the contents of the final appraisal report (section 4).</td>
<td>• The Developmental Portfolio to outline the non-negotiable evidence required, with the ability for staff to personalise and add additional evidence as appropriate.&lt;br&gt;• The new section to include provision for staff to record their involvement in professional learning and professional development.&lt;br&gt;• To encourage the appraisee to reflect on their teaching practice for the year by completing a PMI activity.&lt;br&gt;• Formalise and standardise requirements of the final appraisal report to improve feedback for the appraisee.</td>
<td>BR, LA, MA, RO&lt;br&gt;BR, LA, MA, RO&lt;br&gt;HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Intended Outcome</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student feedback</strong></td>
<td>• Student evaluations to seek feedback on both curriculum and relational aspects of learning and teaching.</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review existing student feedback evaluation forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater use of ICT</strong></td>
<td>• Make greater use of our IT rich environment to support and enhance the appraisal process.</td>
<td>BR, HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make all appraisal related documentation available electronically on the teacher drive of the school network.</td>
<td>• Staff would have the ability to provide detailed documentation and not be constrained by the limitations of small boxes on paper.</td>
<td>BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to an electronic format for the distribution and storage of appraisal documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>• The proposed changes to the appraisal process outlined to staff with an opportunity for staff to feedback to the TAG.</td>
<td>BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book time in staff induction programme and Professional Learning calendar for start of next year.</td>
<td>• A second session to take staff through the finalised appraisal process for current year.</td>
<td>TAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create time within the professional learning programme throughout the year for the completion of the appraisal process.4</td>
<td>• Provide professional learning sessions on what to expect from an appraiser and how to set ‘deep’ development objectives.</td>
<td>BR, HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To value the appraisal process by giving staff time to engage with it.</td>
<td>BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the meeting concluded, members of the group took responsibility to draft changes to progress the developmental portfolio section, the review of generic job descriptions and alignment with the professional standards, and the step by step guide to the overall appraisal process. It was two weeks before the end of the school year and members of the group felt that this was a positive way to maintain momentum with the action plan for the implementation cycle.

**TAG subgroup meeting**

*Section 2: Developmental Portfolio*

The focus of the second meeting was to critique the three existing sections of the PMAS documentation in more depth and draft changes in alignment with Table 5.1. The themes of the three sections reviewed were: professional information and self review questions (section B); personal development objectives (section C); and provision for a summary of a classroom visit (section D).

The outcomes of the robust discussion was that these three sections would be replaced by a new section entitled ‘Section 2 – Development Portfolio’ comprising of three parts: Section 2.1 Self Review; Section 2.2 Development Objectives; and Section 2.3 Professional Learning / Development Log. It was felt that some of the professional information asked for in the existing Section B was a duplication of what was requested on the front page of the PMAS documentation and was therefore removed to streamline the process and potentially save time for the appraisee. The self review question of Section B referred the appraisee to an appendix which was reported as being attached to the PMAS document but in reality was only available electronically on the school network. A new section: 2.1 Self Review was drafted retaining three questions from the existing documentation pertaining to professional satisfaction, future plans and aspirations, and personal / professional strengths, and one original question focusing on professional practice was reworded.

The TAG had determined at the first meeting that the framework for establishing developmental objectives needed to be more rigorous to challenge staff to set ‘deep’ objectives / goals, and that they needed to align more with what the school was trying to achieve as set out in the strategic and annual plans to address some of the needs of the organisation. The TAG discussed how this could be achieved, and concluded
the existing template for establishing developmental objectives needed to be expanded to include specific columns for defining key performance indicators, portfolio evidence and reflection for each objective/goal. It was decided that the template needed to stipulate three categories: school wide, learning area (department); and personal, against which staff needed to establish a development objective / goal for each category to strengthen the schools’ overall aims and objectives. The provision for appraisee and appraiser comments on the achievement of the objectives was maintained. These changes were drafted to create Section 2.2 Development Objectives.

Staff wanting to update their professional development record for their curriculum vitae frequently asked the Deputy Principal in charge of professional development, what courses they have been on during their time at the school. The members present believed it was important for staff to maintain their own record of professional learning attended on site and involvement in external professional development as another form of evidence for their developmental portfolio and this was also an opportunity for staff to record their reflections upon completion of the course or session. The TAG members discussed how current applications for support from the school (ie. money and/or time) to attend external professional development must detail how the course links and supports the achievement of staff’s developmental objectives. The members felt that making another connection between development objectives, professional development applications with the professional learning log, could assist staff to become more reflective with their teaching practice. A template for the learning log, Section 2.3, was drafted using the headings: date; description/title/provider; objective(s); and included a column to record reflections in relation to their teaching practice.

**Section 3: Preparation for final meeting**

The TAG members determined that a PMI (plus, minus, interesting) activity requiring staff to reflect on their teaching practice for the year, would encourage staff to prepare and have input into the final stage of the appraisal process, the creation of the summary appraisal report by the appraiser. The TAG members felt that this reflective activity would not be time consuming as it could be completed in 5-10 minutes. At this point the contents of the final appraisal report had yet to be drafted.
by the TAG. Once sections 2 and 3 were formatted, they were distributed by email to all members of the TAG for review at the upcoming final meeting of the year.

**Meeting Two**

A meeting was held in the last week of the school year (2009) to discuss progress to date against the implementation action plan and to confirm ‘where to from here’. The proposed new sections, Section 2: Developmental Portfolio and Section 3: Preparation for final meeting were reviewed with no further changes to the proposed format or content required. The team member taking responsibility for drafting the merging of the generic job descriptions with the professional standards outlined his approach and progress to date. This task was more involved and time consuming than many of us had thought at our initial meeting. As such, I offered to work with him on this where possible, as the proposed changes to the existing practice were going to require significant time and energy.

The group then considered how we were going to introduce the planned changes to the whole staff. It was decided that we needed to have several sessions within the start-up programme for staff at the beginning of school year and the professional learning programme. The professional learning programme is a timetabled weekly session for staff where a range of prepared themes are delivered to either the whole staff or staff opt to attend choosing from a range of options.

One of the major changes to the appraisal process was the creation of the electronic documentation merging the generic job description with the Professional Teacher Standards, and the identification of the required pieces of evidence for the portfolio. Before the appraisal process for 2010 could get underway, staff feedback was required on the range of generic job descriptions and associated documentation for the various positions at the school. The group decided that the first session in the ‘start-up’ programme for staff needed to introduce the planned changes for the first section of the appraisal documentation, ‘Job Description incorporating Professional Standards’. A further session would be required to outline to staff the requirements of the Developmental Portfolio and the guidelines for the writing of the final appraisal report. We also needed additional time in the professional learning programme for the delivery of training for appraisers. A member of the TAG negotiated with the
senior leadership team for two sessions in the staff ‘start-up’ programme and professional learning programme.

The next item to consider was the existing PMAS Staff Handbook. A ‘step by step guide’, a flow chart providing an overview to guide staff through the steps involved in the appraisal process had been drafted by a team member and distributed by email for consideration prior to the meeting. This would replace the previous flow chart in the handbook entitled ‘The PMA System – As an appraisee- what do I do’. Following discussion, amendments were made to wording and formatting to provide greater clarity of the process for staff. A diagram depicting the Integrated Appraisal Process Model espoused by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) was included after the flow chart for the visual learner as an alternative representation of the new appraisal procedures. The diagram is included in the earlier literature review chapter (Figure 2.2). The TAG also wanted to convey to staff that the planned changes were not only based on the on-site research findings but were influenced by current appraisal literature depicting best practice. The team would next meet at the beginning of the new school year but remain in contact by email.

TAG subgroup meeting
PMAS appraisal documentation
A meeting was held mid January, two weeks before school started, between myself and the member of the TAG team who was taking responsibility for merging the generic job descriptions with the professional standards and itemising of evidence required. This person had exceptional IT skills which was a huge advantage to this phase of the action plan. It was obvious from the progress he had made over the school break, that he had spent enormous personal time in not only formatting the new documents but in checking the accuracy and alignment with existing documentation, for example: school policies and procedures; Ministry of Education resource, Teacher Performance Management (1999); and Pukeko High Staff Handbook, Pukeko High non-negotiables for Learning Area Manuals and Unit planning.

The focus of this meeting was to discuss and critique the progress of the appraisal documentation. As outlined in the document analysis section of the previous chapter,
existing practice had teachers utilising one of three main documents depending on the years of experience; Beginning Teacher, Classroom Teacher, or Experienced with the addition of the Unit Holders PMAS as appropriate. To enable greater personalisation and inclusion of relevant job descriptions the PMAS documentation was expanded to include a range of documents to cover not only the years of experience but the variety of positions at Pukeko High School. The goal was for the staff member to personalise them with their professional details once they had been downloaded from the school intranet. The existing documentation was adapted to create generic PMAS documents for the eight generic positions within the school. The documentation excluded positions within the senior leadership as they are appraised by external education consultants engaged by the Board. Performance Management Appraisal documentation was created for the following generic positions at Pukeko High:

- Beginning Teacher
- Classroom Teacher
- Experienced Teacher
- Head of Learning Area / Experienced Teacher
- Head of Subject / Experienced Teacher
- Teacher in charge of Subject / Experienced Teacher
- Whanau Leader
- Assistant Whanau Leader / Experienced Teacher

Each set of documentation was created as a template to record the process of the mandatory PMAS at Pukeko High. The cover page included a section guiding staff on how to work with the electronic format of the document. The documentation was designed to be personalised and modified by individual staff members by completing the parts highlighted (in yellow) and saving it to their personal drive on the school network. The document would then be completed electronically and sent to the Principal with the single printed page of required signatures. There was much debate about whether the sign off sheet was needed although the expectation was that the appraisal development objectives would be submitted to the Principal with the final report. For now, the members of the TAG working on this section went with the sign
off sheet being submitted with the other documentation to the Principal, accountability won through.

Once the Principal finished reading each staff members’ appraisal documentation, the next step in the process requires the Principal’s personal assistant to save all electronic copies to a secure folder within the management drive of the school intranet, which only the Principal and Principals personal assistant would have access to. Alternatively, staff could print out a copy of the PMAS documentation to work with and submit the completed hard copy to the Principal on completion of the process.

The highlighted sections on the front cover required staff to personalise and complete: their name; the name of their appraiser; position; learning area (department) they belong to; qualifications; length of teaching service; length of teaching service at Pukeko High; courses taught; tutor class (if relevant); number of management units; and to list the responsibilities for which management units are held. The cover also included a detailed contents list which acts as an electronic quick link taking you to the appropriate section within the document. The cover page concludes with any relevant foot notes on terms as required.

We were conscious that by merging the generic job description with the Professional Teacher Standards (Ministry of Education, 1997), the document was becoming quite lengthy and could be quite overwhelming to staff. We set about to critique each set of documentation, in particular, we considered the obligatory examples of evidence / portfolio items against the key performance indicators. We determined that not all the pieces of evidence listed were essential and that the list should be sub divided into two categories: non-negotiable items and optional items. The non-negotiable items were the mandatory pieces of evidence required for their portfolios. The optional items listed were exemplars staff might consider gathering as additional portfolio evidence.

The benefit of working electronically means that staff would have the ability to delete unwanted optional items or add in items of evidence that may align with their specific development objectives. This process took several sessions to reach a point where
the content only needed final formatting amendments before the documents were uploaded to a folder on the staff network entitled ‘Appraisal’. Documents were created as read only files so that staff were prompted to download and save only to their home drive. This prevented staff from altering the base documents. The decision was also made to have a single page ‘signature evidence’ sheet which replaced the collection of signatures against evidence throughout the appraisal documentation in order to support the move to an electronic format.

**TAG subgroup meeting**

*PMAS Policy and Procedures Staff Handbook 2010*

Critique of the existing fifteen page PMAS staff handbook by the TAG members, highlighted the need to condense the content by reducing repetition of information, and to ensure that the current Board of Trustees’ Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy was accurately reflected in the handbook. The outcomes of the discussion for planned changes to the PMAS Staff Handbook are described in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2: Changes made to the PMAS staff policy and procedural handbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing PMAS Staff Handbook</th>
<th>Changes for 2010 PMAS Staff Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover page</td>
<td>• The addition of a focus statement: Improving student outcomes through personal and organisational development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contents Page / List of Appendices | • Details of contents page updated to reflect overall alterations to document.  
                                   • Revised list to reflect additional PMAS generic job descriptions now available.  
                                   • All appendices made available electronically on the Teacher network. |
| Rationale                   | • Replaced ‘rationale’ with definition of terms: Appraisal and Performance management |
| Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy | • Amended the policy section to accurately reflect the rationale and purpose of the existing policy.  
                                               Removed duplicated information. |
| Key Aspects of PMAS / Timeline Summary of Process | • Removed diagrammatic representation of the three key aspects of the process and the summary timeline.  
                                                 This information was merged into the new ‘Step by Step Guide’. |
| Level Descriptors eg Beginning Teacher /Classroom Teacher / Experienced Teacher | • Reviewed and amended Level Descriptors for Beginning, Classroom and Experienced Teacher to reflect what was set out in the Secondary Teachers’ Employment contract.  
                                       • Reviewed and amended the PMAS mandatory requirements section and combined this with the above information in a section entitled ‘Mandatory Requirements’, reducing duplicated and conflicting information in handbook. |
| PMAS Self Appraisal         | • Reviewed and section retained. |
| The Performance Management Appraisal Report: guidance on what the report should contain with identification of other considerations for appraiser and appraisee. | • Reviewed and section retained. |
| PMAS – A Step by Step Guide | • ‘Step by Step Guide’ rewritten and formatted to create a flow chart which aligned with the new changes and deadlines for the appraisal process to guide staff.  
                                  • Include the Integrated Appraisal Process Model (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005) as a visual representation of the process |
| Evidence Indicators for Appraisers: Indicators useful for appraisers in helping to develop indicators of professional standards or performance objectives. | • Removed this section as it duplicated what is in the Appraisal documentation. |
| Appraiser / Appraisee List: List of who is appraising who | • Updated list for 2010 |
| Term by Term timeline       | • Removed as this was included in the ‘Step by Step Guide’. |
| New Section: Portfolio Development | • Additional section to outline to staff what is an appraisal portfolio and provided examples of what it might include. |
| Attestation of Individual Teacher Performance for Salary Increment | • Reviewed and retained. |
The revised PMAS Policy and Procedures Staff Handbook for 2010, once completed in its first draft, was circulated to members of the Senior Leadership Team and TAG for critique. The only feedback received required several small formatting changes to be made. The newly compiled PMAS Staff Handbook for 2010 was twelve pages in length compared to 77 pages in the 2009 publication.

**Professional Learning - 28th January 2010**

Within the start up programme for staff at the beginning of the school year, there was a one hour session dedicated to introducing the proposed changes to the appraisal process for 2010. I created eight Power Point slides which created the framework for the whole staff presentation. With new staff at the beginning of the year (and to refresh the minds of existing staff), it was important to start by looking at our new mission and vision statement that had been adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2009 and make links between this document and the intent of performance management and appraisal.

This was followed by taking staff through the Pukeko High Development Model, a document produced by the foundation Principal, and referred to extensively in the founding years of the school. Two categories of the development model in particular were relevant to the work the TAG had been undertaking, quality teaching and best practice. These two themes were unpacked in relation to Pukeko High as a ‘learning organisation within a learning community’, the schools’ mission, vision and values, and the ultimate goal of the Pukeko High Graduate – the independent life long learner.

An outline of the review undertaken to date, of the appraisal practice at Pukeko High was presented next. It was important to emphasise that the planned changes were based on the findings and recommendations from the whole staff survey (term 4, 2009), the focus group interview, and the Teacher Appraisal Professional Learning Group. The PMAS Policy and Procedure Staff Handbook for 2010 were then issued to all staff and staff were briefed on what the handbook contained.

Before the appraisal process could begin for 2010, the TAG required feedback on a very significant change to the overall process that is the review of the generic job
description for the various teaching positions at Pukeko High. Staff were asked to refer to pages six and seven of the handbook, the ‘Step by Step Guide’ for the appraisal process. The first step outlined the intent of the current meeting, which required feedback on the draft PMAS appraisal documentation by Week 3, t1 2010. Staff were asked to review the draft PMAS documentation relevant to their position, that is, the generic job description, key performance indicators, examples of evidence / portfolio items. Feedback would be sought at the Heads of Learning forum, the Whanau Leaders forum, and the Learning Area forums or staff could send it directly to me. An overview of the steps that would take place once the feedback was received and collated was provided to the staff ahead of the appraisal process commencing week 4, term 1, 2010. The session concluded with a question and answer time.

**Feedback from Staff forums**

The review of the draft PMAS documentation was put on the agendas for the first meeting of the year for the Head of Learning Area forum (curriculum leaders of the school), and the Whanau Leaders meeting (pastoral leaders of the school). The Heads of Learning meet once every three weeks, which is the precursor to the Learning Area (department) meetings which are held in the intervening weeks. Items discussed at Heads of Learning meetings frequently lead into the Learning Area meetings. Whanau Leaders meet every second week and meet with their respective Whanau staff weekly.

Feedback received directly at the Heads of Learning and the Whanau Leaders meetings were collated along with the feedback received from the Learning Area meetings and the feedback sent directly to me. Whanau leaders sought specific minor changes for the wording of the responsibilities of the Whanau tutor, and due to the specific responsibilities held by staff, PMAS documentation was requested to be created for Assistant Whanau Leader / Classroom Teacher.

Two main themes emerged from the overall feedback and these were that some staff felt the process created more paperwork as it very detailed and wordy (9 responses from staff), and that more time would be needed to complete the process (7 responses from staff). The TAG felt that the additional planned sessions in the
professional learning programme and meeting cycles would go some way to creating 'time' for staff to complete the process but they felt that this was an issue that needed further consideration by management as we continued with the ongoing review of appraisal practice at Pukeko High. The feedback received in general from the whole staff was mainly in the form of questions seeking clarification or queries being raised by staff. The questions and queries were answered by the TAG in table format and circulated to all teaching staff by email (Table 5.3) as a way of maintaining open communication and transparency during the process.
Table 5.3: TAG response to staff queries on draft PMAS documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question /queries raised by staff</th>
<th>TAG response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will there be further PD on training on ‘how to be an Appraiser/ Appraiser’?</td>
<td>• There is a PL session scheduled for 18 February with shorter sessions throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it possible to keep a soft copy?</td>
<td>• It is preferred that a softcopy is maintained throughout the cycle with only the signature page and final appraisal report being printed for your personal staff file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time – we need more time</td>
<td>• We are looking at how we can build extra time for appraisal into meeting cycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of templates for surveys</td>
<td>• Templates of surveys exist for student evaluations currently and there will be further exemplars available to create a survey for Head of Learning. Any survey template may be adapted to suit the individual needs of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times are student feedback/evaluations completed?</td>
<td>• One is required to be completed before the end of term 1 with at least one further survey completed mid-late cycle to monitor progress made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of lesson planning</td>
<td>• Plan book or soft copy of lesson planning is required for attestation and as part of the appraisal process. Optional lesson format which aligns with unit planning non-negotiables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to Learn(L2L) / Mentoring – division of labour</td>
<td>• L2L / Mentoring facilitators are there to support staff in the delivery of the programmes and to monitor the progress of programmes. For part time staff, their involvement in the programme is negotiated with their Whanau Leader dependent on their timetable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular – what level of contribution is expected?</td>
<td>• As part of the employment process all staff spoke about co-curricular activities they could be involved in. There is an expectation that staff are involved in our co-curricular programme throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development objectives – who do I share these with?</td>
<td>• Staff may choose to share these with staff other than their appraiser i.e. Head of Learning, Senior Leadership Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final page – is there a need for duplication of signatures?</td>
<td>• Signatures are only collected on the single page print out (refer to last page of the PMAS documentation). If teaching across more than one subject area, the signature would be sought form the person responsible for your major subject area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about appraisal versus competency?</td>
<td>• There are separate processes as outlined in the PPTA contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Observations – how many do we have to do?</td>
<td>• A minimum of two are required, one of which must be completed by your appraiser. Observations may be part or full lessons focusing on a particular aspect or general lesson observation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This session was collaboratively planned by members of the TAG, with input from members of the senior leadership team who were asked to critique the draft presentation. The session was led by members of the TAG. The goals for the session were to look at how to set ‘deep’ development objectives and to understand what makes for an effective appraisal encounter. A Power Point presentation was created to provide a framework for the session.

The presentation commenced with a ‘Do Now’ starter activity for staff on arrival, where staff were asked to read an excerpt from It’s about Learning (and it’s about time) by Stoll, Fink and Earl (2005, pp 88-89). The excerpt was on reflecting as a teacher and as staff finished the reading they asked to engage in a Think: Pair: Share activity were they individually think about the questions posed, share with the person next to them and then feedback to the group as a whole. The activity asked staff to reflect on their teaching practice so far this year and decide on what was something that went really well and something they thought they could have done better or would do differently next time. A Think: Pair: Share activity is a great warm up exercise to engage and get people talking.

The first part of the presentation took staff through the ‘Developmental Objectives’ template (Appendix E) explaining the requirements of each section. The aim here was to highlight the difference between surface and deep goals. A handout was issued to all staff depicting examples of extracts from two staff developmental objective plans based on improving the comprehension of particular data to raise student achievement. The resource was an adaptation of the Performance Agreement Action Plan developed by Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005). Staff discussed the plans in small groups and feedback to the whole staff on the perceived differences and benefits of the different approaches.

The second half of the presentation looked at what the appraiser and appraisee can do to make the process effective. Staff were shown a twelve minute video clip from the UK website, www.teachers.tv entitled Performance Management – the Reviewer’s Guide. The video clip was of a facilitator working with two experienced head teachers viewing and analysing a role play of an appraisal meeting, and
Thinking about what not to do when they carry out their own appraisal meetings in the future. The role play was interspersed with discussion between the facilitator and head teachers. The final section of the video looked at three stages of ground work espoused by the facilitator, as required to be considered before an appraisal meeting takes place: physical environment, preparation, and running the meeting. The facilitator then presented the head teachers with laminated cards containing statements that they matched up with one of the three stages.

At the conclusion of the video, a discussion activity was led to summarise the key points of the video. To close the professional learning session, staff were taken through the next steps of the process which was that all of the resources including the video clip would be uploaded to the Appraisal folder on the teacher drive of the school network for future reference and, in line with 'Step by Step Guide', the finalised PMAS appraisal documentation would be available for downloading and personalised as of the next day (week 4, term 1, Friday 19 February 2010).

**REFLECTIONS ON INTERVENTIONS**

This section includes my reflections on the implemented interventions. I believe that one of the most important highlights of this collaborative and participatory process has been how enthusiastic and optimistic the members of the TAG were. Despite the busy schedules of the members at the end of the school year when the intervention cycle commenced and at the beginning of the new school year, the TAG were dedicated to ensure the action plan was implemented to effectively to bring about improved practice.

On reflection, we required more sessions within the professional learning programme: at least two more sessions to deliver more in-depth training for appraisers and appraisees, and one further session at the beginning of term 3 for appraisers to meet with their appraisees (the term 2 professional learning programme had one scheduled session for appraisers to meet with their appraisees). The professional learning sessions are 45 minutes in length and while they are short and sharp and staff stay focused, it is challenging to embrace the topic of appraisal in a robust and rigorous manner without having a series of sessions.
The development objective resource used during the second professional learning session should have utilised the exact same headings as were used in the development objective template (Appendix E) of the PMAS documentation so there was greater alignment for staff between the exemplar and what was being asked of them.

**CONCLUSION**

The intervention cycle, led by the dedicated members of the TAG has involved the planning and implementation of an action plan to bring about change to the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High. This cycle has progressed from the review of literature and data collected from the questionnaire and focus group during the reconnaissance cycle. The following chapter discusses the third cycle of the PRAR model and describes the evaluation of the changes implemented during the intervention cycle.
CHAPTER SIX
THE EVALUATION CYCLE

INTRODUCTION
This chapter outlines the evaluation cycle of this research based on the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002). The evaluation stage involves the assessment of the interventions implemented in the previous cycle and evaluates how effective the changes have been. It is important to observe the effects of the implemented changes, and “reflect on these effects as a basis for further planning, subsequent critically informed action … through a succession of cycles (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1990, p. 27).

The aim of the evaluation cycle for this research was to evaluate the implemented changes to the effective reviewed appraisal documentation and practice at Pukeko High. The guiding research question for the evaluation phase was:

➢ What are the teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the implemented changes?

This chapter provides an analysis of the data collected from the evaluation questionnaire used to establish the effectiveness of the reviewed appraisal documentation and practice. The first section of the chapter looks at the demographics of the sample group that responded to the questionnaire. The following section presents the results for part two of the evaluation questionnaire which looked at the philosophy and intent of the appraisal process and these results compared with the relevant results of the reconnaissance questionnaire. The next section presents the results for part three of the evaluation questionnaire which looked at respondents' own experience with the reviewed appraisal practice. The latter results are also then compared with the associated section from the reconnaissance questionnaire. The final section shows the results for the fourth and concluding part of the evaluation questionnaire which asked respondents to identify
the strengths and suggest any changes or improvements for the reviewed appraisal process. This is followed by a conclusion to the chapter.

The evaluation cycle overview adapted from the PRAR model is depicted in Figure 6.1 and illustrates the process I followed during the evaluation of the implemented changes. The process involved two main elements: data collection and comparison of evaluation data with reconnaissance data.

Figure 6.1: Cycle Three – Evaluation overview based on the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002)

**EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Part One - Demographic Information**

The first section of the questionnaire sought demographic information on the respondents: gender; teacher registration status; number of years in the teaching profession; and whether they were currently responsible for appraising staff. Table 6.1 presents the demographic information of the respondents for both the reconnaissance and evaluation questionnaires.
Table 6.1: Comparative demographic information of respondents (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconnaissance</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Registration</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Registration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2-5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently appraise staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographics of the respondents for the reconnaissance and evaluation questionnaires were comparable for all categories except for ‘Teaching Experience’. For this category, there was a reduction in the number of Provisionally Registered Teachers responding (teachers with less than two years teaching experience), and an increase in the number of experienced teachers responding (teachers with more than ten years teaching experience) for the evaluation questionnaire. This could be attributed to the change in staffing between the two school academic years (2009 and 2010). For example, second year teachers moving into the next demographic grouping and so on.

**Part Two- Staff perceptions on effectiveness of the reviewed appraisal practice**

This section examined the results for part two of the evaluation questionnaire. Part two of the questionnaire required respondents to consider the philosophy and intent of the reviewed appraisal practice and to rate each statement depending on how they aligned with their assessment of the statement. The results are presented in Table 6.2.
Table 6.2: Response to questionnaire part two - effectiveness of existing appraisal practice (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>*NA / Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1. The appraisal process is well publicised and explicitly detailed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2. The purpose of the appraisal system is clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3. The intent of the appraisal process is centred on improvement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4. Appraisal is an opportunity to confirm the job description.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5. The appraisal process challenges me to set deep appraisal objectives for improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6. There are clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7. The appraisal process is beneficial to career development.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8. The appraisal process is a confidential and transparent process between parties involved.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9. The appraisal process supports the gathering of objective, data-based information.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10. The appraisal process is a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11. The process encourages objective and factual discussions between appraisee and appraiser.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12. The appraisal process enhances individual, professional improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13. The appraisal process enhances organisational improvement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 14. The appraisal process assists staff to identify future areas of development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15. The appraisal process provides staff with the opportunity for feedback on strengths.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA = Not applicable/Neutral

As table 6.2 shows, six statements rated highly with the respondents (70% or higher), demonstrating they were positive features of the reviewed appraisal practice at Pukeko High. Question 1 dominated the results, having the most positive outcome with 90% of respondents affirming the appraisal process as being well publicised and explicitly detailed. Question 8 ranked the second highest with 82% affirming the appraisal process as a confidential and transparent process between parties. Four further statements affirmed positively by the respondents were; the appraisal process assists staff to identify future areas of development (Q.14, 78%); the purpose of the appraisal system was clear (Q.2, 77%); the appraisal process provides staff with the
opportunity for feedback on strengths (Q.15, 73%); and the process encouraged objective and factual discussions between appraisee and appraiser (Q.11, 70%).

Overall, the ‘strongly disagree’ category received very low responses for any of the questions posed. The results shown in Table 6.2 demonstrated one predominant area of weakness, Q.10 with the highest negative score of 38%. This area indicated that the reviewed appraisal process was not a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff. This finding is in conflict with the positive results detailed in the previous paragraph. Due to the wording of the question, it cannot be determined whether the staff believe that the process is not ‘rigorous’ or is not a ‘reliable approach to managing the performance of staff’. This is an area that could have been considered further during the intervention cycle.

**Part two questionnaire comparisons**

A comparison of results for part two of the reconnaissance and evaluation questionnaires was achieved by combining the positive scores (strongly agree and agree) for each question. These results were graphed to assist in the evaluation of the implemented changes and effectiveness of the reviewed appraisal practice. The comparison figures for part two are shown in Figure 6.2.
The comparison results reflected a positive, upward shift for all questions, albeit in varying degrees, except for questions five and fifteen. These two questions both demonstrated downward shifts. The focus of Q.5 on whether the appraisal process challenged staff to set deep appraisal objectives for improvement and Q.15 that focused on the appraisal process as a means of providing staff with the opportunity for feedback on strengths both had minimal reductions which mean the implemented changes had little effect on these two features.

The most dramatic increase revealed in Figure 6.2 was with Q.1, with an improvement of 37 percentage points. An overwhelming 90% of respondents affirmed the reviewed appraisal process as being well publicised and explicitly detailed. The comparisons in Figure 6.2 showed results for three other questions which increased significantly between the reconnaissance and evaluation questionnaires. These were: the purpose of the appraisal system was clear (Q.2, 31 percentage point increase); the appraisal process supports the gathering of objective, data-based information (Q.9, 30 percentage point increase); and, there are clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives (Q.6, 27 percentage point increase).
The comparisons in Figure 6.2 also identified four questions with minimal movement or improvement between the two sets of results. These were: the appraisal process was beneficial to career development (Q.7, 1 percentage point increase); the appraisal process was a confidential and transparent process between parties involved (Q.8, 2 percentage point increase); the appraisal process assists staff to identify future areas of development, (Q.14, 4 percentage point increase); and, appraisal is an opportunity to confirm the job description (Q.4, 6 percentage point increase). The remainder of the questions in Figure 6.2 (Questions. 3, 10-13) had moderate increases between eight and 14 percentage points.

Part Three – Personal experience with the reviewed appraisal practice

The third part of the evaluation questionnaire asked respondents a range of questions to obtain data on their personal experiences with the reviewed appraisal practice. The question themes focused on the level of input to the reviewed appraisal system, appraiser / appraisee training, development objectives, type of evaluative data gathered during the process, interactions with appraiser, method of completion used for appraisal documentation, generic job description and final appraisal report. The overall results are presented in Table 6.3. This section of the questionnaire also gathered qualitative data from the respondents, as each question had space for respondents to make additional written comments. These comments will be included as supporting evidential data as appropriate.
Table 6.3: Response to part three questionnaire - personal experience with the reviewed appraisal practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 16. What level of input have you previously had in the review of the current appraisal system?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f) There has been no review in the time I have been at the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>g) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>h) A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>i) Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>j) Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraisee in the last five years?</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>e) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>f) A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>g) Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>h) Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18. Would you like to receive any training as an appraisee?</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>c) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>d) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraiser in the last five years?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>d) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>e) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>f) I have never been an appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20. If you are currently an appraiser, do you have any guidelines for your role?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>d) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>e) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>f) Currently not an appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21. Would you like to receive formal training as an appraiser?</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>c) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>d) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22. Were your development objectives for this appraisal round:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>f) linked to the strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multiple responses allowed, % of total number of responses possible)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>g) linked to annual plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>h) linked to Learning Area plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>i) linked to personal areas of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>j) supported by professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 23. What evaluative data do you gather during your appraisal cycle?</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>g) student evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multiple responses allowed, % of total number of responses possible)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>h) peer evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>i) self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>j) observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>k) documentary evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>l) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24. How often do you meet with your appraiser to discuss progress in relation to your development objectives?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>d) once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>e) at least once a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>f) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25. Are you completing your current appraisal documentation:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>d) electronically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>e) hard copy (paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>f) electronically and hard copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 26. The inclusion of the generic job description for your position in the appraisal documentation:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>d) was an accurate reflection of my role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multiple responses allowed, % of total number of responses possible)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>e) provided guidance for my role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>f) prompted discussion with appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>g) prompted confirmation of job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>h) identified a development goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 27. In regards to your current development plan, does it include:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>a) challenging, deep, rich goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multiple responses allowed)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>b) detailed actions for achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>c) identification of support required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>d) measurable outcomes for your objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28. The guidelines and template for completing the final appraisal report are helpful to produce a quality document.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>b) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>c) have yet to look at it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 6.3 shows, over a third (32%) of the respondents had no knowledge of a review having ever taken place, or had not been involved in the review of the appraisal practice at Pukeko High. A quarter of the respondents indicated they have had ‘adequate’ input into reviewing appraisal practice. Three written comments were received to support this:

- Input was gathered in departmental meetings.
- Done through Learning Area feedback
- Opportunity to join focus group

Table 6.3 also shows that just over a quarter (27%) of respondents had ‘adequate’ or ‘extensive’ formal appraisal training as an appraisee in the last five years (Q.17). Nearly three-quarters of the respondents (73%) have received little or no formal appraisee training, compared to just over a quarter of the respondents (27%) who indicated they have had ‘adequate’ or ‘extensive’ training. This was supported by nearly half (49%) of the respondents indicating they would like to receive formal training as an appraisee. The results for Q.19 show that only 20% of respondents have received training as an appraiser in the last five years and under a half (40%) indicating they have guidelines for their role (Q. 20).

The results in Table 6.3 confirmed personal areas of development (91% of respondents) and Learning Area plans (82%) dominated the links with development objectives (Q.22). Question 23 results revealed that evaluative data is predominantly gathered through lesson observations (89% of respondents) and student evaluations (84% of respondents). Written comments received from the respondents detailed other forms of data collection, for example, moderation reports, analysis of assessment data, discussions with members of the senior leadership team and facilitators from Team Solutions. Finally, the majority (69%) of respondents indicated they meet at least once a term with their appraiser during the appraisal cycle.

In part three of the evaluation questionnaire, the last three questions of the reconnaissance questionnaire was replaced with four new questions. This was enacted to obtain data on specific implemented changes within the reviewed appraisal process. The focus of Q.25 was to measure the extent of staff uptake on moving to an electronic distribution and storage of appraisal documentation. As
Table 6.3 shows, half of the staff (52%) completed their appraisal documentation electronically, a very small percentage (6%) still preferred to use hard copy, with the remainder (42%) using a combination of electronic and hard copy.

Question 26 explored the inclusion of a generic job description for the staff’s position within the appraisal documentation and to what extent it was referred to during the appraisal process with the appraiser. The results showed the generic job descriptions provided guidance for 63% of respondents. This question allowed multiple responses and there was a considerable reduction to the next option, where just over a third (39%) of the respondents indicated it was an accurate reflection of their role. Further investigation is required to determine whether the low response rate is due to the generic job description not being a true reflection of their role or, through self-appraisal the respondents were indicating they don’t meet the roles outlined in the job description.

Question 27 investigated with respondents what their current development plan included. This question also permitted multiple responses and results revealed development plans most frequently included measurable outcomes for the objectives (67%), with just over half (52%) the respondents confirming their plans identified support required. Just under half (47%) of the respondents indicated their plans detailed actions for the achievement of their development objectives.

The final question in this part of the questionnaire delved into how helpful the guidelines and template were for completing a quality final appraisal report. The results showed nearly two thirds (60%) of respondents were positive about the guidelines and template provided for the completion of the final appraisal report, with a third (33%) yet to look at the requirements. It was anticipated by me that there would be a significant number of staff who had not yet looked at the appraisal report requirements in depth, as the evaluation questionnaire took place in Term 3 of the school year and appraisal reports are part of the Term 4 appraisal activities.
**Part three questionnaire comparisons**

The results for part three of the evaluation questionnaire were compared with the results of the questions in the reconnaissance questionnaire by combining the positive scores (strongly agree and agree) for each question as undertaken for part two. These results were graphed to assist in the evaluation of the implemented changes and effectiveness of the reviewed appraisal practice. The comparison figures for Q.16 regarding the level of input into the review of appraisal practice are shown in Figure 6.3.

**Figure 6.3: Breakdown comparisons for question 16 – input to review**

As Figure 6.3 shows there was a positive, upward shift in the number of respondents indicating they have had input to some degree into the appraisal review. While there was a significant change for ‘no review’ and ‘none’ options between the reconnaissance and evaluation, there was still just over a third of the respondents (32%) asserting they have not been involved in the appraisal review. This could be partly attributed to the number of new staff (fifteen) who joined the school at the beginning of 2010.

The comparison data for Q.17 to Q.20 presented in Figure 6.4 focused on appraisee and appraiser training. Question 17 showed a significant reduction (42 percentage points) in the number of respondents who have not received appraisee training in the last five years, and increased figures for all other response options. Despite the positive improvements in the figures for Q.17, results also revealed only 27% of
respondents indicated they have had adequate or extensive appraisee training in the last five years. While there was a 20 percentage point reduction in the number of respondents wanting appraisee training, a significant number of the respondents (49%) indicated there was still a need for further formal appraisee training.

Figure 6.4: Breakdown comparisons for questions 17 to 21– appraisee/appraiser training

![Graph showing breakdown comparisons for questions 17 to 21](image)

The comparison results for questions 19 and 21 as shown in Figure 6.4, indicated that the majority of respondents have not received any formal training as an appraiser in the last five years and despite the downward shift of 15% to 61% there was still a significant number of respondents that would like to receive formal training as an appraiser (Q.21). There was a small positive increase (11 percentage points) in the number of respondents who considered they had guidelines for their role as an appraiser (Q.20).

The comparison results for Q.22 (Figure 6.5) indicated there was considerable change in the focus and frequency of the links with development objectives. The dominant change was the dramatic increase in the range of options respondents now linked to their development objectives (4/5 options). In particular, the significant increase of links with strategic plans (12% to 50%) and annual plans (16% to 74%).
There was a moderate increase in the frequency of links with Learning Area (subject department) plans (64% to 82%).

**Figure 6.5: Breakdown comparisons for question 22- development objectives links**

The comparison results for Q.23 presented in Figure 6.6, shows the predominant increases were with the use of student evaluations (an increase of 37%), and with documentary evidence (an increase of 25%). A small decrease of 5% occurred with evaluative data being collected through self-evaluation.

**Figure 6.6: Breakdown comparisons for question 23- sources of data gathered**
The comparison results for Q.24 (Figure 6.7) showed that respondents now meet with their appraiser more frequently compared to the previous appraisal practice, with over two thirds of respondents (69%) now meeting at least once a term with their appraiser. There were still nearly one quarter (23%) of respondents who had only met once with their appraiser so far during this year’s appraisal cycle.

Figure 6.7: Breakdown comparisons for question 24- frequency of meetings with appraiser

Part Four – Areas of strength, change or improvement

The final part of the evaluation questionnaire invited respondents to describe the strengths of the reviewed appraisal process and suggest any areas that could be changed or improved upon. The responses were thematically coded and tallied and are shown in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4: Questionnaire part four: Areas of strength, change or improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Areas for change or improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Detailed, clear, easy to follow, clarifies expectations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paperwork: needs to be more concise and manageable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Encourages you to think about development objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Takes time to put together with evidence to a professional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Electronic, easy to edit and less wastage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appraiser – not experienced enough to be an appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotes professional conversations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A tedious, stressful compliance process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greater accountability compared to previous years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Too much data collection required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gives a more detailed description of job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish ‘common goals’ across staff before setting Professional learning programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehensive review of professional practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professional development has to be tied to development goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensures whole school productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Encourages reflection on teaching practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objective process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overwhelming strength of the reviewed appraisal practice, as shown in Table 6.4, is that it is perceived as being detailed, clear, and easy to follow and clarifies expectations (23 responses). While these are considered strengths by some respondents, there are equally as many respondents indicating the paperwork needs to be more concise and manageable to improve the overall process. This would suggest that this theme is also the major area of concern for respondents requiring change to bring about improvement. This could be considered a potential area of tension within the reviewed appraisal practice as it appears that respondents have different needs when it comes to the detail of documentation they personally require.

Two further themes had moderate frequency tallies suggesting they were areas of strength compared to the other responses collected. The reviewed appraisal practice encouraged staff to think about their development objectives (9 responses), and the electronic format for documentation was easy to edit, with less wastage of paper (6 responses). These themes related to specific changes implemented in the previous cycle of this research.

**CONCLUSION**

The evaluation cycle examined the reviewed appraisal practice through data obtained from the evaluation questionnaire undertaken with staff. The data has measured the teachers’ perceptions of the interventions implemented and provided feedback on how effective the changes have been when compared with the reconnaissance data. The data gathered during the evaluation cycle provided valuable feedback which is discussed in the next chapter summarising the final conclusions and recommendations drawn from this research project based on the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2003).
CHAPTER SEVEN
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION
The final chapter considers the overall conclusions and recommendations for this research project. The existing teacher appraisal documentation and practice was collaboratively reviewed and interventions implemented to improve practice at Pukeko High. The evaluation stage involved the assessment of the interventions implemented in the previous cycle and evaluated how effective the changes were. The following conclusions and recommendations are drawn from an analysis of appraisal related documentation, responses from teacher questionnaires (reconnaissance and evaluation), and feedback from participants in a focus group interview. Relevant literature is compare and contrasted with the findings. The limitations of the research are also summarised.

CONCLUSIONS
This section discusses the final conclusions against each of the relevant cycles of the PRAR model (Piggot-Irvine, 2002), reconnaissance, implementation and evaluation.

Reconnaissance cycle
An initial component of the action research reconnaissance cycle involved determining, from the literature, the key criteria for appraisal effectiveness. The review of current appraisal literature advocated that for effective teacher appraisal certain features should be evident in the process. From the literature review ten key criteria required for effective appraisal were distilled: an integrated development and accountability approach; based on objective informative data; confidential and transparent processes; the setting of deep objectives; well resourced with training and time; clarity; separation of discipline processes from appraisal; an educative process; and, high trust.
Additional components of the reconnaissance cycle included the analysis of existing appraisal-related documentation at Pukeko High (the policy and the procedural staff handbook), the collection and analysis of data from teacher questionnaires, and feedback from the focus group participants. Common themes emerged from the overall reconnaissance findings and these are reviewed under the effectiveness criteria for appraisal.

**An integrated development and accountability approach**
The findings from this study revealed that while the appraisal policy and PMAS staff handbook (2009) of Pukeko High espoused an integrated approach to appraisal, respondents indicated that the existing appraisal process was not a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff, it did not enhance organisational improvement and there were not clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives. This is in complete contrast to one of the most prominent criteria reported in the literature (Cardno, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2001; Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine, 2003), that is the importance of having an integrated approach to appraisal practice which balances the two purposes of appraisal (accountability and development). At times, organisations find the development and implementation of appraisal practice (policy and/or procedures) challenging to meet both the demands of accountability and development (Piggot-Irvine and Cardno, 2005)

**Objective and informative data**
The findings of this study revealed there were two issues for this criterion. One, there was only a partial match between the criterion and the appraisal-related documentation, and secondly there were conflicting results between two features of the questionnaire. While the questionnaire results inferred the appraisal process encouraged objective and factual discussions between appraisee and appraiser, the results also revealed that the process did not support the gathering of objective, data-based information. The reconnaissance results also showed that classroom observations and self-evaluation were the most frequent methods of gathering data during the appraisal cycle.
If an appraisal process is to be considered as a “valid, fair, rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff” (Piggot-Irvine, 2003, p. 172), objective data should be gathered from a multiple range of sources. Scriven (1989) also supports making use of multiple sources of data to enhance the reliability of assessment regarding a teacher’s performance. While the current appraisal practice allows for the gathering of data from multiple sources, the process does not encourage staff to do so. Nolan and Hoover (2008) make the point that encouraging appraisees to analyse their objective data with their appraiser, helps them to become “more thoughtful about their actions rather than focusing on autopilot” (p. 34).

**Confidential and transparent processes**

The overall findings of the reconnaissance cycle showed that there was a partial match with confidentiality and transparency, as a feature of effectiveness across the school’s appraisal policy and PMAS staff handbook. The analysis of the appraisal related documentation revealed that confidentiality was only referred to in the policy guidelines in reference to the confidentiality of written appraisal documentation. There was no match with transparency and any of the appraisal related documentation. This finding conflicted with the perceptions of the questionnaire respondents (80%) who indicated that the existing appraisal practice was a confidential and transparent process between parties involved.

Having confidential and transparent processes is an effectiveness criterion supported by many authors (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1996; Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005), as it is important that the information an appraiser deals with remains unadulterated and that all parties contributing information to the process are assured that confidentiality will be maintained. It is also set out in the mandatory performance management requirements (Ministry of Education, 1997), that the Board appraisal policy must include a statement on confidentiality, however, no clear guidance is provided within the Ministry’s guidelines as to the extent that the term “confidentiality” must cover.

**Setting of deep development objectives**

For this study, the perception of more than half of the questionnaire respondents (58%) was that the existing appraisal practice challenged them to set ‘deep’
development objectives. This result was of some interest and surprise to the TAG, considering the appraisal-related documentation gave minimal guidance as to the expected standard for development objectives, and the constraining design of the development objective template that staff were required to complete which did not encourage staff to consider how the achievement of the appraisal objectives would be assessed.

This finding does not match the recommendations by several authors (Fitzgerald, 2001; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005) who believe in the importance of the setting of ‘deep’ development objectives and plans for improvement, which includes the indicators for assessing the achievement of the objectives and link to required professional development. The establishment of deep appraisal objectives compared to the surface format are a feature of effective appraisal.

**Appraisal training**

The findings of this research indicated there was no match between the appraisal-related documentation, questionnaire responses or feedback from participants in focus group on the effectiveness appraisal criteria, appraisal training. The questionnaire results indicated that the majority of the respondents had not received any form of appraisal training in the last five years. An appraisal process must be well resourced with training for fundamental appraisal activities (Cardno, 1996; Fitzgerald, 2004; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2002). Dean (2002) advocates that all teachers need to engage in an appraisal training programme, with “top-up training” (p.81) periodically to accustom new staff with the school process and to refresh or remind staff about the overall appraisal process.

**Well resourced with time**

A finding of this research revealed there was no match between the appraisal-related documentation and the issue of time to undertake and complete the appraisal process. However the feature of time was an area of contention between participants of the focus group. While some participants believed the existing appraisal practice was considered manageable within the timeframe, others stated there was a lack of time to undertake the process. The literature (Cardno, 1996;
Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2003; Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003), promotes the importance of creating sufficient time to conduct and complete the process within the busy life of a school as essential to effective appraisal. The timing of each part of the overall process needs to be scheduled and fitted in with other commitments and pressure points on the school calendar. Dean (2002) writes that school leaders need to consider ways of making time available for classroom observations and appraisal interviews. Dean (2002) suggests considering the use of day relievers or in-service days to assist in undertaking parts of the overall process.

**Clarity**

A further key finding for the reconnaissance cycle was that the existing appraisal practice was affirmed as being well publicised, clearly laid out with detailed expectations and guidelines. The analysis of the appraisal documentation revealed the process could be enhanced further by providing more detailed guidance to teachers on the requirements and desired layout of the final appraisal report. Poster and Poster (1991) confirms that an effective appraisal process “gives individuals greater clarify of purpose through the provision of clear objectives” (p. 6). This is supported by authors who strongly believe (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005), that all appraisal-related documentation, that is, policy and procedures, should clarify all guidelines and required criteria and be well publicised within the school for effective implementation.

While the appraisal process promotes the discussion and confirmation of the individual job description between appraisee and appraiser, the findings identified a gap between process and practice. Individual job descriptions were not included with appraisal documentation issued to staff.

**An educative process**

A further finding was that even though the espoused purposes of the Pukeko High policy included: “to encourage and enable staff to improve their performance in their professional roles and, to provide staff with specific feedback on individual performance” (Pukeko High, 2009), the educative process was not supported and not translated into the procedures for appraisal. Although the questionnaire results indicated the existing process provided staff with the opportunity for feedback on
strengths, the findings revealed it was also common practice for appraisees to meet only once with their appraiser during the appraisal cycle to discuss progress in relation to their development objectives. The limited ‘contact time’ would suggest that the ability to develop relationships that are “based on bilateralism (shared control, shared thinking, shared evidence, shared planning and monitoring),” (Piggot-Irvine, 2003, p. 173) is limited, if not non-existent.

An educative process improves teachers own learning and development through confronting and solving problems therefore improving outcomes for teaching and learning (Cardno, 2005; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Piggot-Irvine, 2003).

**Trust**
A key finding was the absence of any match with the effective criterion trust, that is, the development of trust-based relationships. On reflection, the questionnaire should have included a more targeted question to seek more specific feedback on this criterion theme. Dean (2002) identifies the relational importance between the criterion of trust and the culture of the school as a component of effective appraisal. The culture of a school grows and develops from the school’s vision and values. In an organisation where there is shared vision and values, it is more likely that trust will exist (Dean, 2002). In a climate of trust, teachers are more likely to share and problem solve together and collaboratively progress.

The criterion of trust has some overlapping features with the previous criterion of an educative process. The educative process also supports the development of high trust which is essential for open, honest and respectful dialogue between the appraiser and appraisee (Middlewood, 2001; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Piggot-Irvine, 2003).

**Separation of discipline process from appraisal**
The findings of this research indicated that while respondents were aware of the potential tension if appraisal and attestation were not kept as separate processes, analysis of the appraisal documentation indicated a minimal match with this criterion. Policy guidelines referred to the use of arbitrator in the event of a dispute and the procedural handbook outlined dispute resolution regarding either appraisal or
attestation. There was an absence of reference within the appraisal policy to the separate staff discipline policy.
To maintain the development of trust and openness essential to the appraisal process, discipline processes must be kept separate from the appraisal process, with different personnel than the appraiser conducting disciplinary and competency proceedings if required (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005).

**A further general finding in this cycle**
A key finding from the reconnaissance cycle confirmed that the development and implementation of the founding appraisal documentation was not undertaken in a consultative manner with staff and that a collaborative review of the appraisal system had never been undertaken. Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) write that a significant contributing factor to how teachers perceive their appraisal system is whether they have been collaboratively involved in their organisation’s self review of the appraisal system. This view is also held by Nolan and Hoover (2002).

**Intervention cycle**
The guiding question for the intervention cycle focused on what changes needed to be planned and made to the existing practice. Following the interpretation of the reconnaissance data, the TAG implemented changes to the Pukeko High appraisal documentation and the PMAS staff handbook.

The most significant change to the appraisal documentation was the creation of generic appraisal documentation detailing a job description for each position within the school, merged with the appropriate Professional Teacher Standards and obligatory and optional examples of portfolio evidence for the key performance indicators. An essential component of appraisal is the development of a job description defining the roles and responsibilities and required standards of performance for all appropriate stakeholders (Piggot-Irvine and Cardno, 2005; Rudman, 2002). Each set of documentation was created as a template for staff to record the mandatory PMAS process at Pukeko High. The documentation was stored on the teacher electronic network and it was designed to be personalised and modified when downloaded by staff to their personal computer drive.
Modifications were also made to the second section of the appraisal documentation, the ‘Developmental Objectives’ and renamed this as ‘Development Portfolio’. The ‘Portfolio Development’ section was added to the handbook to provide an overview of what is an appraisal portfolio and examples were provided of what a portfolio might include. Portfolios have the potential to play an integral role in the appraisal process, meeting the needs of both assessment and professional development purposes (Wolf, 1994). The template for recording development objectives was expanded to include specific requirements aimed to guide staff to set ‘deep’ developmental objectives. This approach is supported by Piggot-Irvine (1999) who espouses the development of ‘deep’ appraisal objectives as a feature of effective appraisal. An additional template for staff to maintain their own record of professional learning and development was added to this section. A new section was added to the appraisal documentation incorporating guidelines for the final appraisal report to provide clarity and transparency with the expectations for the final report.

Revision of the PMAS staff handbook required several changes to align with the new appraisal documentation and remove duplicated information. What was depicted as the Performance Appraisal and Development Policy in the handbook was replaced to reflect the most current one (Pukeko High, 2009) adopted by the Board ensuring the integrity of the document was maintained. The TAG made two changes to the appraisal cycle, the number of formal lesson observations was increased to two and the minimum required number of meetings between the appraisee and appraiser was also increased. These changes were made as mechanisms to support not only the collection of objective and informative data but to increase the opportunities for dialogue between the appraiser and appraisee and therefore provide opportunities to build a stronger, more trusting relationship. These changes were depicted in the diagrammatic representation of the appraisal cycle included in the revised ‘Step by Step Guide’ that outlined the overall process against school calendar deadlines.

How the Professional Standards level descriptors were reported upon and the PMAS mandatory requirements were amended to reflect what was set out in the Secondary Teachers’ Collective Agreement (New Zealand School Trustees Association, 2007). Several sections of the staff handbook were removed (key aspects of PMAS/ timeline
summary of process, evidence indicators for appraisers, term by term timeline) as they were either duplicated elsewhere in the handbook or in the appraisal documentation. These actions were taken to enhance the clarity of the overall process, and promote openness and transparency. The list of appendices were removed from the handbook and made available electronically on the teacher network as a means of ensuring staff were working with the latest documents and to be environmentally friendly by keeping paper usage to a minimum.

Student feedback evaluation forms were reviewed and questions that sought feedback on the relational aspects of learning and teaching were added to the curriculum focused questions. It was anticipated that this would gather richer and broader data for teachers to reflect on. This was not however measured during this research project but would make an interesting topic for future research. Collecting data through student evaluations is one mechanism that contributes towards the accountability aspects of appraisal (Dean, 2002; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005).

The aim of streamlining the PMAS staff handbook, the centralisation of appraisal documentation, appendices and student evaluation forms electronically on the teacher network, were mechanisms implemented by the TAG for ease of administration of the appraisal process. The TAG also booked time in the start-up programme at the beginning of the following school year to introduce the planned changes and seek feedback on the changes. The aim here was to continue to involve staff in development of the interventions to the existing appraisal practice (Fitzgerald et. al., 2003; Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003). The opportunity to involve staff gave them some degree of ‘ownership’ of the changes.

Professional Learning sessions were also booked in the new school year for the TAG to present to staff the finalised PMAS Staff Handbook (Pukeko High, 2010), the requirements of an appraisee, how to set deep development objectives and, what the appraiser and appraisee can do to make the process effective. Further sessions for appraisal were booked for Terms 2 and 3 in the professional learning programme to provide time for appraisees to progress their appraisal.
Evaluation cycle

The guiding question for the evaluation cycle was: What are the teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the implemented changes? The results of the evaluation questionnaire were compared with the results of the reconnaissance questionnaire and the following key findings for the evaluation cycle were determined.

Strengths of the reviewed practice

The key findings for the evaluation cycle of the research indicated significant positive shifts for many features of the reviewed appraisal practice. The results of the implemented changes reflected an encouraging, upward shift across the spectrum of features surveyed, albeit in varying degrees of positiveness.

The features of the reviewed appraisal practice with the most significant upward shift were; that it was well publicised and explicitly detailed; the purpose of the appraisal system was clear; the process supported the gathering of objective, data-based information; and, there were clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives. These features are supported by several authors (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005) as espoused effectiveness criteria for appraisal. There was minimal downward movement for two features: the appraisal process challenged respondents to set deep appraisal objectives for improvement and the process provided staff with the opportunity for feedback on strengths. It therefore can be concluded, that either these implemented changes had little effect on these two desirable features or it might have been too early to determine the impact of them.

The implemented changes brought about an increase in the number of respondents who now met more frequently with their appraiser. There was also a significant positive change in the focus and frequency of the links respondents made between their development objectives and school related plans (strategic, annual, learning area), personal and professional areas of development.
Areas of reviewed appraisal practice requiring improvement

A key finding from the overall comparison of the reconnaissance and evaluation phase results showed there was still a need for further formal appraisal training. The training provided during the professional learning sessions was perhaps too concentrated and resulted in information overload, and in hindsight, not conductive to supporting long term change. The issue here is the busy-ness of a school and the competing demands for professional learning time. As a perceived need by the staff, a systematic process for school wide development in the area of appraisal training needs to be collaboratively considered and planned for (Cardno, 1996). Dean (2002) writes that most of the training for appraisal can be done in-house and while much of the training will involve discussion, it is a valuable aspect of the training as teachers identify with the process and understand that appraisal is done ‘with them’ and not ‘to them’.

One area of strength was also described by respondents as being the main area that required change or improvement. The reviewed appraisal process was described by a group of respondents as being detailed, clear, and easy to follow with expectations well clarified. In complete contrast to this, a similar number of respondents suggested the ‘paperwork’ needed to be more concise and manageable. This key finding signified that respondents have varying needs when it comes to the detail of documentation they personally believe is required to complete appraisal effectively.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

The review of the appraisal practice at Pukeko High was undertaken in a collaborative process and actively involved the staff. The concluding finding is that while the implemented changes resulted in significant positive shifts overall, several features have been identified that require further development to support an effective appraisal process at Pukeko High. The recommendations from this research for the Board, senior leadership team and staff at Pukeko High are outlined in the following section.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations to further improve the appraisal practice at Pukeko High have been synthesised from the data collected and the conclusions made during this research. A series of recommendations have been made and these are presented in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1: Recommendations for the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Pukeko High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review the Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Plan and implement explicit on-going training for appraisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide dedicated time for the appraisal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Re-evaluate the reviewed appraisal practice after another full cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inclusion of the Registered Teacher Criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy

The Performance Management Appraisal and Development Policy (Pukeko High, 2009) needs to be reviewed while taking the following recommendations into consideration. Staff should be more actively involved in the review of the policy. To achieve this, the review of the policy could be an agenda item at appropriate forums that allows for professional discussion to take place, that is, the Heads of Learning Area, Learning Area and Whanau Leaders meetings. This would see the adoption of a more collaborative approach than emailing out the policy to all staff as a method of seeking feedback at Pukeko High. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005), advocate that extensive consultation is required with staff in the development of a Teacher Appraisal Policy.

The collaborative review of the appraisal policy should also consider the identified gaps in the policy against the effectiveness criteria, if the policy is to support effective appraisal practice. In particular, the policy guidelines should provide greater guidance on how required interpersonal skills and a climate of trust could be developed amongst staff, the necessity for confidential and transparent processes, and the separation of discipline processes from the appraisal process. These are features of effective appraisal supported by the literature cited earlier in this chapter.
The policy guidelines relating to the minimum requirements for development objectives, and obtaining objective, informative data need to be more clearly defined. A specific guideline relating to the explicit training for appraisers would also strengthen and enhance the effectiveness of the overall appraisal policy. It is important that the espoused theory aligns with the practice, that is, the procedural documentation and practice at Pukeko High aligns with the appraisal policy and vice versa. The appraisal policy at Pukeko High needs to be reviewed and amended to match the improved practice. The appraisal policy is one of the key policies that all staff should know about and therefore should be a component within the induction programme for newly appointed staff (Dean, 2002).

**Training for appraisers**

While appraisal training was initially provided by the Ministry in 1997 with the introduction of performance appraisal, research undertaken by Fitzgerald (2004) revealed minimal training, if any, has taken place at either the national or local level since then. There is an identified need for further on-going and ‘deep’ training for appraisers at Pukeko High. Explicit training for appraisers to further develop their knowledge, increase their skills and confidence across the range of appraisal activities is required to develop consistency and quality across the organisation. In particular activities that develop confidence in managing dilemmas (Cardno, 1999), strengthen the educative process and build “respectful, trust-based and open relationships” (Piggot-Irvine, 2003, p. 176).

**Time**

Critical to the effectiveness of an appraisal system is the time dedicated by management to support the implementation of appraisal. Creating allocated time during meeting cycles or through the professional learning programme shows staff that appraisal is valued by the Board and senior leadership team as one means of improving learning and teaching at Pukeko High. It is essential that sufficient time is created or allocated for staff to not only complete the professional aspects of appraisal but engage in reflective practice, which Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) assert, is a component of effective teaching.
To create time and work smarter, staff should be encouraged to make greater use of ICT to support the implementation and on-going appraisal practices. For example, the use of the learning management network or the recently acquired Microsoft collaborative tools available through live@edu could reduce the workload required for the distribution, collection and analysis of peer and student feedback. This theme requires further exploration to consider potential barriers to this approach, for example, staff reluctant to use ICT or staff with limited ICT skills.

There is also a vast amount of student achievement data available to teachers through the student management system which is not being fully utilised by many staff. The data can be easily extracted and manipulated by teachers, to not only track student’s progress but for staff to reflect upon how they are going in comparison to their peers. Not all staff have the knowledge and skills to analyse data in depth and would require professional development before taking on aboard this approach.

Streamlining the gathering of data, that is, making data more accessible and compiling portfolio evidence against the performance indicators might give time back to staff to engage in other valuable activities, such as appraisal.

Re-evaluate the appraisal practice with staff after one further cycle.
The evaluation was undertaken before one full cycle of the implemented changes could be completed and detailed feedback on the final appraisal report was not able to be completed. It is recommended therefore that another collaborative review of the appraisal practice is undertaken with staff in twelve months time to gather data from an ‘in-practice’ viewpoint and to evaluate how well the implemented changes have been embedded. By then a second cycle of the reviewed appraisal practice would be near completion and it would be fascinating to see if and how the perceptions of staff have changed. The aim would be, to continue to refine and develop the appraisal practice at Pukeko High based on the action research methodology.

Inclusion of the Registered Teacher Criteria
The Registered Teacher Criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010) recently published the criteria for quality teaching in New Zealand that “will progressively
replace the Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions from 2010 as the standards for teacher registration. The *Registered Teacher Criteria* will be mandatory for all teachers renewing or reapplying for a practising certificate in 2011 (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010). They consist of two professional dimensions (professional relationships and professional values, and professional knowledge in practice), and include twelve criteria in total. Each criterion has associated indicators that explicitly outline what the criterion looks like in practice.

While all teachers in New Zealand should have received a copy of the handbook, distributed through their employer, further work is required at site level to ensure that the new *Registered Teacher Criteria* are included in appropriate school systems, policies and procedures. Teachers need to consider how the specified criteria will impact on their current practice and future requirements for appraisal, attestation and registration. At the time of writing, draft evidence guides were currently being trialled as part of the Council’s pilot programme and will be made available to the educational profession in due course (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010). The Board and SLT of Pukoko High will need to collaboratively lead and work with staff through the implementation phase as the requirements of the criteria are embedded into appraisal policy and procedures at Pukoko High.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

There were a number of limitations that may have had a bearing on the quality of findings within this research. As the research was only undertaken in one school, the findings, implications and recommendations are site specific. The results can not be generalised and applied to other schools.

One limitation of the research was that respondents had the opportunity to make written comments in particular sections of the questionnaires. This opportunity was not utilised by many of the respondents and some of the comments made did not relate to the theme of the question or did not expand on the theme. Some respondents engaged more fully with the questionnaire than others.
Another limitation was that some of the questionnaire findings were reported using lower level analysis and that there was some bias in the results due to ‘not applicable’ being assigned a numerical value.

A further limitation was the change over of staff between the two academic school years, with the reconnaissance questionnaire being completed in one school year (2009) and the evaluation questionnaire being undertaken in the following school year (2010). The respondent population was not consistent between the two questionnaires. The turnover of staff from one year to the next meant the some of the respondents were unfamiliar with the existing appraisal practice at Pukeko High and therefore had nothing to compare it to when they completed the evaluation questionnaire.

I am also aware that this thesis has not focused on one feature of the ‘black box’ (Timperley et. al., 2007), the link between teaching and student learning. While the implemented changes brought about an increase in the number of participants now linking their development objectives with strategic, annual and learning area plans, recent literature (Ministry of Education 2007; New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010; Timperley et.al., 2007) would suggest that the development of ‘deep’ appraisal objectives should include how they will impact on improving student learning. The breadth of this field, teacher and student learning, was beyond the scope of the current research questions which focused on improving appraisal systems and processes at site level.

FURTHER RESEARCH
This research was not able to gather and investigate existing examples of current exemplary teacher appraisal practice from other schools. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, a wider search through national educational agencies would need to be implemented to explore this theme in future research. Further research into establishing a model of best practice for appraisal in New Zealand secondary schools could provide a platform for professional dialogue within organisations as they undertake review of their appraisal process at local level and add to the body of literature.
As this research proposes, ICT could be utilised more fully in appraisal practice. A study exploring the benefits of a fully integrated, electronic based appraisal system would add a new dimension to educational appraisal literature. It would be interesting to establish a group of interested and committed teachers as a case study to research the amalgamation of effective appraisal practice and the advantages of modern technologies.

This research was not able to investigate ways to extend and shift the focus on setting ‘deep’ development objectives linked to improving student learning and raising student achievement. A study examining how to set deep development objectives that improve student learning would add to the body of literature.

As this research project has demonstrated, undertaking action research in a school environment is ideally suited as being part of change management process. It is a requirement of Boards to sustain a planned cycle of continuous self-review (Ministry of Education, 1993). Action research is an ideal methodology for schools to adopt as their framework for mini-projects focused on the wide range of school self review tasks.

**CONCLUDING COMMENT**

This research adds to the body of literature on teacher appraisal, a component of Performance Management through the review of existing appraisal practice at a large, co-educational South/East Auckland secondary school. The findings and recommendations will also be available to the wider educational community who may be interested in undertaking school review utilising action research methodology or have a specific interest in teacher appraisal. The continued success of the appraisal practice at Pukeko High will ultimately rest on the commitment of the leaders within the school responsible for teacher appraisal to strive for best practice, and on individual staff as to how they are supported to engage with the process.
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Effective Teacher Appraisal Questionnaire
Reconnaissance Phase

All information gained from this questionnaire will be treated in the strictest confidence, and will only be available to the researcher and supervisor.

Please complete and return the questionnaire to the Mrs Horner, Principals PA by next Monday [date inserted giving participants one week for completion]

PART ONE  Demographic Information

1. Are you:  
   □ a) Male  □ b) Female

2. Do you hold:  
   □ a) Full Registration  □ b) Provisional Registration

3. Do you work:  
   □ a) Full time  □ b) Part time

4. How many years have you been teaching?  
   □ a) Less than 2 years  □ b) Between 2-5 years  □ c) Between 5 – 10 years  □ d) 10+ years

5. Do you currently appraise staff?  
   □ a) Yes  □ b) No

Instructions:
Each statement is evaluated on a 5 point scale where the highest scoring is given a score of 5 (strongly agree) and lowest a score of 1 (strongly disagree). Participants are asked to tick the box that most closely aligns with their evaluation of that statement. Please tick only one box and not across more than one box. If you feel unable to complete an evaluation for a particular statement please leave it blank.

SCALE: 1= strongly agree  
2= agree  
3= not applicable / can’t comment  
4= disagree  
5= strongly disagree

PART TWO

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The appraisal process is well publicised and explicitly detailed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The purpose of the appraisal system is clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The intent of the appraisal process is centred on improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appraisal is an opportunity to confirm the job description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The appraisal process challenges me to set deep appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. What level of input have you previously had in the review of the current appraisal system?

- a) There has been no review in the time I have been at the school.
- b) None
- c) A little
- d) Adequate
- e) Extensive

Additional comments:

17. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraisee in the last five years?

- a) None
- b) A little
- c) Adequate
- d) Extensive

Additional comments:

18. Would you like to receive any training as an appraisee?

- a) Yes
- b) No

Additional comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Additional comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraiser in the last five years?</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) I have not been an appraiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. If you are currently an appraiser, do you have any guidelines for your role?</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) currently not an appraiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Would you like to receive formal training as an appraiser?</td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Were your development objectives for this appraisal round:</td>
<td>Tick as many that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) linked to the strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) linked to the annual plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) linked to your Learning Area plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) linked to personal areas of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) supported by professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What evaluative data do you gather during your appraisal cycle?</td>
<td>Tick as many that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) student evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) peer evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) documentary evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Other please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How often do you meet with your appraiser to discuss progress in relation to your development objectives?</td>
<td>a) once</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least once per term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Other please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. The feedback on your last appraisal was constructive.

Additional comments:

a) ☐ Yes
b) ☐ No
c) ☐ This is my first appraisal at BDSC

PART FOUR

- The strengths of the current appraisal process are:

- The changes or improvements I would like to see are:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire and contributing to the review of the appraisal process.

Please return completed questionnaire to the labelled box held by Sue Horner, Principals PA.

I invite you to participate as a focus group member as part of the reconnaissance phase of this research project. Please complete the accompanying detachable return slip should you wish to volunteer to be involved in a focus group interview.
INFORMATION SHEET

Title of Thesis:  
Improving Teacher Appraisal through action research: One school’s journey.

I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management degree in the Department of Education at Unitec Institute of Technology and seek your help in meeting the requirements of research for a Thesis course which forms a substantial part of this degree.

The aim of my project is to evaluate current teacher appraisal documentation and practice and to collaboratively implement changes that lead to improved practice. Following the implementation, the improvements will be evaluated and a model of effective teacher appraisal established.

I request your participation in the following way.

- I will be collecting data using a questionnaire.
- I will be conducting focus group interviews and would appreciate your contribution as a member of the group. I will also be asking you to sign a consent form regarding this event.

Neither you nor the college will be identified in the Thesis. To protect anonymity, I will limit reports to groups of views with a minimum of four people in any one subgroup (ie years teaching experience). I will be recording the focus group contributions and will provide a summary of findings for focus group members to check before data analysis is undertaken. If you have any queries about the project, you may contact my supervisor at Unitec Institute of Technology.

My supervisor is Eileen Piggot-Irvine and may be contacted by email or phone. Phone: (09) 815 4321 ext 8936. Email: epiggotirvine@unitec.ac.nz

Yours sincerely

KE Brinsden
ASSOCIATE PRINCIPAL

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2009 -1008
This study has been approved by the UNITEC Research Ethics Committee from (2 October 2009) to (31 November 2010). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 7248). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
CONSENT FORM - ADULTS

DATE:

TO: Teaching Staff of Botany Downs Secondary College

FROM: Karen Brinsden

RE: Master of Educational Leadership and Management

THESIS TITLE:
Improving Teacher Appraisal through action research: One school’s journey

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research and I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered. I understand that neither my name nor the name of my organisation will be used in any public reports.

☒ I agree to take part in the questionnaire for this project.

Signed: ___________________________________

Name: ___________________________________

Date: ___________________________________

PARTICIPATION IN A FOCUS GROUP

For part of the research, I would like to establish a focus group. The focus group will meet following the analysis of the questionnaire results. The findings of the questionnaire will be shared with the focus group members prior to the focus group interview. The aim of the interview is to provide participants with the opportunity to add depth to their questionnaire answers and clarify some of the perceived patterns from the questionnaire findings.

The focus group will be limited to a maximum of eight members, with the intention to have a mixed group with a range of teaching experience. Volunteers will be randomly selected from the slips returned.

The participants of the focus group will be provided with a summary of findings. Should a focus group member wish to withdraw they may do so at any time.

If you would like to volunteer to be a member of the focus group, please complete the consent section overleaf;
I would like to take part in the focus group for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years have you been teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ a) Less than 2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ b) Between 2-5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ c) Between 5 – 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ d) 10+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: ______________________________________

Name: ______________________________________

Date: ______________________________________

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2009 -1008
This study has been approved by the UNITEC Research Ethics Committee from (2 October 2009) to (31 November 2010). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 7248). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Effective Teacher Appraisal Questionnaire
Evaluation Phase

All information gained from this questionnaire will be treated in the strictest confidence, and will only be available to the researcher and supervisor. Please complete and return the questionnaire to the Mrs X by next Monday 9 August 2010.

PART ONE   Demographic Information

1. Are you: □ a) Male □ b) Female
2. Do you hold: □ a) Full Registration □ b) Provisional Registration
3. Do you work: □ a) Full time □ b) Part time
4. How many years have you been teaching? □ a) Less than 2 years □ b) Between 2-5 years □ c) Between 5 – 10 years □ d) 10+ years
5. Do you currently appraise staff? □ a) Yes □ b) No

Instructions:
Each statement is evaluated on a 5 point scale where the highest scoring is given a score of 5 (strongly agree) and lowest a score of 1 (strongly disagree). Participants are asked to tick the box that most closely aligns with their evaluation of that statement. Please tick only one box and not across more than one box. If you feel unable to complete an evaluation for a particular statement please leave it blank.

SCALE: 1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3= not applicable / neutral 4= agree 5= strongly agree

PART TWO
Please evaluate each of the implemented changes.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The appraisal process is well publicised and explicitly detailed.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The purpose of the appraisal system is clear.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The intent of the appraisal process is centred on improvement.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appraisal is an opportunity to confirm the job description.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The appraisal process challenges me to set deep appraisal objectives for improvement.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>There are clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The appraisal process is beneficial to career development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The appraisal process is a confidential and transparent process between parties involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The appraisal process supports the gathering of objective, data-based information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The appraisal process is a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The process encourages objective and factual discussions between appraisee and appraiser.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The appraisal process enhances individual, professional improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The appraisal process enhances organisational improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The appraisal process assists staff to identify future areas of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The appraisal process provides staff with the opportunity for feedback on strengths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART THREE**

Please tick the box that best fits your answer. Space has been provided should you wish to make any further comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>What level of input have you previously had in the review of the current appraisal system?</td>
<td>f) There has been no review in the time I have been at the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h) A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j) Extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional comments:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraisee in the last five years?</td>
<td>e) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h) Extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional comments:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Would you like to receive any training as an appraisee?</td>
<td>c) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional comments:*
19. Have you ever received formal appraisal training as an appraiser in the last five years?
   
   d) Yes
   e) No
   f) I have not been an appraiser

   Additional comments:

20. If you are currently an appraiser, do you have any guidelines for your role?
   
   d) Yes
   e) No
   f) Currently not an appraiser

   Additional comments:

21. Would you like to receive formal training as an appraiser?
   
   c) Yes
   d) No

   Additional comments:

22. Were your development objectives for this appraisal round: 

   Tick as many that apply.
   
   f) Linked to the strategic plan
   g) Linked to the annual plan
   h) Linked to your Learning Area plan
   i) Linked to personal areas of development
   j) Supported by professional development

   Additional comments:

23. What evaluative data do you gather during your appraisal cycle? 

   Tick as many that apply.
   
   g) Student evaluations
   h) Peer evaluations
   i) Self-evaluation
   j) Observation
   k) Documentary evidence
   l) Other please specify:

   ____________________

   Additional comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24. How often do you meet with your appraiser to discuss progress in relation to your development objectives? | d) □ once  
E) □ at least once per term  
F) □ Other please specify: |
| **Additional comments:**                                                  |                                                                        |
| 25. Are you completing your current appraisal documentation:              | 26. □ electronically  
27. □ hard copy (paper)  
28. □ electronically and hard copy |
| **Additional comments:**                                                  |                                                                        |
| 29. The inclusion of the generic job description for your position in the appraisal documentation: | **Tick as many that apply.**  
a) □ was an accurate reflection of my role  
b) □ provided guidance for my role  
c) □ prompted discussion with appraiser  
d) □ prompted confirmation of job description  
e) □ identified a development goal |
| **Additional comments:**                                                  |                                                                        |
| 30. In regards to your current development plan, does it include:         | **Tick as many that apply.**  
a) □ challenging, deep, rich goals  
b) □ detailed actions for achievement  
c) □ identification of support required  
d) □ measurable outcomes for your objectives |
| 31. The guidelines and template for completing the final appraisal report are helpful to produce a quality document. | a) □ Yes  
b) □ No  
c) □ have yet to look at it |

**Additional comments:**
PART FOUR

- The strengths of the current appraisal process are:

- Further changes or improvements I would like to see are:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire and contributing to the review of the appraisal process.

Please return completed questionnaire to the labelled box held by the Principals PA.
## Developmental Objectives - Goals for 20[...]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Wide (see Strategic/Annual Plan)</th>
<th>Development Objectives / Goals (Short/Medium/Long Term)</th>
<th>KPI: What I need to do</th>
<th>Support Required/Resources</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Portfolio Evidence (Eg links to documentation)</th>
<th>Reflection: eg. Summary of progress, reflective journal, feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appraisee's Comments:** (Comment on achievement of developmental objectives)

Date:

**Appraiser's Comments:** (Comment on achievement of developmental objectives)

Date: