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ABSTRACT

This study set out to examine performance appraisal systems, more specifically the ways that state primary schools integrate the dual purposes of accountability and development that characterise teacher appraisal in New Zealand.

A qualitative methodology was employed for this research, which focused on two primary schools. At each school, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the principals, and focus group discussions were undertaken with eight teachers in groups of four (appraisers and appraisees separately). A document analysis relating to the performance appraisal systems in each school, as well as external policy documents was also performed. The data collected were used to identify themes and commonalities across the schools in a cross-school analysis.

The findings indicate that there is a variety of approaches to performance appraisal, although the dual purposes of accountability and development are both evident in the schools studied. As the literature and the data showed, successful appraisal can be achieved if certain conditions exist. These conditions are: effective leadership; trusting relationships; clear systems; and staff ownership of the appraisal process. Conversely, there were several challenges identified: the lack of clarity of appraisal terminology, closely linked with the confusion associated with the two sets of governing teacher standards; the lack of time for effective appraisal; having trust in the system and the people; and, finally, having clearly defined roles.

These findings suggest that school leaders need to ensure that the performance appraisal systems that are created and implemented, meet the dual purposes of accountability and development. The recommendations arising from this study have implications for schools that include: developing a clearly defined appraisal process; maintaining a school culture which fosters collaboration, trust and learning; allocating sufficient time and resources for performance appraisal; and having clearly delineated roles for all stakeholders. The final recommendation is aimed at the Ministry of Education and the need to consolidate the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) and the Professional Standards for Primary School Teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b) into one set of governing standards for teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

An array of educational reforms occurred in New Zealand in the late 1980s with the implementation of Tomorrow’s Schools (Government of New Zealand, 1988). Two aims of these reforms were improved quality of teachers and schools, and an education system that was more economically efficient (Cardno, 1999). Tomorrow’s Schools (Government of New Zealand, 1988) led to public accountability, ongoing and concurrent performance management policies were systematically introduced to assess, evaluate, regulate and monitor teachers (Fitzgerald, 2008). The notion of quality education came to the fore, and a greater level of accountability was placed on schools to ensure that quality teaching and learning was occurring.

Tomorrow’s Schools (Government of New Zealand, 1988) also saw the creation of self-managing and autonomous schools. Schools were now managed by a locally appointed Board of Trustees (BoT) which consisted of elected representatives of parents and staff, and the principal as the CEO. BoTs were given the responsibility of managing personnel and ensuring that their school had quality teachers delivering the curriculum resulting in a high quality education for students. Until 1988, the Department of Education had been charged with the inspection and assessment of teachers and schools in New Zealand (Fitzgerald, 2008). As a result of the reforms, the Department of Education was replaced with the Ministry of Education. Alongside the MoE, the Education Review Office (ERO) was established as the audit agency to assess and report overall school performance to the BoT and Government. A main component of this ERO audit was to ensure that schools had an effective performance management system. The challenge for schools was to have mechanisms in place to ensure that quality teaching and learning was occurring.

One such mechanism was performance appraisal, which became a mandated requirement in New Zealand schools in 1997 (Ministry of Education, 1997). Performance appraisal is the focus of this research. There was a requirement that Boards of Trustees would have policies and procedures in place to ensure that
teachers were accountable for their performance and that this appraisal process was closely linked to professional development. The Education Review Office (2000) clearly mirrored that notion stating that within a performance management system, appraisal should be related to and inform teacher development. Sinnema and Robinson (2007) expand on this further stating that there should be “clear links between the appraisal of individual performance and professional development plans at all levels of the school: the individual level, the team level, and the school wide level” (p.3). These links are important if strategic goals and organisational learning are to be achieved.

To support schools in meeting this mandatory requirement, *The Guidelines on Performance Management Systems (PMS1-5)*, (Ministry of Education, 1997) were produced. In a report from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on New Zealand education Nusche, Laveault, MacBeth, and Santiago (2012) propose that throughout the *PMS1-5* document the primary focus of performance appraisal was to be a supportive and developmental process that assisted teachers in their professional career development. Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) agree stating that the espoused theory of this reform was improved teaching through a reflective approach.

However, as a conclusion of their study into the perceptions of teachers in relation to appraisal, Fitzgerald, Youngs, and Grootenboer (2003) argue that in reality there was a greater focus on accountability through a managerial, hierarchical, and individualistic system. This can be attributed to the implementation of the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999b). The intent of the standards was as a framework for teacher appraisal when identifying teacher development priorities. However, schools viewed these standards as a way for the Ministry of Education to increase their control over schools. Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) conclude that this “resulted in schools implementing appraisal processes that were largely bureaucratic, even though they were seen as detrimental to the developmental aspects” (p. 78) because of the school’s tendencies to reduce the process to a tick box approach against the *Professional standards for primary school teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999b).
Much of the literature (Cardno, 2012; Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Piggot-Irvine, 2002;) concedes that there must be clear links between the two concepts of accountability and development in appraisal systems, but other literature (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Fitzgerald, Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003; Fullan & Mascall, 2000; Gratten, 2004) has found that this has been a challenge in some New Zealand schools. Therefore, integrated appraisal systems that meet these dual purposes (accountability and development) are at the centre of this research project. This chapter continues with 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 RATIONALE

This research focused on performance appraisal systems, more specifically the ways that schools integrate the dual purposes of accountability and development that characterise appraisal in New Zealand state schools. The rationale for conducting this research is threefold, being concerned with:

1. The historical issues that saw performance appraisal mandated by the government to help improve the quality of teachers and student achievement;
2. The rhetoric around the quality imperative for the purpose of performance appraisal leading to a focus on improving teaching and learning. The two aims here are accountability and staff development; and
3. Personal experiences focused around the confusion related to the purpose and process of performance appraisal that has existed in primary schools where I was employed.

Historical issues: Performance appraisal that meets the dual purposes of accountability and development were legislated for in 1996, when the Ministry of Education (MoE) gazetted the National Policy of Matters to be taken into Account (Ministry of Education, 1996) by the employer in relation to the appraisal of teachers. The ‘Principles’ of this document state that:

Boards of Trustees should ensure that policies and procedures for the appraisal of teacher performance:
i. Are part of an integrated performance management system operating within the school;

ii. Are appropriate to individual teachers, the schools and wider community;

iii. Are developed in a consultative manner with teachers;

iv. Are open and transparent;

v. Have a professional development orientation;

vi. Are timely and helpful to the individual teacher;

vii. Give consideration to matters of confidentiality, including the provisions of the Privacy Act and the Official Information Act.


What is outlined in The Principles reiterates what schools must provide in a performance management system in relation to appraisal. These mandated requirements were part of the quality imperative which had, and still has, direct links to the political environment of teacher accountability and performance (Codd, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2008). This involves teachers being accountable for their actions and as Brundett & Rhodes (2011) state “to be accountable to the many stakeholders in education entails offering an account of performance and to justify this in relation to established or expected standards” (p. 4). This links directly to the dual definitions of quality that Sallis (2002) offers.

Sallis’ (2002) first definition is that “quality is about measuring up to pre-determined standards and meeting those standards time and time again” (p. 13). The second definition refers to the notion of transformational quality. Sallis (2002) argues that transformational quality “has less to do with systems and procedures and more to do with continuous improvement and organisational transformation” (p.13). This links directly to the mandated appraisal requirements which were implemented to provide a framework for this continuous improvement to occur and consequently raise the quality of teaching in New Zealand schools (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Fitzgerald, 2008). According to this MoE policy, teacher appraisal needed to have direct links to teachers’ development and this became the focus of appraisal.
However, as noted in the introduction to this chapter, the implementation of the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) changed this. The intentions of the standards were to: provide a framework for teacher appraisal; give a focus for identifying development priorities; and to ensure a consistent approach to performance appraisal within the education sector. In reality, the introduction of the standards led to a merging of the development focus of performance appraisal with the somewhat conflicting accountability aspect of the *Professional standards for primary teachers (PS)* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and, as a result, accountability became dominant. This is supported by Piggot-Irvine (2000) who, in a study of performance appraisal in New Zealand Primary schools, found that many principals “had jettisoned the developmental focus on appraisal and were using a checklist against the professional standards alone” (p.333). Several other writers (Fitzgerald, 2008; Forrester, 2011; Oldroyd, 2005) concur, stating that in general, performance appraisal had fostered a competitive culture leading to a focus on targets, checklists of performance, and a decline in teacher trust. Fitzgerald et al. (2003) suggests that the introduction of the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) increased the level of bureaucratic control over the teaching profession. Clearly, the development purpose of performance appraisal was no longer a strong feature of teacher appraisal systems.

Therefore, this study aimed to investigate how schools managed the integration of accountability and development within performance appraisal systems. Its key concerns were:

1. The purposes and approaches that schools adopted in relation to performance appraisal;
2. The integration of the *Professional standards for primary teachers (PS)* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and/or the *Registered teacher criteria (RTC)* (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) within the school performance appraisal system;
3. The conditions or strategies that school use to effectively integrate accountability and development purposes of performance appraisal; and
4. The challenges that school must overcome to effectively implement the dual purposes of accountability and development.
Furthermore, research over the last ten years in relation to achieving these dual purposes of accountability and development, has been inconclusive. Schools in New Zealand have been struggling for the last two decades to effectively implement this policy and create performance appraisal systems that serve dual purposes at the same time (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001). The issue of achieving the integration of accountability and development has been made even more challenging by the fact that these purposes occur at different levels. These levels are: at an external level relating to the education system mandated by the government; at an organisation or school level; and lastly at an individual level, both from a professional and personal viewpoint. Several writers (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005) summarise these levels and the purposes in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Multi-level purposes of appraisal systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Purpose: Accountability</th>
<th>Purpose: Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>School review and audit</td>
<td>Improving the quality of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>Charter goals</td>
<td>School Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL Professional</td>
<td>Management decisions</td>
<td>Performance Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL Personal</td>
<td>Professional responsibility</td>
<td>Self-reflection and improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997, p. 5; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001, p. 6; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005, p. 25)

As Table 1.1 shows, appraisal is a complex mechanism with dual purposes and must be considered through different lenses. In this instance the purposes of appraisal are co-dependent and cannot be separated as the individual needs of the teacher and the organisation’s goals must be met (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). Balancing the dual purposes of accountability and development with the needs of the organisation and individuals presents a challenge for educational leaders.
Another theory presented is that performance appraisal sits within the political environment of performativity and measurement, implying that appraisal has been captured as a managerial tool (Fullan & Mascall, 2000). Therefore accountability can be more of a focus (Codd, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2008). Middlewood and Cardno (2001) concur, stating that the accountability aspect dominates; therefore, schools struggle to implement effective performance appraisal systems that serve dual purposes. However, in contrast, a recent OECD report on New Zealand education, Nusche et al. (2012) postulate that the performance appraisal and development processes in some schools are perceived as effective. This contrast supports the need for further research to be done in this area.

The OECD report on New Zealand education (Nusche et al., 2012) also offers recommendations to further enhance current practice. These recommendations are based around the Professional standards for primary teachers -PS (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and the Registered teacher criteria -RTC (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b). The PS are part of the Collective Employment Agreement for teachers while the RTC are criteria that teachers must meet in order to be registered to teach in New Zealand schools.

The report suggests clarifying the use of these two sets of standards that govern teacher performance, indicating that the OECD recognise that confusion has arisen in New Zealand in regards to the terms ‘accountability’ and ‘development’ since the introduction of the Registered teacher criteria (RTC) in 2010. This appears to have added another layer of complication to an already problematic system. The New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC) replaced the Satisfactory teacher dimensions that had been in place since 1996 with the new Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b). This added to the discourse and confusion around performance appraisal as there were now two different sets of standards that teachers needed to meet (Nusche et al., 2012). This confusion is consistent with my professional experience, which leads me to question current practice and the level of understanding that schools have relating to the purpose and management of performance appraisal.
The literature review presented in Chapter Two, is inconclusive regarding the success of integrated performance appraisal systems currently employed by New Zealand state schools. Therefore, this research contributes to existing knowledge in this field and provides recommendations that identify the strategies and conditions that schools and principals should adopt to successfully manage the dual purposes of performance appraisal of teachers – accountability and development.

DATA COLLECTION
Two data collection sites were selected for this study. The two schools where the research was conducted were New Zealand state primary schools. The schools were chosen using the following criteria: locality, a well-established and experienced principal, and a school roll of 500 or more students. These schools ranged from 600 to 850 students and are in the same geographical area within a New Zealand city. The principals have been at the schools for six and ten years respectively, which suggests they have been involved in the development of the current performance appraisal system at their schools.

RESEARCH AIMS
The aims of this research project were:
1. To critically examine the experiences of principals, appraisers and appraisees in implementing a performance appraisal system that effectively integrates accountability and development; and
2. To identify the strategies and conditions that principals, appraisers and appraisees perceive as important in implementing a performance appraisal system that effectively integrates accountability and development.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
1. What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)?
2. What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important?
3. What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?

**ORGANISATION OF THESIS**

The thesis is organised into seven chapters. Chapter One has presented an overview of this research project, a rationale that justifies the study and an outline of the research aims and questions.

Chapter Two presents a literature review that critically evaluates the literature relevant to the study.

The research methodology and design are examined in Chapter Three. I have explained the reasons for taking a subjectivist epistemological position, choosing a qualitative methodology and adopting the three data collection methods of document analysis, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the ways in which validity and reliability have been addressed, along with the ethical issues relevant to the research.

Chapter Four outlines the findings from the document analysis of school documents and other documents from a variety of external sources that related to the performance appraisal of teachers.

Chapter Five describes the data collection and analysis process from the semi-structured interviews with the principals from each of the two schools, and the data collection from the focus group discussions with the appraisers and the appraisees from each of the study schools.

Chapter Six discusses the data in relation to the research questions. I have linked this analysis to the literature regarding performance appraisal system in schools.

Chapter Seven completes the thesis with the presentation of the five key conclusions of the project, a review of the possible limitations of the research and final recommendations with regards to practice and further research.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION
This chapter reviews literature that is concerned with the performance appraisal of teachers. Although this study takes place in New Zealand, teacher performance appraisal is a global concept and it is prudent to discuss this before specifically exploring the New Zealand context. Before commencing the review, several terms are defined to provide the reader with an understanding of how these terms are applied within this study. This review then considers the notion of performance appraisal that meets the dual purposes of accountability and development. The concept of an integrated appraisal system is discussed, followed by the identification of the key characteristics that can make appraisal successful.

There are several significant themes that emerge from the literature. These themes are: the multiple purposes for performance appraisal; building trusting relationships in the context of appraisal; and, lastly, the role of the principal in appraisal. These themes form the sub-headings in the second part of this chapter. The chapter is structured in the following way: the global context of performance appraisal; performance appraisal terminology; the effective characteristics of performance appraisal; the links between accountability and development in a performance appraisal system; and, lastly, the themes identified within the literature base focused on the New Zealand context.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FROM A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE
Since the 1980s there has been an unprecedented era of educational reform across the globe. Schools, and other educational institutions around the world, have experienced a time of unprecedented “government intervention in terms of the curriculum that is taught and the ways in which educational establishments are monitored” (Brundett & Rhodes, 2011, p. 1). The notions of quality and accountability in schools have been at the forefront of this educational reform. Mausethagen (2013), in a study related to this increased focus on accountability within the educational context and the associated impact on teacher relationships, found that there were two key factors that led to these significant changes in educational policy relating to
teacher accountability around the world. The two key factors identified were a range of policy statements from the United States in the 1980s concentrating on the agenda of restructuring education, and the involvement of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Since the 1990s the OECD has produced many documents and reports relating to the educational policy reforms around the world. Mausethagen (2013) recognises the significance of these reports and explains that “the OECD plays an important role in legitimizing new initiatives in national policy development” (p. 18). In the context of performance appraisal these changes to accountability policies “place a greater focus on student performance and often position goals and outcomes outside the control of the professions. These developments have led to a stronger emphasis on policies related to individual self-discipline and accountability of performance” (Mausethagen, 2013, p. 18). This was mirrored in New Zealand which saw Tomorrow’s Schools (Government of New Zealand, 1988) implemented in the 1980s. This was major reform.

This reform changed the focus for schools as they become much more accountable. Smyth and Shacklock (1998) concur stating that schools were becoming market driven environments where there was a:

changing ideology and discourse of schooling (where students=customers; teachers=producers; and learning=outcomes). Coupled with this is a worldwide move towards recentralising control over education through national curricula, testing, appraisal, policy formulation…while giving the impressions of decentralisation and handing control down locally. The perception of teachers’ work is also changing and being promoted as deliverers of knowledge, testers of learning and pedagogical technicians. (p.20)

In reality teachers are working in cultures more focussed around performativity and managerialism. This means that teachers are being subjected to tighter control by outsiders, more efficient forms of accountability, more sophisticated surveillance of outcomes, and greater reliance on measures of competence and performance (Codd, 2005; Forrester, 2011; Smyth & Shacklock, 1998). This is closely linked to the perceived notion of poor quality teaching mentioned in Chapter One, and the resulting public perception that the imposition of benchmarks, objectives and accountability as
the solution, is a threat to the teaching profession (Fitzgerald, 2008; Forrester, 2011). Fitzgerald (2008) refers to this as the “erosion of trust in teachers and their professional knowledge, autonomy and expertise” (p.113). This type of control over teachers can have a negative effect on performance appraisal. Piggot-Irvine (2000) identifies these effects as defensive routines such as resistance, non-compliance and avoidance. Coupled with these are the concepts of cynicism and controlling relationships between staff. Robinson (1992) suggests that these controlling relationships are in direct conflict with the notion of collaboration and internal commitment, which are essential elements of effective performance appraisal. The global discourse around education, with particular focus on the concepts of performance appraisal and teacher accountability, has impacted heavily on New Zealand schools through the major changes in policy and practice.

One such impact is the notion of teacher professionalism and how teachers are perceived in the New Zealand education setting. Teacher professionalism and the challenges of maintaining this in the current political environment of accountability is summarised by Carr and Harnett (1996) who state that:

...the professionalism of teachers is based on the recognition of their right to make autonomous judgements about how, in particular institutional and classroom contexts, to develop their students’ capacity for democratic deliberation, critical judgement and rational understanding. Without this kind of professional autonomy teachers have no protection against external coercion and pressure, and they quickly become neutral operatives implementing the ‘directives’ of their political masters and mistresses. (p.195)

Teacher professionalism is an important concept that must be addressed in schools. A culture of professionalism emphasises practice more than outcomes and has a more open-ended method to curriculum design, allowing unexpected results to surface and the growth of diverse human aptitudes such as creativity, imagination and critical thinking (Codd, 2005). This professional approach is based around cooperation, reciprocity, trust and shared respect between colleagues (Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003). If this approach is developed and fostered within a school culture, the quality of the education can be enhanced, as teachers are empowered and become
deliberate and proficient learners (Gunter, 1996). Therefore, educational leaders need to foster teacher autonomy and encourage the development of a more self-reflective culture within a framework of teacher collaboration. This relates directly to the notion of reflective practice and self-development.

With the implementation of *Performance management in New Zealand schools* (Ministry of Education, 1996), the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and the *Registered teacher criteria* (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) there has been an increase in professional accountability and a greater emphasis on control mechanisms. However, one question remains unanswered: “Will teachers see this as a regime of managerial control or as occupational empowerment?” (O'Neill & Scrivens, 2005, p. 191).

In summary, education has changed dramatically in the last 30 years throughout the world, and New Zealand is no different. New Zealand education has undergone major policy change since the 1980s and, as stated earlier, there have been challenges to successfully implementing these changes. However, there have been positive changes. Before identifying themes within the research literature that are important to consider for educational leaders when dealing with performance appraisal systems, it is important to establish a clear understanding of the relevant appraisal terminology.

**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL TERMINOLOGY**

There are several terms associated with performance appraisal that need to be clarified at this point. Human resource management (HRM), more specifically the notions of mutuality, or vertical fit; and adopting a hard or soft approach for performance appraisal need to be introduced and defined. Then the following terms are discussed: performance management, performance appraisal, attestation, accountability, and teacher development.

**Human resource management (HRM)**

‘Performance management’ originates from the area of Human resource management (HRM), and comprises an array of human resource actions that contribute to an
organisation’s success (Rudman, 2002). Several notions need to be defined which have a direct impact on performance management under the HRM framework. These are the concepts of mutuality, or vertical fit; and adopting a hard or soft approach in relation to performance management and performance appraisal.

Educational leaders must focus on creating a balanced approach to performance management that ensures both the goals of the individual and the needs of the organisation are met. The link between these goals is referred to as mutuality. This sits within the HRM framework and is referred to as the ‘vertical fit’. ‘Vertical fit’ is seen as the balance between the organisation and its strategic goals and that of the employee and their skills and behaviours. Rudman (2002) postulates that HRM is underpinned by the premise that employers and employees share a common cause and there is a central theme of alignment or mutuality i.e. both benefit. In relation to performance management, schools can adopt a ‘soft’ or ‘hard’ approach. The ‘hard’ purposes are driven by accountability and bureaucratic drivers. More ‘soft’ purposes link with development objectives and have some sense of professional autonomy (Fitzgerald, Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003). The notions of ‘soft’ or ‘hard’ approaches are important considerations as they directly relate to ‘bureaucratic’ and ‘professional’ approaches to performance management and appraisal.

Performance management

The terms ‘performance management’ and ‘performance appraisal’ are often used interchangeably but they are in fact quite different concepts. In an education context performance management concerns the policies and procedures which ensure that teachers provide an effective educational programme that fully meet the needs of students (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Ministry of Education, 1997). Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) add that performance management is an encompassing system that incorporates the following: induction, appraisal, job descriptions, remuneration, promotion, discipline, and exit. A key task of an educational leader is to ensure that teacher’s performance is managed appropriately. In a school context, performance management may be summarised as having three personnel management functions as described by Cardno (2012). These are:

1. The induction and initial monitoring of staff;
2. The appraisal of staff; and
3. The professional development of staff (Cardno, 2012, p. 91).

These three functions characterise an effective performance management system.

The purpose of performance management, therefore, is to develop and use staff abilities to maximise the achievement of students, develop high quality teachers, and enhance organisational success. Cardno (2012) concurs, and defines performance management as “as an integrated and diverse set of organisational activities that are aimed at achieving strategic organisational ends” (p.91). According to the Ministry of Education (1997), sound performance management systems provide a systematic approach to goal setting and link school objectives to the performance of each individual staff member (Ministry of Education, 1997). Performance management has “the capacity to shape and reshape schools, colleges and universities” (Forrester, 2011, p. 7). Performance management is expected to involve the development and implementation of policies and procedures to ensure that the teachers and staff of schools provide education and services that fully meet the needs of their students (Ministry of Education, 1996). Performance appraisal is one element of a performance management system.

**Performance appraisal**

In contrast to ‘performance management’, ‘performance appraisal’ is a form of teacher evaluation (Cardno, 2012; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). A common definition of ‘performance appraisal’ is that it is a set of evaluative activities used by an organisation to enhance employee performance by clarifying expectations, setting improvement objectives, gathering data and providing feedback and support (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Perillo, 2006). Performance appraisal is one of the three core functions of a performance management system. In an educational context, performance appraisal encompasses both the effectiveness of the individual teacher, and their accountability for their performance. Fullan and Mascall (2000) postulate that appraisal is “part of a political movement of accountability: teachers are seen as public servants who should be accountable for their work” (p.41). This is referring to the political and policy environment of performativity and measurement that appraisal sits in, thus implying in itself that appraisal has been captured as a managerial tool (Codd, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2008; Smyth & Shacklock, 1998).
Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1997) also offer a definition stating that “performance appraisal involves introducing a staff member to the job, outlining expectation of performance, monitoring this performance, and assisting them through formal and informal staff development to do the job well” (p.11). Piggot-Irvine (2003) elaborates, noting that appraisal must be an on-going process that involves teachers in a dialogue about performance data, which provides a basis for considering what needs to be improved. The Education Review Office (2013) takes a similar position, noting that “performance appraisal establishes objectives for teachers and leads to professional growth through reflection and formal feedback” (p.1). Effective performance appraisal enables teachers to self-evaluate on the basis of their ability to enquire into and strengthen the relationship between their own teaching and the learning and achievement of their students (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007). These authors clearly incorporate the vocabulary of improvement within their definitions of performance appraisal. In an *OECD Review of evaluation and assessment in education in New Zealand*, Nusche et al. (2012) identify that teacher appraisal occurs in “two specific instances: (1) To gain or renew registration to teach; and (2) as part of the employer's performance management processes for salary progression and professional learning and development” (p.24). Clearly performance appraisal is a system that needs to serve the dual purposes of accountability and development. Accountability is now explained.

**Accountability**

‘Accountability’ is one of the key purposes associated with performance appraisal and therefore a clear understanding of this term is required. Accountability is a term found in literature concerned with performance management and performance appraisal. It has its origins in the field of HRM and quality (Sallis, 2002). Accountability “describes a relationship in which one party has an obligation, contractual or otherwise, to account for their performance of certain actions to another” (Brundett & Rhodes, 2011, p. 22). In the context of education, to be accountable to the variety of stakeholders requires offering an explanation of teacher performance and being able to justify this in relation to expected outcomes or standards (Brundett & Rhodes, 2011; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). In the New Zealand context, these standards would be the *Registered teacher criteria* and the *Professional standards for primary teachers*. As noted earlier in this chapter, the implementation of *Performance Management Systems: PMS1*: 
Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997), was intended to improve the quality of teaching and learning. O’Neill and Scrivens (2005) postulate that “at any given time and place, teacher accountability procedures have been deliberatively created by particular groups to achieve certain political ends” (p.184). Accountability is, in essence, meeting pre-established expectations or standards which is related to the notion of quality (Sallis, 2002). In the New Zealand education system a term closely associated with accountability is ‘attestation’. This term is used widely in New Zealand schools but finding a definition in the literature concerned with appraisal in New Zealand schools is problematic. Attestation is used in discussion around the measurement or assessment of teacher performance which is linked with pay-scale progression and teacher registration (Nusche et al., 2012).

Teacher development
Another important purpose of performance appraisal included within the integrated appraisal model is ‘teacher development’. Teacher development “is widely accepted as fundamental to the improvement of organisational performance and, therefore, is a core task of management and leadership” (Bolam, 2002, p. 103). From a leadership point of view, teacher development is about providing staff with the opportunity to reflect, grow and learn so they have the greatest impact on student achievement as possible. This is a challenge in an “ever-changing world but educators themselves have to continue learning in order to fulfil their tasks with a sense of efficacy” (Oldroyd, 2005, p. 187). Therefore, it is essential that teachers participate in professional development.

In New Zealand the term ‘professional development’ has been used as a “catch-all phrase for the various training courses and initiatives used to extend teachers’ knowledge and practice” (Education Review Office, 2009, p. 4). While this term is still prevalent, it is often used in conjunction with the term ‘professional learning.’ Professional learning is a broader concept that refers to what teachers have gained from their formal professional development, while acknowledging that teachers also acquire knowledge and understanding in informal ways. Teachers get better at teaching through various formal and informal forms of feedback, professional dialogue, reflection and action. The phrase ‘Professional learning and development’ (PLD), captures this complexity and reflects the diverse ways in which teachers develop their
skills, abilities, and approaches for the benefit of students (Education Review Office, 2009). The key words associated with teacher development are: learning, growth, reflection, and improvement.

**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL – Effective characteristics**

Effective appraisal occurs when the dual purposes of accountability and development are balanced. Piggot-Irvine (2003) notes that effective “appraisal interactions are non-controlling, non-defensive, supportive, educative and yet confidential” (p.172). The following diagram outlines the criteria which are essential for effective appraisal to occur.

![Diagram of Criteria for Effective Appraisal](image)

*Figure 2.1  Elements of effective appraisal  
Source: (Piggot-Irvine, 2003, p. 173)*

Many authors concur with the Piggot-Irvine (2003) criteria for effectiveness, although they may use slightly different terminology. These links are presented in Table 2.1 on the following page.
Table 2.1  Links between Piggot-Irvine’s criteria for effective appraisal and other authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Effective Appraisal</th>
<th>Links with other authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An educative process</td>
<td>Cardno (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Review Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlewood (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlewood and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust / Mutual respect</td>
<td>Middlewood and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moreland (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tschannen-Moran (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated accountability and</td>
<td>Cardno (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>Fitzgerald (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlewood (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piggot-Irvine and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-resourced with training and</td>
<td>Cardno and Piggot-Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>(1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudman (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youngs and Grootenboer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on objective and informative data</td>
<td>Fitzgerald et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piggot-Irvine and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timperley (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear guidelines</td>
<td>Piggot-Irvine and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the superficial - ongoing</td>
<td>Fitzgerald (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and in-depth</td>
<td>Piggot-Irvine and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent and confidential</td>
<td>Cardno and Piggot-Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlewood (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piggot-Irvine and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent from disciplinary</td>
<td>Cardno and Piggot-Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspects</td>
<td>(1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piggot-Irvine and Cardno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However it is important to note that two further criteria can be added to Piggot-Irvine’s (2003) effectiveness criteria. These two additions reflect the current context of New Zealand schools. Whilst both of these could incorporated under the first criterion (an educative process), neither are explicitly discussed. The first is the inclusion of the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model (Ministry of Education, 2007) as the process, and the second is a focus on ‘student learning’ (Sinnema and Robinson 2007; Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung, 2007) within the appraisal process. These two concepts post-date the Piggot-Irvine (2003) criteria, and must be considered, as current literature documents them as essential components of performance appraisal. This is documented in Table 2.2 on the following page.
Table 2.2  Additional criteria for effective appraisal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Criteria for Effective Appraisal</th>
<th>Links with authors and documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused on student learning</td>
<td>Sinnema and Robinson (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardno (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these characteristics are important for performance appraisal systems to be effective. As noted in the table above, and in the Introduction chapter of this thesis, mandated requirements in New Zealand stipulate that performance appraisal must meet the dual purposes of accountability and development.

**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL – Links between accountability and development**

For performance appraisal to be effective, it must serve the two purposes of accountability and development. As noted on page 6 in Table 1.1, appraisal occurs at various levels (education system, school and individual). Therefore, appraisal should include a focus on accountability for the organisation and the individual, as well as a focus on providing mechanisms for the organisation and individuals to grow and improve. This balance is represented in Figure 2.2 and the authors (Cardno, 2012; Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001) note that an integrated appraisal system would lie midpoint between accountability and development.

![Integrated Appraisal System](image)

*Figure 2.2 Continuum: accountability – development*

*Sources:* (Cardno, 2012; Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001)

This integrated approach provides schools with the opportunity to have a system that meets the dual purposes rather than separating the accountability and development aspects and managing them in isolation from each other. This requires performance appraisal systems that incorporate the organisation’s strategic goals within the
individual teacher development targets (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). This appears straightforward, but in reality can create tension as individual teachers may disagree or oppose the school direction. One way to overcome this tension is to ensure that the integrated appraisal system follows the process below:

![Figure 2.3 The integrated appraisal process model](source)

As this model shows, there are various stages that have an accountability or development purpose. Having a clear process is the first step to effective appraisal. The next step is identifying specific characteristics and conditions that need to exist within this system.

In summary, performance appraisal systems need to be considered in several ways: the terminology used and the application of these; the ideal process for an integrated and balanced appraisal system; and, lastly, the characteristics of an effective system. Within the literature reviewed, several recurrent themes have been identified in regard
to implementing a performance appraisal system that integrates the dual purposes of accountability and development. These themes are: the multiple agendas or purposes for performance appraisal; building trusting relationships in the appraisal context; and the role of the principal in establishing conditions for effective appraisal to occur. These themes are presented in the next section.

THemes

Multiple agendas or purposes for performance appraisal
The first theme I will discuss is that of the multiple agendas or purposes of performance appraisal. Within the literature reviewed there are two key approaches that are described.

The bureaucratic approach
The first approach is the bureaucratic approach. This is characterised by hierarchical structures, impersonal processes and summative assessment procedures (Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003, p. 78). This is also referred to as hard HRM which is focussed on policies, structures and processes (Oldroyd, 2005). The key vocabulary and values associated with this approach are individualism, hierarchy, control mechanisms, surveillance, competition, rewards, secrecy, compliance, and accountability (Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Oldroyd, 2005). It is seen as a way of monitoring teachers by using terms such as: assess, evaluate, attest, and appraise. However this approach to performance appraisal may create a competitive culture, with a ‘tick-box mentality’, and a decline in trust between staff. Educational leaders need to consider this carefully before adopting a bureaucratic approach to performance appraisal.

The professional approach
The second approach is the professional or soft HRM approach. Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) explain that the professional approach is “seen as promoting self-review in a supportive collegial environment for the purpose of professional growth” (p.78). Likewise soft HRM is described as having a focus on individual and team relationships, and building a culture of development (Oldroyd, 2005). The key
vocabulary and values associated with this approach are: development, improvement, recognition, collaboration, reciprocity, respect, trust, and lastly reflective practice. This approach closely mirrors the concept of self-development, which Jones (2005) describes as the product of making sense of your own experiences and dealing with challenges as they impinge upon your professional life. Both the bureaucratic and professional approaches are required components in a schools performance appraisal system. However, using a system where they work simultaneously can be problematic.

**Which approach should be adopted?**

There appears to be a disparity between the theories outlined and the current performance appraisal practice in schools. The literature details two approaches when describing current practice in schools. Firstly, at a practical level, Cardno (2012) postulates that in reality schools struggle to separate the purposes and values that underpin accountability and development and so they operate separately. The alternative approach at a philosophical level, offered by Fitzgerald et al. (2003), is that the bureaucratic and professional approaches are largely incompatible, but are often combined in schools with undesirable consequences as a result of a lack of clarity of purpose and justification. Fitzgerald et al. (2003) claim that this is a result of poor management and understanding of the requirements for teacher accountability and development by school leadership teams. The key issue to address if there is to be an effective form of performance appraisal that succeeds in meeting the dual purpose of accountability and development, is that there must be a common understanding of the purpose, guiding values and the process within the school context. Good (1997) agrees stating that any successful performance appraisal systems must be complementary to the established values and culture of the school.

Therefore it is prudent to identify what would constitute accountability and development processes under both a bureaucratic and professional approach. Firstly, if a bureaucratic or hard HRM approach was implemented for appraisal the processes could be defined as:

- Accountability – a focus on managerialism considering performance pay, bonuses and meeting student outcome targets; and
• Development – would be related to organisational and mandated national goals and these would be mandated from the management of the ‘organisation’.

The focus for this approach is economic and how to efficiently achieve the tasks and strategic goals of the organisation using humans, teachers, in the education context, as resources (Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Oldroyd, 2005).

Conversely, a professional or soft HRM approach could be defined as:
• Accountability – meeting the desired outcomes of the profession whilst being accountable for your own growth and development; and
• Development – based on personal needs with the outcome being personal growth and improvement.

This approach focuses on the human side and how best to develop and maximise the ‘humans’ (teachers) employed. The desired outcome of this approach is the development of staff through a collegial approach which values all staff.

The adoption of either approach in isolation, or a combination of both approaches, will provide schools and school leaders with the complex task of balancing the dual purposes. Cardno (2012) suggests that schools use an approach that integrates both accountability and development with an emphasis on developing the teaching and learning programme. There are several key elements identified:
• Reciprocal accountability between the manager and the staff member;
• Concern with the individual performance based on negotiated and agreed expectations for both accountability and development;
• Goal setting that is specifically related to teaching and learning;
• Development needs identification and alignment at the individual, departmental and organisational level;
• Developmental activity strengthened by expert mentoring and coaching;
• Hierarchy (management) support, with strategic and operational resource links;
• Open acknowledgement of contentious issues and joint effort to find solutions to problems of practice;
• No comparative element; and
• Data based judgments (through the collection of evaluation material including information about student learning outcomes).

The introduction of the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) and more specifically the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ process in 2007, supports this approach to the improvement of teacher practice. The ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ process is focussed on teachers improving their practice with the aim of having a positive impact on student outcomes. This process is fundamental if teachers are to improve their teaching and learning programmes.

**Benefits and challenges for the multiple agenda approach**

If the dual purposes of accountability and development can be achieved in a single performance appraisal system there could be much potential at both the individual and organisation level. On an individual level, appraisal challenges teachers to question their performance and seek new ways to develop their skills (Van Velsor & McCauley, 2004). Cardno (2012) elaborates, stating that if teachers know how well they are performing and how well students are learning, then they can pinpoint areas for improving their practice and students will benefit from this improvement. The Ministry of Education (2005) agree, stating that optimising teaching quality has the greatest potential of improving student achievement.

On an organisation level, both the organisation and the individual teacher could benefit from staff performance appraisal if it contains elements of accountability and also the identification of areas of improvement. Sinnema and Robinson (2007) similarly state that appraisals encourage reflection and help to identify professional development needs that align with and support the goals of the institution. A by-product of this integration is a more collaborative approach by appraisers and appraisees to performance appraisal and enhanced student achievement. To achieve this focus, a learning culture needs to be developed in schools. This will be discussed later in this chapter.
Conversely, if the integration of accountability and development is not well managed and there are no clear purposes and values driving the approach, there can be negative consequences. These include the process becoming compliance-driven or a tick-off exercise that leads to lack of engagement (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007). If this occurs, then student achievement may not be at the heart of the purpose, and the process loses its focus on improved teacher practice and student outcomes.

The notion of ownership of the appraisal process, a key findings of Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) research, is another important consideration. Cardno (2012) states that an effective performance appraisal system is one that is valued by staff and as a consequence that they are committed to. When teachers do not trust or value a performance appraisal system and opportunities for professional growth are circumvented for accountability purposes then staff will not engage effectively. This aligns with Robinson (1992) who claims that the notion of internal commitment is an essential element of an effective performance appraisal. The implication is that educational leaders need to ensure staff have some control over the process to obtain the required commitment for performance appraisal to be effective (Youngs and Grootenboer, 2003).

Another issue that needs to be considered is time. Teachers regularly comment on time constraints within the profession and it must be remembered that the more teacher inquiry occurring the greater the time and effort required by both the school and the teacher (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Sinnema & Robinson, 2007). Educational leaders need to ensure that the provision of time is considered when attempting to effectively implement this integrated approach.

**Building trusting relationships in the appraisal context**

The second theme to discuss is that of building trusting relationships in the appraisal context. The importance of human relationships in educational leadership and management cannot be overlooked or underestimated. Viewing an organisation through the human resource frame highlights relationships between people and organisations: “Organisations need people (for their energy, effort and talent), and people need organisations (for the many intrinsic and extrinsic rewards they offer)”
(Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 137). Several writers (Bush, 2003; Cardno, 2012; Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003) identify ‘human resource management’ (HRM) as a key function of an educational leader because schools rely on the relationships between the various stakeholders such as students, staff, and the wider community. When examining HRM, trusting and positive relationships are pivotal within the organisation. Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2004) believe that, in developing positive relationships, an educational leader displays a willingness to understand and show empathy for all staff. Robinson, Hohepa, and Lloyd (2009), similarly state that, in everyday situations leaders should be focused on developing trusting relationships by establishing norms of respect and showing personal regard for staff. Relationships built on trust are developed when principals respect and care for others and consistently “walk the talk” (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 13). Van Velsor and McCauley (2004) support a similar view, stressing that values such as honesty and integrity help to create trust. Whilst the literature points to the educational leader having a significant role in developing these trusting relationships, it must be a goal for all staff to have this type of relationship (Piggot-Irvine, 2002).

Establishing trusting relationships has the potential to create a learning culture where there are fewer misgivings about sharing practice and working together to grow professionally. Positive interactions and the use of positive affirmation is one essential component in establishing these trusting relationships and cultures within a school. Lashway (2006) highlights the importance of those interactions that involve fundamental human affirmation, stating that “teachers cherish recognition for the countless efforts they make on behalf of students” (p. 45). School leaders need to ensure that teachers receive this affirmation, which in turn contributes to building a culture of trust. In the context of performance appraisal, this culture of trust should be based around learning-focused relationships within the staff.

Trust has an important influence on the culture of a school. Educational leaders must develop performance appraisal systems within their school that value teachers’ participation in an open and trusting way. Trethowan (1991) identifies a trusting environment as a key component of an effective appraisal system. Smith (1989) elaborates that this trusting environment can be developed when the teacher has an understanding of, and some control over, the content and process of appraisal. If
teachers trust their colleagues and the appraisal process, they are far more likely to productively engage in the process and see it as a positive experience. Fitzgerald et al. (2003) argue that this can be achieved if teachers are actively involved in the development and implementation of performance management systems that have clear purposes and processes for both performance appraisal and teacher development.

The type of HRM approach (bureaucratic or professional) is also a major factor in establishing trusting relationships. Darling-Hammond, Wise, and Pease (1983) note that “the sense of suspicion and anxiety is greater in a hierarchical system where a superior is evaluating a teacher’s work for bureaucratic purposes” (cited in Fitzgerald et al., 2003, p.96). If a bureaucratic approach is undertaken a trusting relationship between the principal and the staff must be developed. This is essential if the appraisal is to be meaningful and shift to a more professional approach built on trust. Trethowan (1991) supports this, stating that trust between the teacher and appraiser needs to be developed and nurtured on a daily basis and it cannot be achieved by decree. Middlewood (2001a) elaborates stating that trust is essential to eliminate the negative connotations where “appraisal is perceived as something that is done with you, not to you” (p.180).

In a professional approach, teachers can be more open to engaging in the process and viewing it as a learning experience. From her study of teachers’ perceptions of the role of leadership orientation and trust, Tschannen-Moran (2009) noted that teachers working in high trust environments were more likely to reveal truthful, appropriate, and thorough data about learning issues while also offering possible solutions. This is an important consideration, as performance appraisal may work more effectively when the two people involved have a positive relationship where a high level of trust exists. Incidentally, the idea of influence may always be evident but, if a trusting relationship exists, it will be acceptable to both appraiser and appraisee. Nusche et al. (2012) support this stating that ‘trusting’ professionals are eager and willing to receive feedback from their colleagues and/or superiors if it is conducted in a collegial and supportive environment. Therefore a collaborative process, where both parties are well informed of the purpose and course of action helps to create a trusting relationship.
Middlewood (2001a) suggests that “since some form of dialogue between appraiser and appraisee remains at the heart of performance appraisal, it will work more effectively when:

- A positive relationship exists between the two, i.e. when trust exists that there will be no manipulation or hidden agenda, when appraisal for example is perceived as something that is done with you, not to you;
- The teacher believes that the manager/appraiser has a good understanding of what the teachers specific job entails;
- The teacher believes that the appraiser has the capacity to deliver on any issues identified which require resources;
- The teacher believes the appraiser understands any inhibiting factors within the school. (p. 180)

The research clearly identifies that building and maintaining positive relationships based around trust and sharing is important for the leader and staff. However, Robinson et al. (2009) offer a contrasting view and argue that the quality of these trusting relationships does not guarantee successful outcomes for the teachers or the students. The implication for effective leadership and management is that unless robust trusting relationships built around continuous improvement of pedagogical practices have been formed, the system may be ineffectual.

The concept of building trusting relationships is central if a performance appraisal system is to be successful. Piggot-Irvine (2003) concludes that “trust needs to be established through honest interactions in all situations – not just that of appraisal, but in every interaction at every level of the school” (p.177). Therefore, educational leaders must ensure that trust is a major attribute of their school culture.

The role of the principal in appraisal

The final theme identified in the literature is that of the educational leader needing to play a significant role in managing the integration of accountability and development. Nusche et al. (2012) maintain that principals play a key role in performance appraisal of staff. Typically, in New Zealand state and state integrated schools, principals have delegated responsibility from the BoT to oversee the performance appraisal of teachers and to ensure there are systems in place to meet the dual purposes of
appraisal. Additionally the principal is expected to be the leader of learning. These roles have been examined under four headings: balancing the external and internal demands; creating a learning culture; maintaining a focus on teaching and learning; and managing and participating in professional development.

**Balancing the external and internal demands**

The role of an educational leader is complex and fraught with both external and internal challenges on a daily basis. O’Neill and Scrivens (2005) state that school leaders increasingly work in a political context in which external ‘restructuring’ changes, initiated by national, state or local authorities to raise standards of achievements, exert priority over their own vision of desirable improvements. Bolam (2002) concurs, stating that a leader’s dilemma “is how to balance and in fact manage the implementation of an often onerous external change agenda, while simultaneously trying to promote school-initiated improvement and the associated professional development” (p.103). The key consideration for educational leaders when managing the process of performance appraisal is to ensure that organisational processes are “designed in ways that align with, and support, the goal of instructional improvement” (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007, p. 321). If this occurs, it would be expected that the external demands, such as raising student achievement against *National Standards* (Ministry of Education, 2009), would be a by-product of improved teacher practice and on-going development.

**Creating a learning culture**

A key role of the educational leader is to establish and sustain the professional learning culture in their school. Schools are learning communities and therefore need to have a learning culture so all stakeholders see the potential to grow. Robinson et al. (2009) describe a learning culture as “an organisational climate that nurtures learning through putting in place the infrastructure and conditions that people need to continually enhance their capabilities” (p. 283). Cardno (2012) and Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung (2007) explain that if well-established policy and procedures for performance appraisal are in place, the appraisal system can contribute to the learning culture of the school. Fullan and Mascall (2000) suggest that when leaders are developing a
learning community, treating teacher development as a non-negotiable component is the key to effective professional growth of teachers.

Professional dialogue
Another key consideration when establishing a learning culture is ‘professional dialogue’. Professional dialogue is discussion between staff which is a daily occurrence within an educational setting. Whether it is setting goals, reviewing curriculum, discussing data, or sharing information about current teaching issues, there is professional dialogue between staff. Successful educational leaders provide opportunities to focus on professional dialogue between staff. Active participation in this dialogue by the educational leader may come in the form of a one-to-one meeting with a teacher about classroom observations or about educational topics in general. It may be in the small groups where a particular curriculum area is being discussed or even as a whole staff for such issues as policy changes from the government. This discussion needs to be a focus within a school and an effective leader will need to build a culture of high trust and collegiality.

There can be confusion between the words discussion and dialogue and these terms can be used in the wrong context. In the context of this study, discussion is merely talking and bouncing ideas whereas dialogue involves advocating, inquiring and solving a problem or issue. Simply, dialogue is about moving our practice or theories forward. Senge, Cambron-McCabe, Lucas, Smith, Dutton, and Kleiner (2000) offer alternative terminology but in the context of education I believe the essence of the definition is the same. They define ‘reflective dialogue’ as a conversation where teachers “talk to each other openly and reflectively about their situations and challenges; their subject matter, the nature of learning, their teaching practices, and their own thinking—their attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of the world” (p. 327). This type of dialogue is essential if a professional approach is to be adopted in a school which is focused on achieving the dual purposes of performance appraisal.

Teachers can often feel isolated within their own classroom and professional dialogue with peers, whether it be formal or informal can be extremely beneficial. Southworth (2004) states that “professional dialogue and discussions are important because they develop shared knowledge, common meanings and deeper understandings about
classroom practice. Having opportunities to talk about learning is vital to professional growth” (p.184). Southworth (2004) and Blase and Blase (2000) both note that effective leaders have the ability to engage in dialogue with teachers that promotes reflection and leads to professional growth. This is a skill that must be practiced and used regularly. As with all facets of education, the goal must be improved outcomes for students, and providing opportunities for professional dialogue can be no different. This helps to develop a learning culture that will include such features as life-long learners and staff with positive attitudes towards personal growth.

Maintaining a focus on improving teaching and learning

This focus is on providing opportunities for the teachers to develop their personal teaching abilities. Research demonstrates that “teachers would be more motivated by a system that had a strong developmental focus on assessing and growing teachers’ capacity to continuously evaluate and strengthen the impact of their instructional strategies” (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007, p. 388). Fullan and Mascall (2000) agree suggesting that there is a need to provide opportunities for teachers to engage in professional dialogue, which is focused around improved student outcomes. This type of development can “link theory and practice, that is content-based and student-centred, which engages teachers in the analysis of teaching” (Fullan & Mascall, 2000, p. 37). This dialogue can lead to a deeper understanding and appreciation of current classroom practice and teaching programmes.

This focus on teaching and learning can also provide educational leaders with an opportunity to work with teachers both in and out of the classroom. Weber (1996) agrees with the view of educational leaders understanding the importance of what is actually happening in the classroom (through observations), as well as focusing on developing teaching and learning by working with teachers and providing a variety of opportunities for reflection. Nusche et al. (2012) identify that teachers in New Zealand appreciate feedback provided by principals when they visit classrooms, noting that it was useful. Blase and Blase (2000) note that useful principal feedback “focused on observed classroom behaviour, was specific, expressed caring and interest, provided praise, established a problem-solving orientation, responded to concerns about
students, and stressed the principal’s availability for follow-up talk” (p.133-134). Effective leaders must focus on continually developing the teaching ability of their staff.

Maintaining the focus on improving learning for teachers is essential if the desired outcome of improved student outcomes is to be achieved. As Sinnema and Robinson (2007) point out, “there is now a growing empirical support for the view that effective teachers inquire into, rather than take for granted, the relationship between what why do (style) and its impact on student outcomes” (p. 325). The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) outlines the 'Teaching as Inquiry' model (Figure 2.4) as an essential component for teachers to establish effective pedagogy. “Effective pedagogy requires that teachers inquire into the impact of their teaching on their students” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 35).

![Teaching as Inquiry Model](image)

**Figure 2.4 ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ Model (Ministry of Education, 2007)**

As the model shows, there are three main components of the inquiry process. The *Teaching inquiry* is of particular importance in relation to performance appraisal as it involves focusing on the teaching strategies and pedagogical practice. In the teaching inquiry “the teacher uses evidence from research and from their own past practice and
that of colleagues to plan teaching and learning opportunities aimed at achieving the outcomes prioritised in the focused inquiry" (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 35). This is consistent with a focus on teaching and learning and has links to a learning culture.

Managing and participating in professional development

As the leader of learning, it is essential that the principal be seen as committed to ongoing learning and development. Cardno (2005) postulates that “one significant way in which school leaders can influence those they manage, influence development in the school and, in turn, positively influence the learning experiences of students is by supporting and effectively managing the professional development of staff” (p.294). Whilst the concept of professional growth is more complex than just being involved in professional development, two key roles for the principal are effectively managing a professional development system and secondly to actively participate in professional development alongside staff. This is important as development is a key purpose of performance appraisal.

The goal of professional development is to develop or up-skill staff to improve student outcomes. Development is one of the key purposes of performance appraisal and therefore must be a focus for the leader in a school. A key finding in the School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why. Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (Robinson et al., 2009) was that “when promoting and participating in teacher learning and development, leaders ensure an intensive focus on the teaching-learning relationship and promote collective responsibility for student achievement and well-being” (p. 42). Effective educational leaders not only ensure there is a variety of learning opportunities and experiences for teachers but they actively participate themselves.

When educational leaders build their professional programme knowledge, there are potential benefits. Principals gain a valuable insight and more in-depth understanding of the environments that teachers require if they are to meet the desired outcomes and sustain improvements in the learning of each student (Robinson et al., 2009). An additional benefit for leaders who are actively participating in professional development is that staff are more likely to approach the leader as a resource and
seek pedagogical advice as they are seen as knowledgeable about the curriculum content (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). The Education Review Office (2009) note that when principals are active learners, “their professional discussions with staff are based on a shared understanding about new knowledge relevant to their school” (p. 13). However, this argument is built on an assumption that the principal is the only source of pedagogical advice but this does not consider the ‘master’ teacher. The reality is that whilst the principal needs to be seen as the leader of learning, other staff members will have more practical knowledge of teaching on a daily basis. This enables the principal to focus appraisal on student learning and developing teacher pedagogy.

**SUMMARY**

In summary, since the 1980s there has been a great deal of educational reform in New Zealand. In relation to performance appraisal systems, these were legislated for in 1996 and since then there has been a varied degree of successful implementation. The literature relating to performance appraisal systems identifies several factors that have contributed to this lack of success. These factors include a tension between the dual purposes of accountability and development; and a lack of understanding around the terminology and processes being used. The literature also pinpoints three key themes that need to be considered when schools and principals attempt to successfully implement a performance appraisal system. These themes are: the multiple agendas or purpose of performance appraisal; the building of trusting relationships; and finally the role of the leader within performance appraisal.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION
This chapter begins with an overview of the research methodology by presenting the rationale for adopting a subjectivist epistemological position for this study and consequently a qualitative approach to the methodology, data collection and analysis. An explanation of the research design and school sampling is then provided, with a brief description of the data analysis framework.

The next section describes the data collection methods and how the data was analysed. This is done in two sub-sections which are: (i) the semi-structured interview and the focus groups; and (ii) document analysis. A discussion of the validity, reliability and ethical considerations relevant to the study conclude the chapter.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
The purpose of this study was to examine performance appraisal systems in two state primary schools therefore I adopted a subjectivist epistemological position. I chose this epistemological position as the research questions required me to collect and analyse teachers’ and principals’ experiences and perceptions of performance appraisal in their schools. The subjectivist approach supposes that people, in this case teachers and principals, perceive the world in different ways, and construct their own social reality. Researchers who adopt a subjectivist position view the “social world as being of a much softer, personal and humanly-created kind and will select from a comparable range of recent and emerging research techniques – accounts, participant observation and personal constructs” (Cohen & Manion, 1998, p. 7).

Taking a subjectivist epistemological position led me to assume an interpretivist paradigm. An interpretive paradigm “argues for the primacy of relationships over particles. It asserts that no problem can be understood in isolation from its greater environment” (Davidson & Tolich, 2003, p. 28). The key characteristics and distinguishing features of an interpretive approach that suited this study were:

- It was a small scale research study;
- It involved micro-concepts (individual perspectives, personal constructs, negotiated meanings, and definitions of situations);
- The fact that people actively construct their world;
- The events and individuals involved were unique;
- That people interpret events, contexts and situations as they see them;
- That reality is multi-layered and complex; and
- The situation needed to be examined through the eyes of the participants, not the researcher.

Adapted from (Cohen & Manion, 1998; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007)

Research that utilises an interpretive paradigm not only investigates the different parts to the environment, but also focuses on how these parts interact and connect to form the whole (Cohen et al., 2007). Schools are complex organisations that have an array of components that interrelate, and the difference between what is espoused and practiced can be problematic because these leads to inconsistencies. For the purpose of this research, I ensured that I gathered and digitally recorded data from individual principals and teachers which assisted me in establishing a ‘picture’ of their perceptions and understanding of performance appraisal within their schools.

As with any approach, there can be weaknesses involved. The limitations of an interpretive approach include:

- Power plays over the participants by the leaders in the setting; and
- A lack of acknowledgement of external forces (in this study, the MoE, the NZTC etc.).

(Cohen et al., 2007, p. 26)

These were considered as part of the methodology selection and the way that the research was structured and conducted. To eliminate the notion of power over participants, I selected research sites where I had no existing relationships and therefore I met participants for the first time. In relation to the external forces, this was addressed in the question schedule where data were collected from the participants relating to the outside agencies that impact on the profession, namely the MoE, NZTC, NZEI and ERO.
The interpretive approach adopted links closely to the ontological position of constructionism. Bryman (2012) describes constructionism as an ontological position that asserts that organisations and culture are socially constructed and are in a constant state of revision. Creswell (2002) agrees stating that “social constructivism is where individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work. They develop subjective meanings of their experiences” (p.8). For this research, this suggested that I should rely heavily on the participants’ views, and I did so. The questions asked were broad and general to enable the participants to “construct the meaning of a situation, a meaning typically forged in discussions or interactions with other persons” (Creswell, 2002, p. 8). As a consequence of the literature reviewed around research methodology, using an interpretive approach in this study was appropriate, as I sought to gather individuals’ perceptions and experiences of performance appraisal in their respective schools.

For the purpose of this study, I adopted a qualitative approach. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) note that “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). Bell (2010) states a similar view, noting that qualitative researchers are more focussed on interpreting the perceptions of the world from the perspective of the individual. This links directly to the research questions for this study that asked teachers and principals to give their understanding and perceptions of performance appraisal from both a personal and organisational level.

A qualitative approach also provided me with some flexibility. Punch (2005) suggests that qualitative research starts with a more general approach to the questions and becomes more specific as the study evolves. The research questions adopted for this study followed a structure from the general to the specific. As can be seen in Appendices A, B and C, the interview and focus group questioning commenced with participants discussing appraisal in their schools in a general way and then defining appraisal within their school. The questions then became more specific relating to the accountability and development of teachers and links within the school system. The sequence of the questions was adopted to build a clear picture of appraisal within the school, obtain specific examples, and ask the participants to elaborate on their previous answers if necessary. This approach provided me with flexibility during data
collection to probe and ask deeper questions. According to Davidson and Tolich (2003), this flexibility of the research process for qualitative researchers is seen as a strength. In contrast, “quantitative researchers view this ‘flexibility’ as simply a lack of rigour and one of the greatest weaknesses of this approach” (Davidson & Tolich, 2003, p. 29). To overcome this limitation, I ensured this study had a clear purpose with a transparent and well-structured process for decision making.

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

The research design is important for any study. Research design is referred to by Bryman (2012) as a “framework for the collection and analysis of data” (p.715). There were many considerations including: the approach to sampling and selection of participants; the methods used to collect the data; and lastly the analysis of the data.

I adopted a case study approach to the data collection for this research. Yin (2009) identifies that a case study is an inquiry that “investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context” (p. 18). I selected the case study approach for two reasons: in the first instance, the research aligned with the interpretive and constructivist approaches mentioned previously; and, secondly, the research involved two primary schools where principals’, appraisers’, and appraisees’ perceptions of performance appraisal data were collected. Once the data was collected from each case, commonalities were identified across the schools. This approach was assumed as it provided the most suitable framework for the analysis and interpretation of data.

Once the case study approach was selected, sampling became a critical consideration for this research. It was important to have a clear sampling approach which would lead to unbiased results that could potentially be considered by principals and staff members in other primary schools. This aligns with Wilmot (2005) who proposes that the aim must be unbiased results that could be of use to an extensive range of the population. The first factor to consider was the selection of schools. As all schools in New Zealand have principals, appraisers and appraisees, this research could have been conducted in any school. However, some form of selection needed to occur to
ensure that the study was manageable. The schools were randomly chosen using the following criteria: locality, a well-established and experienced principal, and school size (500+ students). The selected schools range from 600 to 850 students and are in the same geographical area within a New Zealand city. The next consideration was the selection of research tools to gather the data from the participating schools. It was decided that semi-structured interviews, focus groups and document analysis would provide an informed picture of performance appraisal in the research schools.

**Data analysis – general discussion**

This research focussed on primary schools as I am currently employed in this sector. As the study involved a number of teachers and principals from different primary schools, there was a range of experiences, perceptions, systems and therefore interpreting the data was complex. There were two key factors that I considered when analysing the data. The first was the approach to the data analysis, and the second was the management of the large amount of data produced.

The first consideration was in relation to the case study approach. Creswell (2007) identifies two processes as a *within-case analysis* and a *cross-case analysis*. If this approach had been adopted for this study it would have matched the approach outlined by Yin (2009). This would have involved the initial analysis being based on a single case analysis of each school, then a *cross-case analysis* occurring which would have looked for patterns and assertions that could be made across the two cases. However this study employed an alternative approach which used the data collection methods (document analysis, interviews, and focus groups) as a ‘case’ where a commentary was produced that summarised the views and perceptions of the different groups (principals, appraisers, and teachers), and the cross-case analysis occurred once the ‘case’ (document analysis, interviews, and focus groups) analysis had happened. Figure 3.1 on the following page provides an overview of the sampling framework.

The second factor was managing the large amount of data that this research generated and the need to have a systematised data analysis method to allow meaningful findings to be unearthed. Lofland, Snow, Anderson, and Lofland (2006)
suggest that “analysis involves a kind of transformative process in which raw data is
turned into findings or results” (p. 195). Krueger and Casey (2009) state that the
analysis of the data must follow a progressive process that is methodical and
organised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part One</th>
<th>Part Two</th>
<th>Part Two</th>
<th>Part Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>Interviews (Principals)</td>
<td>Focus Groups (Appraisers)</td>
<td>Focus Groups (Appraisees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North School</td>
<td>Policy &amp; Appraisal documents</td>
<td>One interview</td>
<td>Four appraisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South School</td>
<td>Policy &amp; Appraisal documents</td>
<td>One interview</td>
<td>Four appraisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>National documents (MoE, ERO, NZEI, NZTC, OECD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.1   Sampling framework overview**

Therefore, this research adopted a general inductive approach to analyse the data
from each school. Bryman (2012) and Lofland et al., (2006) explain that inductive
analysis is based on the data and that themes emerge from the data itself. When
analysing the transcripts from the interviews and focus groups, I identified the common
themes within each school, which provided opportunities for cross-case analysis and
the emergence of ‘whole study’ themes that I used to inform the findings and
recommendations.

**RESEARCH METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS**

This section outlines the methods used for collecting and analysing the data for this
study. It is structured under two main headings, which are ‘Semi-structured interviews
and focus groups’ and ‘Document analysis.’ Within each of these headings, the data
collection methodology and the analysis that occurred will be discussed.
Method 1 and 2: Semi-structured interviews and focus groups

Semi-structured interviews

For the purpose of this research, I used semi-structured interviews, employing a mixture of pre-defined questions and some discussion between the researcher and the participant (a semi-structured interview). Hinds (2000) suggests using a semi-structured approach when the research “needs in-depth information, or subject matter is potentially sensitive, or the issues under examination would benefit from development or clarification” (p.47). Bell (2010) has a similar view, stating that interviews provide the interviewer with adaptability as they can query answers, and examine respondents intentions and beliefs. The semi-structured interviews allowed me to focus on the topic of performance appraisal, yet at the same time allowed some flexibility to uncover further information related to the strategies and conditions that are prevalent in the participating schools. As Bryman (2008) explains, “questions may not follow on exactly in the way outlined on the schedule. Questions that are not included in the guide may be asked as the interviewer picks up on things said by the interviewees” (p. 438).

As I was utilising interviews to collect data, I needed to consider several factors. The first was piloting the interview schedule as suggested by Yin (2009). The strength of this piloting was that it ensured the questions in the interview were succinct and followed a progressive order, therefore leading to successful planning of the process. Hinds (2000) suggests that piloting also provides interviewers with practical feedback from a colleague or peer about their interview technique. I piloted the interview process with colleagues at my own school and refined the interview schedule, by re-ordering the questions to allow for better flow of ideas, prior to commencing the research in schools. This ensured the questions were valid and would uncover the relevant data.

Another factor to consider was the process of transcription. Bryman (2012) describes transcription as “the written translation of a recorded interview or focus group session” (p. 717). It is important that this transcription is an accurate record of what has been said by the participants and the use of a recording device is essential in this situation. Bell (2010) concurs that recording an interview can be useful when:
you are attempting any form of content analysis and need to be able to listen several times in order to identify categories but perhaps it is most useful because it allows you to code, summarise and to note comments which are of particular interest without having to try to write them down during the course of the interview. (p. 167)

However, there were some potential disadvantages when using interviews to collect data. Firstly, the accuracy of the transcript data was vital. Bell (2010) and Cohen et al. (2007) state that within the data collected using an interview technique, there is a possibility of researcher subjectivity and bias in the transcript. I limited this potential bias by ensuring that the participant commentary was recorded precisely (Hinds, 2000) and that the participants had ownership over their data. This was achieved by providing the participants with an opportunity to view the transcripts and amend these as they saw appropriate. An additional disadvantage with this type of data collection is time. Bryman (2012) and Hinds (2000) suggest that an hour of interview will take between five and ten hours to transcribe. Gaskell (2000) also suggests that undertaking more interviews does not necessarily mean more detailed understanding of the context; rather it is the quality of the interview that will ensure meaningful data is collected.

Considering these facts, I decided to use a purposive sample and carry out individual interviews on the principals of each school. Bryman (2012) refers to purposive sampling as using participants that have a direct relationship with the research questions. Although all staff members have experiences around performance appraisal, it is usual for the principal to have overall delegated responsibility from the Board of Trustees for performance appraisal in schools and therefore their views are unique.

The two semi-structured interviews took place over a period of two months as both principals were on sabbatical at different times during term two and three. The interviews were held in the office of each participant at a time that was convenient for them. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed and, in order to maintain confidentiality, a pseudonym (North School Principal or South School Principal) was used throughout the transcription, data analysis and reporting process. Participants in
the semi-structured interviews were asked twelve questions (as listed in Appendix A) that focused on a range of topics regarding performance appraisal in their schools.

In practice, the responses of the participants confirmed that the choice of the semi-structured interview was the most suitable for the purpose, because it focused the answers on the core research topic, but also allowed the participants enough flexibility to describe their school’s approach to performance appraisal. The semi-structured interview questions were also aligned with the focus groups (2 groups per school) which allowed me to look for convergence between the three sets of data from the two participating schools. This helped triangulate the results and consequently strengthened the reliability and validity of the findings (Creswell & Miller, 2000)

*Focus groups*
A focus group is defined by Bryman (2012) as “a form of group interview in which there are several participants; there is an emphasis in the questioning on a particular fairly tightly defined topic; and the emphasis is upon interaction within the group and the joint construction of meaning” (p.717). Focus groups were appropriate in this research, as participants had the opportunity to construct joint meanings relating to performance appraisal that were relevant to their context. Hinds (2000) states that focus groups are used when the researcher sets out to collect data concerned with: how participants are thinking; participants describing their perceptions of situations; and lastly when there is a need for deeper appreciation of the person’s experience. Focus groups fulfilled these requirements for this study.

Ideally this study would have encompassed all stakeholders within each school but this would have been unmanageable. Krueger and Casey (2009) suggest that the ideal size for a group when sharing a number of experiences and knowledge is 5-6 participants. At each school, I presented an outline of the research rationale and process to the whole staff and asked for volunteers to participate. I randomly selected 5-6 teachers that had indicated their willingness to participate. I also considered that the schools may have had different approaches to performance appraisal therefore the group size may have varied. This would be dependent on how many appraisers each school had. In the end, all four focus groups conducted had four participants, except the appraisers’ group from South School which had three due to an absence.
The selected sample of teachers included groups of appraisers and groups of appraisees, because of their potentially differing involvement in the appraisal process. This is in line with Bryman (2012) who postulates that the research questions are likely to offer parameters for the sample categories. For example, one of the research questions was focussed around the role of the leader; therefore, the relevant leaders of appraisal had to form part of the sample. Another question focused on the conditions for effective appraisal and development. Teachers are directly engaged with these conditions within their school context therefore they had valuable perceptions and information to share.

A key to conducting a successful focus group is the questions asked. Krueger (1994) claims that “forethought must be given to developing questions for a focus group. They may appear to be spontaneous, but they have been carefully selected and phrased in advance to elicit the maximum amount of information” (p.54). For this research, I used certain questions that sought direct answers, whilst other questions required open discussions. The main themes from the literature review informed the choice of questions. This approach provided me with greater scope to discover the perceptions of the participants in relation to their own setting.

As can be seen in the ‘Focus Group Schedules’ (as shown in Appendices B and C), I began with two general questions which asked the groups’ to talk about performance appraisal at their school and also how the system has developed. These questions were designed to elicit details about the general appraisal system and its development over time. This gave me a general overview of the performance appraisal system and aided in asking clarifying and probing questions later in the focus group. The second part of the focus group schedule asked participants more specific questions about the research aims. These questions were the same as those used in the semi-structured interviews to provide opportunities for triangulation.

An additional questioning technique I used was “sentence completion” which were sentence starters “designed to elicit information on motivation and feelings regarding a desirable or undesirable behaviour” (Krueger, 1994, p. 61). This approach was employed to gain an understanding of the participants’ knowledge of the phrases ‘performance appraisal’ and ‘accountability’ in their school contexts. This was
facilitated by reading a statement and allowing all participants an opportunity to record their definition of performance appraisal and accountability. The participants were then asked to share what they had recorded. I saw the advantages of using this sentence completion technique in the focus group environment as:

- It allowed participants a few moments to collect their thoughts;
- It encouraged the quieter participants to get involved; and
- It eliminated the ‘me-too’ responses as everyone had written something down.

(Adapted from Krueger, 1994).

The main reason I adopted the focus group approach was the advantage it provided for discussions to occur between participants that hold the same standing within the performance appraisal system. Cohen et al. (2007) state that focus groups provide potential for discussions to develop, thus generating an extensive array of replies: “this is particularly useful if the group have been working together for some time or common purpose, or where it is seen as important that everyone concerned is aware of what others in the group are saying” (p. 287). This was pertinent to this study as principals, appraisers and appraisees had an understanding of their experiences within their own context.

However, I found one limitation of using focus groups was the lack of opportunity to allow individual or personal issues to emerge. Cohen et al. (2007) identifies the same issue, suggesting that it is problematic to ask probing questions to one person in a group situation, as the dynamic of the group denies access to this sort of data. This was addressed by returning the transcripts to all group members, and allowing them an opportunity to add any missing information to the transcript.

When conducting focus groups, Fontana and Frey (2005) identify three further issues that the researcher needs to be aware of and manage effectively if the focus groups are to be successful:

1. One person can potentially dominate proceedings;
2. Some people may not participate fully and need to be encouraged to engage; and
3. Some people may be uncooperative participants.
In the context of this study, utilising the concept of sentence completion helped to eliminate the first two issues, as well as asking participants directly for an answer. The third point was not an issue as the participants volunteered their time.

**Data analysis - semi-structured interview and focus group**

The semi-structured interview and focus group schedules were structured in a similar way to aid the analysis of the data. Additional probing and clarifying questions had also been prepared in advance. These were the result of piloting the interviews and focus groups. These pilot events provided an insight for the types of probing and clarifying questions that may be required. Once the interviews and focus groups had been conducted, transcribing was completed within the next three-four days. All transcripts were returned to the participants for the verification. No amendments were required to the completed transcripts. At this stage, the analysis of the data commenced.

The analysis of the raw data needed to be approached in a systematic manner to identify the emergent themes as they related to the literature themes. I used three key approaches - coding, memos, and concept charting (Bryman, 2012). As part of the analysis, I adopted two types of coding referred to as *initial coding* and *focused coding*. Bryman (2012) and Lofland et al. (2006) describe *open coding* or *initial coding* as beginning to examine your interview and focus group transcripts line by line, identifying key words and ideas.

The first stage of the analysis involved highlighting the interview and focus group transcripts to sort data into sub-themes and complete the initial coding. This allowed for easy grouping and regrouping of the sub-themes. A table was used to present these sub-themes for each question. The data was grouped by school (N or S) and the type of participant (principal, appraiser, appraisee). The following example shows the structure for the data presentation in Chapter Five.

**Table ____ Question ___: Principals, appraisers and appraisees data**

*(N=North School; S=South School)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These sub-themes were not always identical for principals, appraisers, and appraisees as the different participants had different perceptions of concepts and ideas associated with the questions. To show the differing perceptions, participant quotes were identified that supported each of the classified sub-themes. In Chapter Five, these quotes are presented after each table and are used to illustrate the participant perceptions and ideas.

The final phase of the data analysis involved narrowing the sub-themes into the major data themes. This was done by utilising the ‘focused coding’ approach which is more targeted and discerning. This commenced after the initial coding was completed. Lofland et al. (2006) explain that focused coding is simply selecting the predominant themes, identifying the links and justifying their inclusion in the next stage of the process. Once the coding was completed, the themes were presented in relation to each of the interview and focus group questions (this is shown in Table 5.12 on page 105). This summary table was used to highlight the major themes that emerged from the data collected.

Throughout the research study, I used memos to support the coding which took place. Bryman (2012) identifies memos as:

notes that researchers might write for themselves. They serve as reminders about what is meant by terms being used and provide building blocks for a certain amount of reflection. Memos are potentially very helpful for researchers in helping them to crystallize ideas and not to lose track of their thinking in various topics. (p. 573)

This process allowed me to make informed decisions about the data analysis as I had additional notes and explanations readily available that linked specifically to the codes. As Lofland et al. (2006) suggest, if researchers do not make use of memos, they run the risk of getting lost in the vast amount of data and therefore may have difficulties making sense of the data. This was a valuable tool in the analysis phase of the raw data in this project.

The last tool I used to analyse the raw data was ‘concept charting’. Concept charting is referred to as a visual representation which is used to “illuminate and understand
connections” (Lofland et al., 2006, p. 215). The ‘concepts’ that I charted were identified using the coded themes from the document analysis, interviews and focus groups. These charts helped to show the links between the perceptions of principals, appraisers and appraisees.

**Method 3: Document analysis**

The use of document analysis in research can “provide other details to corroborate information from other sources” (Yin, 2009, p. 103). Therefore document analysis in this study served two purposes: first, to establish if the school policy and procedures clearly documented the mandated requirements of performance appraisal; and, secondly, to analyse the external documentation. The following sources of external documentation were used as they have direct links with the primary school sector: the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Education Review Office (ERO), the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC), and the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI). These sources were selected as they have produced documents that are relevant to current practice and I have used them to assist with my role as the deputy principal in charge of performance appraisal. Lastly I used the latest report from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in relation to New Zealand education, as it provided me with useful information regarding performance appraisal. This analysis also provided valuable details regarding the triangulation (validity) of definitions, and requirements for the use of the teacher standards.

Additionally, this documentation provided a framework for data that could be expected to be provided by the participants of the interviews and focus groups. As Duffy (2010) states, document analysis can be “used to supplement information obtained by other methods” (p.125). However, Argyris (1993) warns that there can be a difference between what is espoused and practised, and therefore this was an important contextual consideration when the raw data for each school was analysed. The advantages of using documents to collect additional data were that they were a stable and exact source so repeated analysis could occur. Also, this analysis was unobtrusive for the school and the participants as the documents already existed and had not been influenced by the study (Yin, 2009). The main disadvantage of this method was that access to the policy documents from the schools may have been
deliberately withheld, or selective bias may have occurred with schools only providing me with some of the relevant documentation (Yin, 2009). With all this in mind, the policy and procedure documents that referenced the performance management of teachers with particular focus on the performance appraisal system in both schools were viewed and analysed.

Data analysis – school and other documents
The document analysis occurred on two levels. The first was the various documentation produced by some of the stakeholders in New Zealand education. The second level was at the level of school documentation which included Performance Appraisal policies and any other handbooks or documentation associated with these policy statements.

The other documents were analysed by considering three key aspects: firstly the definitions and uses of the key terminology; guidance for the use of the teacher standards (the PS and the RTC); and, finally the links to the legislative requirements (PMS1).

The school documentation was analysed by using a similar framework developed around the three key aspects, with one addition aspect. These were: the key terminology used; the use and reference to teacher standards (RTC and PS); the links to the legislative requirements (PMS1); and, finally, an analysis against Piggot-Irvine’s (2003) eight criteria, and two additional criteria, that were identified in the literature review as being integral to effective appraisal systems and practice.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY
Throughout the study, I considered the quality of the research and the concepts of validity and reliability were addressed. A key point to consider in relation to the quality of this research was that the aim was not to generalise to the population of all New Zealand schools but rather to provide a valid account of what participants said in their schools. With this in mind, four notions were relevant to this study. These were: construct validity, internal and external validity, and reliability.
Validity
The notion of validity is concerned with the degree to which the research questions, collection methods and findings accurately indicate the concept that I was investigating (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Validity refers to the “extent to which a question or variable accurately reflects the concept the researcher is actually looking for” (Davidson & Tolich, 2003, p. 31). Three sub-levels of validity applied to this study. Firstly, construct validity, which had two key considerations. Simply it was ensuring that the researcher and participants had a common understanding of the construct, namely appraisal. Cohen et al. (2007) explain that to increase the validity of the data, different methods need to be used to research the same construct.

Internal validity is concerned with substantiating the inferences or explanations that emerged from the data and whether these are accurate description of the phenomena being researched (Cohen et al., 2007; Yin, 2009). Bryman (2012) provides an additional definition noting that internal validity is dealing with the trustworthiness or credibility of the data. One method I used to strengthen the internal validity of the data was triangulation. Bryman (2012) and Davidson and Tolich (2003) define triangulation as the use of more than one method of generating data for the purpose of confirming or disconfirming a finding. For the purpose of this study I adopted two types of triangulation, the first being methodological triangulation where I collected data using document analysis, interviews and focus groups, and the second being multiple participant perspectives where I collected data from principals, appraisers, and appraisees.

Another method employed for internal validity was respondent validation, which is defined by Bryman (2012) as “a process whereby the researcher provides the people on whom he or she has conducted research with an account of his or her findings and requests feedback on that account” (p.715). I did this by returning completed transcripts to the participants for checking and amendments. In addition to the transcripts being returned, I piloted the use of the research questions and process for both interviews and focus groups. Krueger and Casey (2009) suggest this action, stating that validity can be strengthened by testing the questions and process and gaining feedback from the ‘test subjects’ about the conditions of the interview and
focus group. I used these strategies to ensure that the data collected was credible and valid.

External validity was also considered in this research; that is, the extent to which the findings of the study could be generalised to a broader population or transferred to another context (Bryman, 2012; Cohen et al., 2007; Davidson & Tolich, 2003). The concept of ‘transferability’ is complex in qualitative research as the goal is not about generating whole population data but more to “provide a precise (or valid) description of what people said or did in a particular research location” (Davidson & Tolich, 2003, p. 34). The key consideration for this research was to seek to provide a valid account of performance appraisal systems within the two school contexts. I was not in a position to make generalised statements about ‘schools in New Zealand’ but rather made suggestions of how the findings could be transferred or applied in other contexts if similar conditions exist.

Reliability
Lastly, reliability was addressed in this study. Reliability refers to the consistency of the measure and the likelihood of repeating the process with the same results (Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Hinds, 2000; Yin, 2009). The key consideration for this study was to ensure that the methods I used to collect data were consistently applied, and that data were recorded in the same way in all settings where the research was conducted. The idea of researcher bias identified in earlier sections is concerned with reliability and objectivity focussing on not allowing “personal values or theoretical inclinations to sway the conduct of the research” (Bryman, 2012, p. 392). The data collection and analysis is free of my personal opinions and views of performance appraisal, and includes only data that was shared by the participants.

Trustworthiness
Trustworthiness is another notion that applies to this study due to the adoption of a qualitative approach. Bryman (2012) proposes that researchers use the term trustworthiness to establish the reliability of the study. The notion of trustworthiness is defined by Bryman (2012) as a set of conditions used by qualitative researchers for assessing the quality of research. These conditions are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. I applied the condition of credibility in this research
by ensuring that respondent validation occurred by returning completed transcripts to the participants for checking and amendments. The notion of *transferability* is complex in qualitative research as the goal is not about generating whole population data but more to “provide a precise (or valid) description of what people said or did in a particular research location” (Davidson & Tolich, 2003, p. 34). The key consideration for my research was that I sought to provide a detailed enough account of my research that readers of my thesis would be able to make their own judgements about the transferability of my findings to their own particular contexts. The *dependability* of the study is closely linked to reliability which refers to the consistency of a measure (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Lastly, *confirmability* is the process of not allowing personal opinions or beliefs to influence the process of the study (Bryman, 2012). The key consideration for my study was ensuring the methods used to collect the data, were consistently applied, and carefully and accurately recorded in all settings where the research was conducted.

The research design, processes, and strategies were prepared to deal with these issues. Table 3.1 on the following page highlights how these notions were applied to this study.

**ETHICAL ISSUES**

Ethical considerations are a significant aspect of any research that involves people. Bryman (2012) suggests that there are four main considerations for researchers in terms of ethics. These are: lack of informed consent; harm to participants; invasion of privacy; and deception. Other vocabulary such as confidentiality, anonymity confidentiality, privacy, reciprocity, and deception are also found in the literature (Bell, 2010; Bryman, 2012; Cohen et al., 2007). The key message is that protecting and caring for the rights of individual participants is at the core of ethical issues in educational research. For this study, the issues of informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity, and minimising harm to participants were relevant.
Table 3.1      Strategies to address issues of validity and reliability in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Tests</th>
<th>Application in this study</th>
<th>Links to the literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Construct Validity | • Piloting of questions and process, and gaining feedback from the ‘test subjects’ about the conditions of the interview and focus group.  
• Methodological triangulation was applied as I collected data using document analysis, interviews, and focus groups. | • Krueger and Casey (2009)  
• Yin (2009)  
• Bryman (2012)  
• Davidson and Tolich (2003) |
| Internal Validity | • Respondent validation occurred by returning completed transcripts to the participants for checking and amending (credibility).  
• Multiple sources of evidence was used to collect data (principals, appraisers, and teachers). This is referred to as multiple perspectives triangulation. | • Bryman (2012)  
• Davidson and Tolich (2003) |
| External Validity | • The main implication for this research is that the study was contextually bound within each school, and complex structures and relationships were prevalent therefore transferring the findings to another school will be challenging if the same conditions do not exist in both settings.  
• Generalised statements about ‘schools in New Zealand’ are not made but phrases like ‘the data suggests that’ or ‘research conclusions could be applied to another school with similar…….’ are used.  
• I have provided enough information about each school for readers to assess generalizability. | • Cohen et al. (2007)  
• Yin (2009) |
| Reliability | • Data collection tools were administered in a consistent manner across each school. This ensured reliability of results within each context.  
• The digital recording and transcribing of data  
• Careful documentation of research procedures is evident | • Yin (2009). |

**Informed consent**

Simply stated, informed consent is asking permission from people to involve them in research and ensuring that they have enough information to be able to give this permission. Cohen et al. (2007), Fontana and Frey (2005) and Hinds (2000) describe this as the participant giving approval after carefully and truthfully being informed about the research process. In this study, this involved obtaining permission from all participants - the schools’ Boards of Trustees, principals, appraisers, and appraisees.
However simply gaining consent was not enough, as all these participants in the research had to be as informed as possible about the purpose, aims, methods, and presentation of the research. As Wilkinson (2001) states, it is crucial that participants know what they are getting into. Therefore, all schools and individuals invited to participate received an information sheet that fully informed them of the nature of the research and the process. These information sheets and consent forms can be seen in Appendices D, E and F. Invited participants were also given the opportunity to ask questions and clarify any issues they had when we met. No inducements were made to the participants other than the opportunity to participate in research that could impact on their profession.

Another point regarding informed consent was the right of the participant to withdraw their participation and their data after the interview or focus group, change their responses, or add additional information. Bryman (2012) refers to this as respondent validation and this was a crucial aspect of the research process. I returned all transcripts to the participants for the purpose of the participant checking the data and results to ensure that the transcript was a trustworthy and valid source of information. Participants were all made aware that they had the option of withdrawing their involvement at any time. However, after ten working days of being sent their interview or focus group transcript for validation, their data became part of the study.

Anonymity and confidentiality

A key ethical consideration in any research is the treatment of the participants involved. The anonymity and confidentiality of all participants in this research was maintained at all times. I took several steps to ensure that the participants’ anonymity and confidentiality was upheld. During the course of the research I ensured the confidentiality of information collected from participants was maintained by having a locked cupboard and code protected computer files for the safe storage of the transcripts, electronic files and hard copy material (Bryman, 2012). In addition to this, the only people with access to the data was myself and my research supervisors. After five years, all data will be deleted and disposed of.

Anonymity, on the other hand, meant ensuring that when the collected information was transcribed and presented, it preserved the identity of the participant. Cohen and
Manion (1998) concur stating that the “information provided by participants should in no way reveal their identity” (p. 366). I used pseudonyms in the transcription process (North School, Principal North, Norman, Nelly, Natalie etc.) to ensure the participants’ anonymity was maintained. Some demographic information was collected but this was insufficient for participants, or their schools, to be identified. One challenge around the anonymity of focus group participants, was the members of the focus group knew who took part in the discussion. To help this situation two steps were taken. Firstly the participants were given a research marker (A1, A2 etc.) during the focus group, but these were changed to random ‘names’ (Naya, Norm, Sam) in the thesis presentation. Secondly, the participants were sent transcripts of the focus group with only their pseudonym recorded. All the rest of the participant answers were coded with the random names. This was discussed before the focus groups commenced and all participants expressed that they accepted that anonymity with focus groups was problematic, and that they were willing to share their answers with all participants from their particular focus group.

A broader contextual ethical consideration was the selection of the schools where I conducted this research as well as maintaining their anonymity. As mentioned previously, I utilised a purposive sampling approach to choose the schools. The following criteria was used: locality, a well-established and experienced principal, and school size (500+ students). The schools selected range from 613 to 850 students and are in the same geographical area within a New Zealand city. When selecting the geographical location of the schools I ensured I did not use schools within the immediate area that I work as I have relationships with many senior leadership team members through professional groups, and the idea of ‘power’ or ‘influence’ was an ethical factor I needed to consider. I chose the central city area, as there were a number of larger primary schools (500+ students) that suited the study. Three schools were initially identified as meeting all the above criteria. One of these was discounted immediately as I had previously been employed there as a Deputy Principal and the notion of ‘power’ may have become an issue. The two remaining schools were contacted, presented with the research overview and both agreed to participate. To maintain their anonymity they are referred to as North School and South School throughout this thesis.
Minimisation of harm

Several steps were taken to ensure the minimisation of harm to participants. Firstly, the possibility existed for pressure from school principals to want access to, or influence over, data used in this study. Principals were given access to the overall findings of the study, but were not given access to the raw data collected from their staff that participated in the focus groups. Secondly, the piloting of both the interview and focus group schedule was conducted prior to the gathering of data from participants. This ensured that the data collected answered the research questions and protected the participants. No participants were coerced at any stage and they had the right to refuse to answer any question if they so wished. Additionally, as noted above, the anonymity and confidentiality of all participants was a priority.

SUMMARY: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter has described the methodology and research method used in this research project. I have provided a justification for assuming a subjectivist epistemological position, together with an interpretive paradigm and a qualitative study approach. I have explained the selection of semi-structured interviews, focus groups and document analysis to collect data. Finally, I have justified the use of a general inductive data analysis approach, described the criteria I used to ensure the validity and reliability of data and explained how I examined ethical issues relating to the study. In the next chapter I will display the findings that this research methodology and data collection methods provided.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS - Document Analysis

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the first part of the data analysis is reported. The documentation from each of the two schools, as well as other documents from external sources are described and analysed. The pseudonyms ‘North School’ and ‘South School’ have been used in order to protect the identity of the research sites. This chapter begins by presenting a brief background and overview of the four key challenges that exist in schools regarding performance appraisal. The process used to analyse the data is then outlined.

As stated in the Introduction and the Literature Review chapters, there are currently significant challenges in New Zealand primary state schools in regards to performance appraisal. These challenges center on four key aspects:

1. Terminology – confusion exists in the definitions and meanings of the vocabulary used in relation to performance appraisal such as ‘appraisal’, ‘accountability’, and ‘attestation’;

2. The standards currently in use to describe teacher practice – schools and indeed educational leaders are confused by the existence of the two sets of performance standards for teachers - Professional standards for primary teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b) and Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b);

3. A lack of understanding around the legislative requirements for schools - this refers to the Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997) which sets out the mandatory requirements for teacher appraisal in New Zealand schools; and

4. Using the effective appraisal system criteria – based on Piggot-Irvine’s, (2003) effectiveness characteristic, and two additional criteria (‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and a student learning focus), that need to be present for performance appraisal to be effective. It appears that schools currently struggle to implement these.

The ‘other’ documentation was analysed by considering three of the four key aspects above: firstly the definitions and uses of the key terminology; guidance for the use of
the teacher standards (RTC and PS); and, finally the links to the legislative requirements (PMS1). The fourth was not used as the ‘other’ documentation selected did not focus on the specific characteristics of performance appraisal in any great detail.

The school documentation was analysed by using the same framework as above with the addition of the final aspect, an analysis against effective performance appraisal criteria. This process for document analysis is similar to that used by Brinsden (2011), and has the advantage of utilizing a framework for analysis that is based on current literature and theory relating to performance appraisal systems.

OTHER DOCUMENTS
As this research is based around state primary schools in New Zealand, one would expect that the four challenges (listed on page 58), would be addressed in documentation produced by government and quasi-government bodies. These parties provide resources and guidance relating to the performance appraisal of teachers in New Zealand primary schools. These bodies are: the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Education Review Office (ERO), the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC), and the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) also creates reports associated with education in New Zealand and around the world. Documentation from these bodies has been analysed and the results are reported in relation to the four challenges.

I selected a variety of documents from the different bodies to analyse. These were selected as they are all documents that are relevant to current practice and I have used them to assist with my role as a Deputy Principal in charge of performance appraisal. The documents selected were:

2. *Appraisal for teachers: support for professional leaders. Workshop One: Strengthening understanding of appraisal* (NZTC);
3. *Board employment responsibilities: Linking charter targets to appraisal in primary schools* (ERO);
4. **OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education** (OECD)
5. **New Zealand Country Background Report** (MoE);
6. **Registered Teacher Handbook** (NZTC); and

Additional word searches were also conducted on the websites connected with MoE, ERO, NZTC and NZEI. The function of these searches was to find further documentation associated with definitions of the following terms: accountability, attestation, development, and appraisal.

**Terminology**

As noted in Chapter Two, appraisal terms are often used interchangeably when they do, in fact, have quite different meanings. If all New Zealand State schools are to consistently develop and deliver effective performance appraisal systems, there must be a common understanding of the terms appraisal, accountability, and attestation. However, this is not the case. The analysis of the ways in which these terms are defined and used in the various documentation is presented in Table 4.1 on the next page.

From this document analysis, there appears to be a consistent theme associated with appraisal. Appraisal is described as a process that serves the dual purposes of accountability and development. However on occasion, ‘appraisal’ is defined as either ‘accountability’ or ‘development’ and no reference is made to the other purpose. For example, the OECD report on New Zealand education states that the “primary focus [of appraisal] in all instances is as a supportive and development process to assist teachers in their professional career development” (Nusche et al., 2012, p. 70). This can create uncertainty and confusion of the understanding of the term ‘appraisal’.

The term ‘attestation’ is used in four documents but it is difficult to find a definition in the official documentation produced by the MoE, ERO, NZTC or NZEI. Attestation is a word that is unique to New Zealand education and other countries would use the term ‘evaluation’ or ‘assessment’. The OECD report on New Zealand education (Nusche et al., 2012) supports this view and has used attestation in discussion around the measurement or assessment of teacher performance which is linked with pay-scale progression and teacher registration. This is consistent within other
documentation examined where the term attestation is not defined but used in the context of teacher assessment.

**Table 4.1: Analysis of appraisal, attestation and accountability definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Definition of appraisal, attestation and accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoE – website</td>
<td><strong>Appraisal, Attestation, Accountability</strong> – no clear definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE - New Zealand Country Background Report</td>
<td><strong>Appraisal</strong> serves two purposes – accountability purposes and improvement purposes. <strong>Attestation</strong> – referred to in the context of attestation of performance but not specifically defined. <strong>Accountability</strong> – referred to as evaluation, assessment, quality assurance and monitoring. (Ministry of Education, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO – ERO report for school BoT around linking charter targets to appraisal.</td>
<td><strong>Appraisal</strong> The guidelines state that appraisal is intended to foster improved teaching by connecting the principal’s development goals to the school’s strategic goals and priorities. Performance appraisal establishes objectives for teachers and leads to professional growth through reflection and formal feedback. Appraisal is also used to guide salary progression, and inform recommendations for full registration and for renewing teachers’ practising certificates. (Education Review Office, 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ERO – website | **Attestation** - no reference  
**Accountability** - no reference |
| NZTC Registered Teacher Criteria Handbook, and website. | This document makes no mention of the words **accountability** or **attestation**. It does not mention **appraisal** except when stating that appraisal meetings and appraisal records could be used as evidence to prove competency. (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) |
| NZTC – Workshop handouts | **Appraisal** is an evaluation process. It must be used to systematically determine the merit of the performance of the teacher against the RTC. **Appraisal** must be managed in such a way that the dual needs of development and accountability are met. (New Zealand Teachers Council, The Education Group, & Evaluation Associates, 2013) |
| NZEI – Primary Teachers’ Collective Agreement (2013-2015) | The ‘appraisal process’ is referred to but not defined. **Attestation** is referred to multiple times in the context of an attestation of practice but it is not defined. **Accountability** not referenced at all. (New Zealand Educational Institute, 2010) |
| OECD - OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education NEW ZEALAND | The term **appraisal** is used to refer to judgements on the performance of school-level professionals, *e.g.* teachers and principals. It states that **appraisal** occurs in two ways: (1) to gain or renew registration; and (2) as part of the employer’s performance management processes for salary progression professional learning & development. **Accountability** is not referred to in the context of performance appraisal. **Attestation** is referred to as a measure of teacher performance and is linked with pay-scale progression. (Nusche et al., 2012) |
Similarly accountability is used in New Zealand education but a definition cannot be readily located in official documentation. *The New Zealand Country Background Report* (Ministry of Education, 2010) refers to accountability as ‘evaluation’, ‘assessment’, ‘quality assurance’ and ‘monitoring of teacher performance’. However, a concern is that accountability is a key purpose of appraisal, yet it is not referred to in five of the documents analysed. This raises the question of balance between accountability and development within performance appraisal systems, as there appeared to be a greater number of references regarding development within the documentation.

While exploring and examining the websites and documentation associated with the MoE, ERO, NZTC, and NZEI, I noted an inconsistent use and defining of appraisal, accountability and attestation. This is problematic as many school leaders would expect to access information from these sources to obtain clarity for such terms.

**Teacher Standards**

There are two sets of performance standards for teachers in New Zealand. These standards were produced by two agencies for two different purposes. Firstly, the Ministry of Education produced the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999b). In 1999, these professional standards were included in the *Primary Teachers Collective Agreement* “to provide a basis for annual attestation for movement up the salary scale” (Nusche et al., 2012, p. 86). As noted in the Introduction chapter of this thesis, the implementation of these standards had a major influence over appraisal systems and became embedded in a bureaucratic approach to control teachers (Fitzgerald, 2001; Fitzgerald et al., 2003). As these standards were linked to pay progression through the attestation process, they assumed a greater importance than was intended (Nusche et al., 2012).

The second set of teacher standards are the *Registered teacher criteria* (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) produced by the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC). The NZTC explain that the RTC are designed to:

- Represent the essential knowledge and capabilities for quality teaching in Aotearoa New Zealand;
• Be both aspirational and achievable for teachers; and
• Apply to all teachers seeking to gain full registration and to renew practicing certificates (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b, p. 1).

In summary the Professional standards for primary teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b) were designed for attestation for pay progression, and to assure minimal levels of competency, whilst the RTC were created as a tool to facilitate teacher registration and renewal of a teacher’s practicing certificate. The concept of professional growth or development is not mentioned in the historical documentation.

Although the NZTC do not include teacher improvement as one of the key design reasons for the RTC, in the Registered Teacher Criteria Handbook (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) it explains that one of the purposes of the RTC is “a framework to guide career long professional learning and development of teachers” (p.3). However, the OECD report on New Zealand education (Nusche et al., 2012) claims that the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) are used in the appraisal of teachers to “gain or renew registration to teach; and professional standards are used as part of the employer’s performance management processes for salary progression and professional learning” (p.135). To further complicate this confusion around the notion of ‘professional learning’, in The New Zealand Country Background Report which contributed to the OECD report, it describes one purpose of appraisal as teacher improvement and states that it is “linked to ongoing professional learning and development to improve teaching and learning linked to either set of professional standards” (Ministry of Education, 2010, p. 51). Clearly, there are conflicting and confusing messages being delivered to schools. This led me to ask the following questions: Should the RTC or the PS be used as the basis for the development purpose of appraisal? And, does it matter?

This confusion is reinforced further by a The New Zealand Country Background Report (Ministry of Education, 2010) which states that “there are currently two sets of professional standards in place [in NZ]. The first are the standards for teacher registration purposes and the second are the standards outlined for pay progression in the collective agreements” (p.59). One may assume that this report is talking about
the RTC and PS as the two sets of professional standards but this is not specified. The terminology used in the report is ambiguous and may also send a confusing message to schools and principals.

**Links with legislative requirements**

The documentation reviewed was consistent in communicating that performance appraisal serves two purposes: accountability and development. The OECD report (Nusche et al., 2012) noted that “teacher appraisal in New Zealand occurs in two specific instances: (1) To gain or renew registration to teach; and (2) As part of the employer’s performance management processes for salary progression and professional learning and development” (p.24). The New Zealand Country Background Report (Ministry of Education, 2010) elaborates and more specifically describes the appraisal purposes as:

1. Teacher appraisal for accountability purposes: registration against the standards set by the NZTC; and attestation against the professional standards for salary progression;
2. Teacher appraisal for improvement purposes linked to ongoing professional learning and development to improve teaching and learning linked to either set of professional standards (p.51).

Although performance appraisal was described in slightly different ways by these two reports, there is a clear correlation between these two definitions.

All documentation was aligned with the Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997) in terms of policy creation, features and aspects to be assessed. For example the report regarding Board Employment Responsibilities: Linking charter targets to appraisal in primary schools (Education Review Office, 2013) reinforces the Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997) and states that “effective appraisal involves observation of teaching, self-appraisal, and opportunities for discussion. Appraisal is more likely to improve the quality of teaching and learning when:

- Development goals are specific and challenging;
- Goals focus on teaching and learning;
• Assessing the achievement of goals is based on evidence of student learning;
• Appraisal tools challenge assumptions about effective teaching and develop;
• Teachers’ capacity to inquire into the impact of their teaching; and
• Appraisal discussions focus on the impact of teaching on learning.” (p.3)

This links directly with the ‘Features of appraisal’ and shows the connections between the two documents. The consistent message throughout the documentation analysed, regarding the implementation of the legislative requirements, is that teachers, school leaders and schools are expected to create, implement and sustain a performance appraisal system which suits the needs of the individual school.

SCHOOL DOCUMENTS
The results of the analysis of the school documentation are reported here using the following headings.

1. The ‘Terminology’ and use of the ‘Teacher Standards’ in North and South Schools are summarised in Table 4.2 and Table 4.3 respectively.
2. ‘Links to the legislative requirements’, the limitations or gaps associated with the ‘legislative requirements’ are examined in Appendices G, H and I.
3. The analysis of the school documentation against Effective Appraisal Systems Criteria is recorded in Appendices J and K.

Terminology and teacher standards
The documentation analysed in the case of North School was the school’s Performance Appraisal Policy (North School, 2013a) and the Performance Management Folio (North School, 2013b) which included all documentation relating to appraisal for teachers. In the case of South School the documentation analysed was the school’s Appraisal Policy and Procedures (South School, 2013a) and Attestation Policy and Procedures (South School, 2013b). As well as these policy documents, South School provided other documentation related to the separate ‘appraisal’ and ‘attestation’ processes in their school. These were Annual Attestation Form (South School, 2012a), Full Attestation Form (South School, 2012c) and Appraisal Inquiry Sheet (South School, 2012b). The data is described in Table 4.2.
### Table 4.2: Analysis of North School and South Schools documentation against the terminology

**Key:**  - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>North School (Policy, Performance Management Folio)</th>
<th>South School (Policy, Appraisal &amp; Attestation Folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>+ North School has a Performance appraisal policy which is focussed around development of staff to achieve their professional and personal goals.</td>
<td>+ South School appraisal policy document relates to the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model and is focussed around teacher practice and student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attestation</td>
<td>- The term ‘attestation’ is not included in any of the documentation. However the policy document states that “assessment against the requirements” will occur annually.</td>
<td>+ South School has a separate ‘Attestation Policy’ which refers to a process that “assures that all teachers at South School meet school expectations”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>- The term accountability is not evident in the North School documentation.</td>
<td>- The term accountability is not evident in the South School documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both schools used the terminology ‘appraisal’ in their school documentation. However the meanings ascribed to these terms differed. The notion of appraisal in the case of North School was taken to mean the improvement and development of staff. The policy stated that the rationale for having a performance appraisal system was that it “improves the quality of teaching and learning and therefore student achievement by providing support and development for staff that will enable them to achieve their personal and professional goals” (North School, 2013a, p. 1). In contrast, South School stated that the purpose of appraisal was to “build teachers’ capacity for thinking about their own practice and its possible impact on student learning and engagement” (South School, 2013a, p. 1).

Although neither school made formal reference to the term accountability, links to the concept of accountability can be found. For example North School, in their *Performance Management Folio*, have a ‘Quality Assurance’ checklist. This checklist appeared to be a tool that was used each term of the school year to check that teachers were meeting the mandated requirements for that school. For example, the
checklist included ‘Long Term Planning’, ‘Assessment Data’, and ‘Student Anecdotal comments’. As the document stated “The purpose of the Quality Assurance section is to assist classroom teachers in keeping on top of the day to day administration and organisational issues within the classroom” (North School, 2013b, p. 5).

**Teacher standards**

The same documentation for both schools was examined for reference to and use of the teacher standards. Results are described in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3:** Analysis of North School and South Schools documentation against the use of teacher standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of teacher Standards</th>
<th>North School (Policy, Performance Management Folio)</th>
<th>South School (Policy, Appraisal &amp; Attestation Folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Standards for Primary Teachers (PS)</td>
<td>± The performance appraisal policy, and job description in the <em>Performance Management Folio</em> reference the PS but do not list them.</td>
<td>± In the performance appraisal policy, there is reference to the PS. There is no additional evidence of the PS in any other school documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Teacher Criteria (RTC)</td>
<td>+ In the performance appraisal policy, there is reference to the use of the RTC and this is clearly linked in the other school documentation.</td>
<td>+ In the performance appraisal policy, there is reference to the use of the RTC and this is clearly linked in the other school documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other standards or criteria</td>
<td>± In the Job Description for teachers there are Key tasks listed which are not linked to the PS or RTC. These are the criteria of the old <em>Satisfactory teacher dimensions</em>.</td>
<td>± The use of the Cultural Competencies (Tataiako) is not referred to in the policy document but is evident on the ‘Attestation document’, and teachers are asked to assess themselves against these criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both schools mentioned the use of the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999b) in their policy documents, yet in other documents there were no links or references to these. Therefore, neither school appears to be following the legislative requirement that the *Professional standards for primary teachers*
(Ministry of Education, 1999b) must be used for attestation. This was also investigated during the interviews and focus groups.

In contrast, both schools stated they used the Registered teacher criteria for appraisal and attestation, and this claim was consistently repeated throughout the documentation. This was in direct conflict with guidelines published in The New Zealand Country Background Report (Ministry of Education, 2010) which describes the dual purposes of appraisal and which standards are supposed to be used for each purpose:

- teacher appraisal for accountability purposes: registration against the standards set by the NZTC for entering the teaching profession and maintaining ongoing membership; and attestation against the professional standards for salary progression; and
- teacher appraisal for improvement purposes linked to ongoing professional learning and development to improve teaching and learning linked to either set of professional standards. (Ministry of Education, 2010, p. 51)

Nusche et al. (2012) agree, stating that the “Registered teacher criteria should be used in the appraisal process so that teachers can gain or renew their Practicing Certificate, and professional standards are used as part of the employer’s performance management processes for salary progression and professional learning” (p.134). Neither school used the Professional standards for primary teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b) at all which could be problematic, as they appear to not comply with guidelines from the Ministry of Education, and are legally part of the Collective Employment Contract.

**Links with legislative requirements**

In relation to the legislative requirements, the appraisal documentation at North and South Schools was also analysed against specific sections of the Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997). These are: ‘The principles,’ ‘The features of appraisal’ and ‘Aspects of teacher performance to be appraised.’ This was done to identify any omissions of legislative requirements in the school documentation. Due to the volume of data, this analysis
was recorded in table form and the full results are shown in Appendices G, H and I. The next section will provide a commentary of this analysis of school documentation against the legislative requirements. Summaries are presented here and further detail is included in each Appendix as noted.

The principles (Appendix G)
The key results of the analysis identify that the policy statements for both schools have gaps in regard to complying with the legislative requirements of The Principles in the Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997). The key areas missing from both schools’ documentation are the notions of consultation with the staff, and the development of a performance appraisal system that is transparent and open for all staff.

The features of teacher appraisal (Appendix H)
As neither school fully complied with The Principles (Ministry of Education, 1997), neither could satisfy the requirement of their policy meeting The Features of Teacher Appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997) criteria. Despite this, North School has documentation in place that meets all of the remaining legislative requirements in terms of ‘The Features of Teacher Appraisal’ (Ministry of Education, 1997) except that the appraiser is not identified in any way.

In contrast the South School documentation had minimal detail available in several areas. The policy and documentation examined here does not:

1. Delegate responsibility for the implementation of the appraisal policy and process from the BoT to a member of staff;
2. Discuss the concepts of confidentiality and disputes;
3. Identify appraisers in consultation with staff; or
4. Have clear information around supporting teachers to achieve their appraisal objectives.

The aspects of teacher performance to be appraised (Appendix I)
The final aspect to consider here the ‘Aspects of teacher performance to be appraised’ (Ministry of Education, 1997). This has direct links to the use of the Professional standards for primary teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b). The expectation in this
section of the *Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal* (Ministry of Education, 1997), clearly states that the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999b) need to be used to set performance expectations. Neither school complies with this requirement, as the teacher standards used in these schools are the *Registered teacher criteria*. In conclusion, both schools fail to meet the legislative requirements outlined in the *PMS1 document* (Ministry of Education, 1997).

**Effective appraisal system criteria**

In addition to analysing the links with the legislative requirements, I also analysed the two systems in place at North and South Schools. I based this analysis on Piggot-Irvine’s (2003) criteria with the additional areas of ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and a student learning focus. These effective performance appraisal criteria were discussed in chapter two of this thesis. Due to the approach adopted, the initial analysis of North and South schools documentation was recorded in table form and the full results are shown in Appendices J and K respectively. The key findings for each school are now outlined.

The North School documentation, displayed in Appendix J, showed variation in terms of alignment with the necessary characteristics for effective performance appraisal systems. In summary the key ‘gaps’ identified were:

1. The system had elements of both accountability and development, yet these were not clearly defined and explained;
2. There was no documented acknowledgement to suggest that North School valued the notions of trust, or time; and
3. The omission of reference to: training appraisers/appraisees.

These gaps are problematic as they can potentially create challenges in the successful implementation of the performance appraisal system. Clear definitions and explanations are important if all teachers are to have a clear understanding of the full appraisal process involved. The performance appraisal policy should clarify all procedures and criteria, and be openly published within the school. (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). In relation to trust and time, these need to be a priority if teachers are to see the value in the system and believe it is important to the
school and the SLT. Trust is important and needs to be developed through respectful trusting relationships (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Moreland, 2011; Piggot-Irvine, 2003). To conduct effective appraisal, sufficient time must be made and given to staff (Morton, 2011; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2002; Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003). Likewise the notion of training appraisers and appraisees is essential if the process is to meet its full potential and be a meaningful programme for teacher growth and accountability. This includes in-depth training on all facets of appraisal with specific training for appraisers (Cardno, 1999; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2002).

South School, displayed in Appendix K, had eleven ‘gaps’ in terms of conforming with the necessary characteristics of effective performance appraisal systems. In summary the key ‘gaps’ identified were:

1. The system has two distinct elements of accountability and development and these are separated not integrated;
2. There was no documented acknowledgement to suggest that South School valued the concepts of trust, confidentiality, transparency, or time;
3. The omission of reference to training appraisers/appraisees; and
4. The lack of separation of the appraisal process from discipline proceedings.

Once again these gaps can create challenges for the successful implementation of the performance appraisal system. Although South School has two distinct processes, and this is in direct conflict with the Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal (Ministry of Education, 1997), they are clearly defined. A major concern, however, is the lack of reference to the notions of trust, confidentiality, transparency, and time, as these all impact on the success of a performance appraisal system. Teachers must have confidence in the appraisal system and if these characteristics are omitted, teacher buy-in may become problematic (Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Rudman, 2002).

In summary, the documentation analysis using documents from North and South Schools highlights the presence of the four challenges outlined in the introduction to this chapter. Therefore schools require support and guidance to find the solutions for these challenges.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In summary, the analysis of documentation from each of the two schools, as well as other documents from other sources, has further highlighted the four challenges that exist in education regarding performance appraisal. These challenges are:

- The understanding and application of key terminology such as appraisal, attestation and accountability;
- The use and understanding of the governing standards for teachers in New Zealand (RTC and PS);
- The links to the legislative requirements (PMS1); and
- How schools use the characteristics identified as being integral to implementing an effective performance appraisal system.

The analysis of the school documentation revealed that the key issues were:

1. A lack of clarity of the terms ‘accountability’ and ‘attestation’;
2. That both schools only use the RTC and have discontinued the use of the PS; and
3. That several of the ‘principles’ and ‘features of appraisal’ that are identified in the legislative requirements were not present within the school documentation.

The notions of confidentiality, trust, transparency, discipline processes, and identification of appraisers were the key issues for the schools.

The analysis of the other documentation from other sources revealed that the key issues were:

1. A lack of consistency and use of terminology associated with performance appraisal (attestation and accountability); and
2. The confusing messages about the two sets of standards and their uses.

As part of the document analysis I have linked these issues with the research questions which were:

1. What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)?
2. What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important?

3. What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?

Table 4.4 on the next page presents a summary of the document analysis findings, the themes that have emerged from this analysis and how these link with the research questions.

**Table 4.4  Summary of findings linking challenges to the research questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Emerging Data Theme</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Clarity of the terminology and its application</td>
<td>Appraisal for Accountability</td>
<td>(1) What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal for Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Characteristics of effective appraisal systems: the notions of time, trust and confidentiality</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>(2) What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The use of the <em>Registered teacher criteria</em> and the <em>Professional standards for primary teachers</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meeting the legislative Requirements outlined in the PMS1 document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These four challenges are potential barriers:</td>
<td>Barriers to effective performance appraisal</td>
<td>(3) What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clarity of terminology and its application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Confusion between two sets of criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding of legislative requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Characteristics of effective appraisal system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS – Interviews and focus groups

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the second part of data analysis is reported. Data from the two interviews and four focus groups are presented and analysed. The purpose of the interviews and focus groups was to collect the perceptions of principals (interviews), and appraisers and appraisees (focus groups) relating to performance appraisal in their schools. The interview and focus group questions are included in Appendices A, B, and C. I conducted one interview and two focus groups in each school, and the data was aggregated for principals, appraisers and appraisees separately.

This chapter begins by presenting a brief overview of the interview and focus group participants from each school. The process used to analyse the data is then outlined. The questions used for the interviews and focus groups provide the headings for the presentation of the data, and tables are used to highlight the frequency of the specific sub-themes that emerge from the data. These sub-themes are then grouped into the major themes.

Structure of data presentation

The data is presented in the following manner:

1. The data collection questions are stated. These can be found in Appendices A, B and C;
2. The key sub-themes identified from the data are noted and presented in a table. The responses from the principals, appraisers and appraisees are categorised under N (North School) and S (South School); and
3. A commentary discussing the data collected follows, which includes separate commentary for the principals, appraisers and appraisees.

Throughout the interviews and focus groups the participants used acronyms specific to an educational context. On the first occasion that an acronym is used in this chapter, I have included the full term followed by the acronym in brackets. Thereafter, the
acronym only is used. A full list of all acronyms used in this thesis can be found on page viii.

THE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

The interview participants
The pseudonyms “North School” and “South School” have been used in order to protect the identity of the research sites. For the purpose of this thesis, both principals will be referred to as ‘she.’ Both principals are very experienced, and have been at their respective schools for a sufficient period of time to be familiar with the school’s performance appraisal system, and to also perhaps have contributed to the system’s development and review.

The focus group participants
Participants for the focus group discussions were asked to volunteer after being given a hard copy outline of the research by their principal. Participants were allocated random (not gender specific) pseudonym names beginning with N or S to indicate their association with North School and South School respectively. The participant’s role within the school is also included in Appendix L. The sample of participants included a variety of experience ranging from new teachers (first year of teaching), to teachers that had over 20 years of experience. Furthermore, a number of appraisers and appraisees had been present at North and South School during recent developments and review of the performance appraisal systems.

FINDINGS – Interviews and focus groups

Question One asked: How does performance appraisal work in your school?
The responses to this question are shown in Table 5.1, along with the number of responses. Two key terms emerged from the responses to this question. The themes of appraisal and attestation were evident in both interviews and all focus groups. Appraisal was associated with the processes of teacher development while attestation was seen as teacher accountability and meeting pre-determined standards. The
appraisers and appraisees also noted who was responsible for these processes in their two schools.

Table 5.1  Question 1: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data  
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal is for teacher development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appraisal is for teacher development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appraisal is for teacher development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attestation is for accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attestation is for accountability/must do’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attestation is meeting standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals set (individual, team, school)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal does attestation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal does attestation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLT and TL does attestation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AP does appraisal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TL does appraisal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting is important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLT= Senior leadership team  AP= Assistant principal  TL= Team leader

Principal responses

Both principals were able to succinctly outline their understanding of the appraisal process at their respective schools. Principal North identified that her school has one document, referred to as a Performance Management Folio, which encompasses both teacher accountability and also teacher development. She referred to this as their “appraisal process” and noted:

At our school in the Performance Management Folio we [Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Assistant Principals (APs)] all fill in the areas of development and what we see in terms of the Registered teacher criteria (RTC), and then after all of those observations, whether it’s me or [one the APs], there is obviously the verbal feedback and there’s the follow-up on the points of development.

Principal South identified that her school has a distinct process in place for both accountability and development. She referred to these as ‘attestation’ and ‘appraisal’, and described the purposes of each as:
Attestation is the must do’s for teacher registration, renewal of practising certificate and salary progression. Appraisal is around professional growth and inquiry into your own practice.

Appraiser responses
All seven appraisers identified that appraisal was used at their respective schools as a way to develop teachers. They also stated that there was some form of accountability involved in this process as well. North School referred to this as “quality assurance” and South School referred to this as ‘attestation’. Similar views were held in regard to the purpose of each. Some examples include:

Nathan: Performance appraisal at our school is run on a yearly basis so every teacher has what we call a Performance Management Folio (PMF) and in there we have Quality Assurance, must do’s, which is just a checklist that’s ticked off.

Saul: The appraisal strand and the attestation strand are quite separate. Appraisal is more on-going and uses the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model. Attestation is more about the non-negotiables and meeting standards.

The three appraisers from North School all noted that the two purposes of accountability and development fell under the same umbrella term of ‘performance management’ in their school and different people were involved in each process. They felt that the Assistant Principals, whom they worked closely with on a daily basis, were the people responsible for overseeing teachers’ development, whereas the principal was more focused on assuring minimal acceptable standards of performance. For example:

Nathan: The principal goes into the teachers’ classrooms twice a year to do a general observation and ensure all standards are being met. The APs go in twice a year to do an observation based around a target goal.

All appraisers discussed the importance of setting relevant and meaningful goals as part of the appraisal cycle. Across the two schools there were a variety of approaches to setting goals and teachers had some autonomy when doing so. The goals could be based on a strategic goal of the school or on student needs within an individual
classroom. A recurring comment from all appraisers was that the goals needed to be student-centred with the aim of improving teacher practice in order to have a positive impact on student achievement. Comments from participants that highlight this are as follows:

Nadia: The school has some strategic goals around students meeting the National Standards in general in reading, writing and mathematics. So teachers have chosen a target group sitting just below the National Standard, that they think with a boost and the right kind of teaching and the right strategies will make National Standards. Goals are set by the teacher and new teaching strategies are investigated and trialled.

Saul: Teachers identify a goal they would like to work on. They try to base it on data, and [teachers] have some sort of intervention or whatever they’re looking at, the use of research and they try to put something into practice and then they measure if they have been successful or not.

**Appraisee responses**

All eight appraisees identified that appraisal was used for teacher development, whereas attestation was more about the various standards that teachers needed to meet. Comments included:

Sheila: Ours is broken into attestation and appraisal and you go through the full appraisal system when your registration is up….then you meet with the senior management and team leader and discuss stuff.

Noah: Attestation is kind of minimal acceptable standards whereas appraisal is focussed on pedagogical development in terms of individual teacher development and professional development.

All appraisees identified that goal-setting was a key component to appraisal at their schools. These goals came in three forms: individual, team and school goals. Participant comments that highlight the idea of goal-setting include:

Noah: I know that the minischool [team] goal comes from…well for example, a strategic school-wide goal is to improve achievement for Maori and Pasifika. So our minischool [team] goal, and it was done in consultation with
my AP, me and the other team leader in the senior school, so our minischool goal is reading, writing and maths for Maori and Pasifika.

Sid: And our goals came out of having a look at the whole school data

Steve: Then our appraisal goals are our inquiry based goals that we set for ourselves with our team leaders at the start of the year.

Question Two asked: How would you define the term “appraisal” in this school?
One theme, teacher development, was dominant in responses from participants regarding the definition of appraisal in their schools as shown in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher development / growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher development / growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher development / growth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting minimal acceptable standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting minimal acceptable standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting minimal acceptable standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reflective process (non-judgemental)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal responses
Both principals, in their definitions of appraisal, included terminology associated with professional growth and teacher development. Principal North also focussed her answer on the students, stating that:

Appraisal is about making sure that the kids are getting the best deal they could get in the classroom, and everyone’s working to the best of their ability, but also that teachers have the training or development to make sure that can happen.

Principal South added an additional dimension stating that appraisal was an organisation’s responsibility to develop and build capacity within its staff. She stated that:

Appraisal for me is about the school as an organisation supporting the professional growth of its staff.
Both principals used terminology linking teachers with becoming more effective practitioners. The key concepts associated with appraisal were personal and professional growth, teacher development and ‘Teaching as Inquiry’.

**Appraiser responses**

All participants from South School identified appraisal as a process linked to professional growth and ongoing development of pedagogical practice. As can be seen in the following quotes, ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ was a major component of this appraisal process in South School.

*Sarah:* The system by which teachers develop their own professional practice and capabilities with support using a ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model.

*Saul:* Divided into two parts or strands attestation which is bottom lines. Second strand is appraisal which uses ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model. This model is teacher directed and based on the needs of the learners.

All participants from North School identified that appraisal in their school was an opportunity to reflect on practice in a non-judgemental way. Comments that illustrate this are:

*Nathan:* The process of teachers reflecting upon their teaching with the support of observation notes, data evidence, prompting questions. An opportunity for a teacher’s effectiveness to be evaluated using a variety of evidence (non-judgmental).

**Appraisee responses**

All appraisees connected the term ‘appraisal’ with professional growth and personal development. Definitions of appraisal from North and South School appraisees included:

*Naya:* A process that enables teachers and management to discuss student progress while at the same time encouraging and nurturing professional development. It allows us as teachers to reflect, grow and develop.

*Sheila:* ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ – that you are using data to shape your teaching practice to meet that need. Then reflecting on that teaching and using this to inform practise…(and also doing research about the need).
Additionally, only one appraisee from each school identified accountability as a component of appraisal as well as development. This was highlighted by Noah and Sid:

Noah: *A process of personal reflection that has two purposes, one to attest to minimal acceptable standards, and two – to develop practice in teaching and learning with students welfare and achievement as the focus.*

Sid: *Two definitions – first is when you are measured, by self and management, against professional teacher criteria. Second is when we select an appraisal goal as an enquiry to focus on over a year or less.*

**Question Three asked: How has this system developed in your school?**

Three reasons for the development of the current performance appraisal system were identified by the participants: in the first instance, mandated changes from the Ministry of Education (MoE), Board of Trustees (BoT) or SLT; secondly frustration or anxiety with the ‘old’ approach; and thirdly, staff within the school providing evidence of a more effective method for performance appraisal. The frequency of responses is shown in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=North School</th>
<th>S=South School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated changes from MoE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration with old approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Ownership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated process from SLT/BoT/MoE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration with old ‘tick box’ approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated process from SLT/BoT/MoE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety with old ‘tick box’ approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Ownership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal responses**

As both principals had been at their respective schools for a period of some years, they had an historical perspective on the development of their school's performance appraisal system. They identified significant changes to the systems over the last five years and gave the following explanation relating to the balance of the dual purposes:

Principal North: *We have refined it a lot…there was a good system in place but it was probably a little heavily weighted towards…I guess the assurance,*

Principal South: *There was a good system in place but it was probably a little heavily weighted towards…I guess the assurance,*
the stuff that you need to do, for example that your planning is done, and all the curriculum areas are covered, and room environment etc. We have really changed that and it is focussed on ‘Teaching as Inquiry’, looking at what you are doing and how do you know it is effective.

Principal South: I guess there was a level of frustration around the …almost the ticking off side of attestation against the professional growth and the kind of one box fits all approach.

The mandated requirements that both participants referred to were the introduction of the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b), and the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle in the New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) (Ministry of Education, 2007). The principals noted that the introduction of these saw a focus placed on schools by the MoE and Education Review Office (ERO) to ensure that the dual purposes of accountability and development were being achieved within performance appraisal systems.

Appraiser responses
All appraisers from South School identified that their appraisal system had changed as a result of new mandated processes from their BoT and SLT, and this linked closely with frustration from staff around the mixed purposes of attestation and appraisal. This was summarised by Sarah who explained that:

Initially it came from senior management from discussions that we [SLT] were having about the frustrations of trying to do everything in one go and not feeling we were doing anything well. There was a cross over and because we were getting bogged down in the attestation type stuff, we couldn’t do the appraisal stuff well.

Similarly, South School participants highlighted a level of frustration with the ‘old’ system which was viewed as a highly authoritarian process which was ‘done’ to the staff, rather than with or alongside them. This was highlighted by participant Sally who explained that appraisal was:

This stressful thing, that all three [SLT members] would visit the classrooms with a ticky sheet.
Sam added that this process was very frustrating and often meaningless as:

*Everyone would get all their stuff out and all neat, panic stricken for days, and there would be people [SLT] down the back watching, looking through everything, talking to a few kids, and then that would be it for another year.*

Within both schools there was a high level of frustration at the ‘old’ appraisal system that was much more focussed on meeting standards and ‘things’ being checked off.

The appraisers also identified that a lack of personal ownership of appraisal goals meant that appraisal was undervalued by staff. Five out of seven appraisers indicated that that this had changed under the new system and as a result staff had much more ownership over their appraisal. This was a major change in both schools over recent time. This was explained in detail by Nathan who identified that:

*It [appraisal] has become much more teacher driven, they [teachers] have taken much more ownership over it, and so it’s less dictated by management as to what their goals are. The onus is on them (teachers) to be more reflective on their practice rather than somebody coming in and doing an observation and then telling them that this is what you need to do.*

Appraisers unanimously stated that staff would engage in the process more willingly if they had ownership of the process and had the opportunity to set their own goals.

**Appraisee responses**

Half of the appraisees identified that changes to the current system was a result of mandated changes from a variety of sources, including MoE, the BoT, and SLT. The remaining appraisees felt the development of the system was more to do with the anxiety that the ‘old’ system created. This ‘old’ system was based on a quality assurance checklist and followed a more traditional approach to appraisal; that is, setting goals, one classroom observation, a checklist of yes/no’s, and then an ‘appraisal discussion’. The appraisees stated:

*Naya: I think definitely over the past two years it’s really become about strategic goals and then where our needs have come from. It’s more of the analysing of the data that we’ve needed to do from National Standards and the expectations, you know, that the Ministry are driving.*
Noah: So I think the appraisal process hasn't changed but the way we discuss things and focus on our children has changed.

Sasha: Well years ago, it looked more like this. Someone would come to your room, from senior management, they’d share it out, a page each and they’d come to your room and do ‘ticks’ and lots of comments....you would have several sessions of being observed. They [SLT] would meet, come to a conclusion, then discuss it with you. It was cumbersome and hollow.

Steve: And it used to cause anxiety too, the checklist format.

Additionally three appraisees from South School noted that staff had taken ownership of the apparent lack of effectiveness with appraisal and had created a solution. This is explained in the following comment:

Sheila: It changed because [Team Leader (TL)] did a course or a paper about appraisal and how it needed to be separated from attestation because the two terms are quite different. So as a result of this learning, senior management decided to split it.

Question Four asked: What part/s of the appraisal system would you say allow teachers to improve their practice and develop?

The principals and appraisers identified three key processes linked to how their appraisal systems assisted teachers in becoming more effective practitioners. These were: ‘Teaching as Inquiry’, ‘Reflective Practice’, and ‘Professional Dialogue’. The appraisees specifically added the student-centred approach. The number of responses are shown in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Question 4: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Teaching as Inquiry'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reflective Practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Dialogue</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Teaching as Inquiry’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Teaching as Inquiry’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student-centred</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Principal responses
Both principals identified that the introduction of the new New Zealand curriculum in 2007 (Ministry of Education, 2007) had a major influence on how teachers developed their skills as teachers. The notion of teachers reflecting on their own practice, and sharing their learning as well as their challenges in meaningful professional dialogue, was a theme in both schools. Principal North summarised this, stating that:

The part that is about teacher development, I think comes from the professional discussion or dialogue, and then what’s actioned from that. The discussions, the trends, sometimes it’s a one off, and then sometimes it is just a matter of sitting down and talking and saying “Try this and we’ll come back and have another look”.

Both principals identified that the provision for both formal and informal opportunities for this dialogue and reflection to occur was essential if the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle was to become part of the school culture and, indeed, the teaching profession as a whole.

Appraiser responses
‘Teaching as Inquiry’ was recognised as an important part of the appraisal process that allows teachers to develop their practice. All three participants from North School concluded that it was a ‘living’ process in their school and described it in the following way:

Nadia: We are open to the fact that everybody’s journey…might be slightly different. They have different things to work on. That’s ‘Teaching as Inquiry’.

Natalie: And the opportunity is there for them to say “Could you come in and observe me doing this and give me some feedback.”

Nathan: And I would add in there that using data, as the actual evidence, is a really useful tool for teachers as well to say “Actually, I’ve got six children who are reading below national standards. What am I doing to help them? What have I done and what can I do next?” Having that data there can be a very effective tool just to help them (teachers) guide their own development.
South School also had a major focus on the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle within their appraisal process. Saul explained how this worked for staff and assisted them to develop their teaching practice.

The entire appraisal process does it. In terms of the appraisal system, so that’s in the teacher inquiry, [teachers] identify a goal they would like to work on. They base it on data, but in terms of using data in its wider sense. Then through team meetings or through one on one meetings with [teachers] at various times, they [teachers] have some sort of intervention or whatever they’re looking at, the use of research and they try to put something into practice and then they measure if they have been successful or not.

All participants noted that ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ stimulated professional dialogue, which led to positive and rewarding learning conversations amongst the staff. It also allowed teachers time to reflect on their practice in a collaborative environment where sharing was encouraged.

Appraisee responses
North School appraisees identified ‘Reflective Practice’, ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and ‘Professional Dialogue’ as key factors to improved teacher practice. Examples of comments that highlight this are:

Nina: For my appraisal or ‘Teaching as Inquiry’, I’ve been able to go and observe and then reflect and bring it into my own practice.

Naya: We’ve discussed all our personal goals at team level so we’re all aware of what everyone else is focusing on so we can nurture and support each another. The professional discussions are a big part of that as well.

All appraisees from South School identified that ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ was the key part of their appraisal system that led to improved practice. Two teachers from North School agreed that ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ was important. Steve from South School summed it up as:

The ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ part, it’s as simple as that.
Two of the appraisees from North School claimed that being focussed on student achievement through the appraisal process had led to improvements in their practice as it meant their appraisal goals were more relevant and meaningful. Naya stated that: 

*I think since those personal goals have been a little more focussed on targeting student achievement, for appraisal I have been more focussed on improving my teaching for that group of kids.*

**Question Five asked: Are there any parts that link to the professional standards or the Teachers’ Council criteria for registration? What parts do this?**

There were two definite responses from participants as shown in Table 5.5. All identified that their schools utilised the *Registered teacher criteria (RTC)* within the appraisal (teacher development) and attestation (accountability) processes. The *Professional standards for primary teachers (PS)* were not used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (links to the RTC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes (links to the RTC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes (links to RTC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (links to the PS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No (specific links to the PS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appraisal &amp; attestation links to RTC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal &amp; attestation links to RTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appraisal &amp; attestation links to RTC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No idea of what purpose of PS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal responses**

The two principals articulated an understanding of the governing standards (*Professional standards for primary teachers* and the *Registered teacher criteria*) for teacher performance in New Zealand state schools. Both schools used the RTC as the basis of both appraisal and attestation processes. The reason given was that the existence of both standards (RTC and PS) caused confusion within their schools. The principals offered the following explanations:

*Principal North: At our school in the Performance Management Folio what you will see is the RTC so when that [RTC] came out we replaced the PS with the RTC. I think they are similar enough, and there is such a close link that I don't think it's a problem.*
Principal South: I mean in actual fact, in terms of the legislative requirement, they’re (PS) that you’re supposed to use for a salary assessment but they’re not what you use for a Practicing Certificate so it’s pretty silly having two, it causes confusion, so we use the RTC for both purposes.

Appraiser responses
According to all participants both schools only use the RTC when appraising and attesting teachers. Participants identified some knowledge and understanding of the difference between the two sets of standards and what they were used for. There was confusion between the participants when discussing this question as evidenced in the following statements made by appraisers.

Nadia: We were talking about Professional Standards and the RTC, and why we ended up with both. If I recall correctly, it was because the union (New Zealand Educational Institute, NZEI) hadn't accepted the RTC. I don't know if this is right though but the Teachers Council had put out the RTC. Is that how it went?

Nathan: There was a lot of discussion about how schools have only used one or the other, or have merged them. Really they were talking about the Professional Standards coming into play more when there was problems… when there is competency issues. I think that we tend to focus on the RTC?

Sarah: The attestation links to those [RTC], that’s what it’s based on. Not sure about the Professional Standards?

Appraisee responses
All appraisees agreed with the principals and appraisers and noted that their schools used the RTC as the standards when teachers are measured for appraisal or attestation. However, six out of eight appraisees identified a lack of knowledge and understanding of the difference between the two sets of standards (RTC or PS) and what they were used for. North School appraisees had little or no knowledge whereas South School had some limited understanding. No appraisees were confident to make a definite statement and opted to ask the researcher questions instead. I asked the clarifying question of “What is the difference between the PS and RTC?” There was
confusion between the participants when discussing this question as evidenced in the following statements made by appraisers.

* Nina: I didn’t know there was a difference [between RTC and PS].

* Sid: Is that [PS] the one that’s kind of the next step on from RTC?

* Sasha: Is that [PS] the ethical script?

* Sheila: Is that the one [PS] with the broader responsibilities as a profession rather than that one [RTC] which is more your duties as a teacher but like the whole, morals and ethics decisions as an educator?

These comments were from teachers that had a wide variety of teaching experience.

**Question Six asked:** What is your role within the performance appraisal system in your school?

Principals, appraisers and appraisees had different perceptions of their roles. These are shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6  Question 6: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data  
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance – ensure this happens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality Assurance – ensure this happens.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Set goals based on students needs/data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor / Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mentor / Coach / Support / Role Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Be organised and ready for observations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate professional dialogue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Share ideas and discuss the journey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be professional and reflective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal responses**

Both principals stated that as the educational leaders for their schools, they had a responsibility to ensure all staff met a certain standard and their role in the appraisal process was the assurance of quality teaching and learning programmes in their schools. Principal North summarised this stating that:
I do observations and I have to report to the BoT about what’s going on, and how the kids are achieving and progressing and how happy the kids are. The buck does stop there.

An additional issue identified by both principals was to ensure that they were seen as a mentor or coach that assisted with teacher development. Both felt that the staff needed to have confidence that they could approach them and receive clear guidance, support and advice to assist with their professional growth.

Appraiser responses
All appraisers identified themselves as people who worked alongside teachers and helped them reflect and grow professionally. This linked closely with the notion of professional dialogue between the appraiser and the appraisee which was evident in the following statements made by the participants:

Natalie: Probably a coach and a mentor. We sit alongside the teacher, we’re not there to go “You’ve got to do this and this…” unless there were issues with a teacher. But still it’s got to be collaborative...

Nadia: Yes it’s the working together. We are helping with the professional discussion by asking reflective questions like “Did the children meet the learning intentions?

Sarah: I try to role model that the process needs to be robust, you should be basing it on research and trying to get those learning conversations going all the time, that it’s not just something you pluck out of the air.

South School appraisers stated that the SLT and TL were all involved in the attestation process, whereas only the TL was directly involved in appraisal for each member of their teams. Therefore only two participants identified that they were involved with the quality assurance of teachers in their teams. For example:

Saul: It’s about providing support but also accountability as well, that these are some of the things that are our bottom lines so again reminding [teachers] that these are non-negotiable.
Appraisee responses
All appraisees for North and South Schools identified three key roles that they played in the appraisal system in their schools: in the first instance, setting goals based on their class needs; secondly, being organised and taking ownership of the process; and, lastly, being professional and reflective. Comments from participants included:

Steve: Yeah, because I feel that my appraisal goals, my inquiry goals are to do with what I do with my children. You know, that’s what I talk to my children about, that’s what we’re trying to achieve, and that’s what changes how I do things.

Neil: Basically you do your lesson trying to keep it just like normal, even though it’s not, as you have someone judging you, watching you.

Nina: We have to reflect on what we were trying to teach and how we achieved that and then justify that in the learning conversation. We figure out what your next steps are and what you need from there.

Sasha: As far as the inquiry cycle goes, that’s quite clear because as a team you’re discussing, and improving, and researching and getting information from each other.

Additionally all four appraisees from North School identified that they were required to share their learning journey with their colleagues.

Question Seven asked: What do you see as the strengths of performance appraisal in your school?
When discussing the appraisal systems in their schools, the participants identified a number of strengths which are shown in Table 5.7 on the following page.

Principal responses
The principals had similar views on the positive aspects of their performance appraisal systems. Principal South noted their key strength as:

…the professional growth and the sharing and that is something we didn’t do at the start. There’s all this rich information out there that we all learn from now through dialogue and collaboration.
Table 5.7  
**Question 7: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data**  
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing and collaborative culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaborative approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on student data to drive appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflective process – Teacher Inquiry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional approach of staff (engagement)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professionalism and high standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate systems for growth and quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Dialogue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust in appraiser/mentor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student centred</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both principals noted that the positive involvement of staff in the process was a strength as the staff were fully engaged with the data and the notion of personal growth and development. **Principal North** described this engagement as:

…*it’s almost exciting. You can’t really describe an appraisal as exciting, but it is. The way they [teachers] talk about what they are doing with their kids is exciting.*

The principals valued a collaborative learning environment where professional dialogue and a sharing culture was prevalent. It was noted that this learning environment must be student focussed.

**Appraiser responses**

All participants noted that a strength of their appraisal system was that it was based on a collaborative model where reflective practice was a key component. Appraisers noted that this collaboration occurred at different levels. For example **Nathan** stated that:

*The appraiser/appraisee relationship is based around collaboration but it doesn’t stop there. The entire staff collaborate and share their journeys at team meetings, mini-school meetings and even whole school meetings. This helps teachers to reflect on their practice as they know they have to share with other people, it’s a real strength of the system.*
A focus on student achievement was seen as another major strength, as appraisal then had a clear focus based on student’s needs. Appraisers explained this in the following statements:

Nadia: I thinks there’s a real move towards it being student data driven and evidence driven.

Sally: Helping student achievement because lots of them [goals] are based on that. I believe it will make a difference in my class to the children and that’s why I do it.

The notion of teachers having ownership over performance appraisal fell into two categories: the first being ownership over the timeline for the appraisal and flexibility to meet the goals; and secondly, ownership over the appraisal goals based on their teaching and student needs, and not having mandated goals from the SLT. Five of seven appraisers identified ownership as important and examples of how this was a strength includes:

Nathan: I think [teachers] are taking more ownership over their learning rather than us [SLT or Middle Management (MM)] coming in and trying to pinpoint their strengths and weaknesses.

Sam: In terms of the process, I think the thing that makes it workable is the flexibility of it whether you want to have a goal that lasts a year or longer or whether you want to have little short inquiries, or a big inquiry broken into bits over the year, that flexibility is quite a strength of the whole process.

All appraisers from South School identified having two separate systems for attestation and appraisal as a strength. Saul offered the following reasons:

I’d say the splitting up of the two things, it is the first school I’ve worked in that’s done it, and it makes it so much easier. You have the non-negotiable things and the accountability here is strong. The real part of the learning process is teachers as learners, that’s where you get some really cool growth in teachers because they haven’t got the “Oh this is going to count against me.” It’s a real strength of the system.
The strengths identified by the participants form a clear picture of what appraisers consider effective strategies and conditions for the implementation of an effective performance appraisal system.

**Appraisee responses**

When analysing the appraisee comments relating to the strengths of their performance appraisal system, several key words were identified: dialogue, inquiry, trust, reflection, professional, and student-centred. Seven of eight appraisees identified the notions of ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and relational trust as strengths within their schools performance appraisal system. Participant comments relating to ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ included:

*Sid:* A strength is definitely the inquiry focus because people here, choose things that they are genuinely interested in, and that they are actually looking to change and improve… it actually impacts upon your daily teaching.

The notion of trust was reflected in this comment:

*Naya:* I think that the strengths too are that it’s…it’s a very non-threatening process, you can trust it. It’s a process that lets you be reflective, I mean we all don’t like being watched ‘teach’, and we all don’t like people coming in and looking at us under a little microscope. But in the end, it’s actually really affirming so it’s actually a really positive process.

Examples of the other strengths identified by appraisees that contribute to a successful performance appraisal system included:

*Sasha* (professionalism, high standards): We do know that the standards are high, very high. That’s a good thing. It feels very professional.

*Noah* (professional approach): I agree totally and then it’s also about knowing that if you are travelling a particular direction, that you can get help to help work towards that. And if it’s new or something challenging for you, or whatever, that there is support for that progress.

*Steve* (collaboration): Collaboration between staff is a strength.
Question Eight asked: What do you see as the biggest challenges or barriers to performance appraisal in your school?

Participants identified several challenges to implementing effective appraisal systems. These are shown on Table 5.8.

Table 5.8  Question 8: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data  
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal responses</th>
<th>Time was a major factor for both principals as they explained that schools are very busy places with diverse needs and systems. In relation to performance appraisal systems Principal North noted that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time can be a barrier. The challenge is making sure you allocate the right amount of time. It’s not only that but also the time to do that revisit when there is something to follow-up on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal South had a similar view stating that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is always a factor so we release them in term one for 45 minutes each with the team leader but they are expected to have already started to develop the appraisal goal in their own time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of time for professional discussion was very important according to both principals. They indicated that if staff were not given this time in a formal setting or situation, often the dialogue and focus on improving practice was forgotten in the hectic routines of a school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The notion of trust was also strongly emphasised by both principals. Two subthemes were identified: the relational trust between the appraiser and appraisee; and teachers’ trust that there were no hidden agendas in the performance appraisal system. Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of time due to other demands  | 1 | 1 | Lack of time due to other demands  | 3 | 3 | Sufficient time to share  | 4 | 4 |
Trust  | 1 | 1 | Developing relational trust  | 3 | 2 | Developing relational trust  | 1 | 2 |
Dual roles of attester and mentor  | 3 | 3 |
principals indicated that developing relational trust with teachers and building a positive attitude towards appraisal was essential if the process was to be successful. Building this relational trust in their schools had reduced anxiety and helped ensure transparency between all parties. Principal South concluded that the idea of trust was about:

Moving people away from appraisal is something ‘that’s done to you.’ That was justified and it’s taken a while for the trust in the new process I suppose and to actually relax a bit. It is about building the culture within the school.

Appraiser responses
The notion of time was identified as a major barrier by six of seven appraisers. This included: time to observe appraisees; time to meet with appraisees; and also time to follow up with additional meetings and observations. Saul noted that:

The first barrier would be time: time to do things well, time for teaching, but also time for you to sit with them and to actually be able to manage that time.

Developing relational trust was also seen as a potential barrier. As Sam noted:

Trust, big things around relational trust. It is the key to unlocking good teaching and learning. If you don’t have relational trust with your team members, or people you’re appraising, then you’re not going to get the good stuff.

North School and South School appraisers identified that conflict could occur and break down the appraiser/appraisee relationship, if the same person was responsible for both attesting and appraising a teacher. This was highlighted by Sam who stated that:

My concern is that the person who ticks the boxes [attestation] was the person leading and guiding and supporting the appraisal. So if the attestation was marginal, if there were lots of things that needed doing, it could make a situation of conflict between the appraiser and appraisee.

Sarah added that it can also have a major impact on the trusting relationship between the appraiser and appraisee. She outlined that:
It’s very difficult to build trust and make that bond that’s so important for open discussions around appraisal particularly if there’s this underlying thing of a marginal or perhaps a failed attestation.

Appraisee responses
Appraisees identified a lack of time as a major challenge to the successful implementation of their schools performance appraisal system. This included opportunities to spend time researching and observing for their inquiry. Time was also needed to share their journey with colleagues, and to reflect and plan their next learning step. Comments that highlight this included:

Sheila: It’s probably the time, like it could be even more valuable if you had more time to share it with other people, because we meet together as a whole staff but it’s not very frequent.

The idea of time to share was explained by Sid:

Because we’re such a huge staff, you don’t know what everyone’s doing, where if you were a small staff, you’d still be spread over the same amount of years, you’d have more of an idea probably, of what other people were doing. So that might be within our team but, you know, we don’t really know what other teams are doing.

As Sasha noted, the idea of sharing your learning could impact on other teachers as well and this potential was not being realised due to time constraints.

I was thinking about that [who knows what I did] because I really felt that last year. I did a lot of work around science and at the end of it I thought… ‘and??’ My class had benefitted but that’s it.

The concept of overload was also identified by appraisees from North School as a possible challenge. Schools are busy places and often there are many professional development projects working simultaneously for a number of reasons. This overload could cause anxiety and stress amongst staff. Appraisees confirmed this was a challenge with the following comment:

Noah: I guess sometimes you just need to leave people be for a bit. It’s all for the greater good but if you think about all the professional development
(PD) and things, sometimes it can be a little overwhelming I think, and people do get a little overwhelmed.

Building relational trust was identified by South School as a potential challenge. As I have noted earlier, performance appraisal created feelings of anxiety and stress and appraisees noted the importance of having relational trust in their appraiser. Appraisees at South School noted that their process of performance appraisal helped develop this trust as both parties had clear roles and expectations. However they noted that when new appraiser/appraisee partnerships were established, it took time to build this trust.

**Question Nine asked: How has this performance appraisal system led to improvements in students’ learning?**

Responses to this question are shown in Table 5.9.

**Table 5.9  Question 9: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data**

(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student focussed goals based on data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student focussed goals based on data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am more focussed on the data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide PD is more focussed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration and sharing ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Constantly reinforced at meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observations &amp; discussions of targets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal responses**

Both principals explained that the intent of their respective performance appraisal systems was improved teacher practice and professional growth which was achieved through a focus on improved student achievement in classrooms. Principal North stated that:

*What they [teachers] are talking about is getting down to the small details now, all about things they are doing for kids. They share it, they talk about what’s working and what’s not. It’s reflective and proactive.*
Principal South also identified the focus on the student data but added the dimension of school-wide professional development which formed part of the performance appraisal system through school goals. She stated that:

*The personal and professional growth of teachers is achieved by focusing on students. That contributes to whole school professional development which is obviously focussed on your student targets which are your areas you want to improve.*

**Appraiser responses**

All appraisers identified that a collaborative approach to performance appraisal which fostered the notion of sharing with colleagues had impacted positively on student achievement. Coupled with this collaborative approach was a focus on appraisal goals which were based on student data. Responses that highlighted these ideas were:

*Nadia: Much more student data and evidence data focussed. And bigger than the observation as its part of our minischool meetings to talk about the data, to talk about strategies, and get ideas from other people.*

*Sally: In the team meetings, we share regularly and show what we are doing. It’s like more of a show and tell thing and so that helps as well. Modelling for each other, and sometimes the appraisal goal comes out through the whole staff PD we are having.*

**Appraisee responses**

Seven out of eight appraisees noted that the key implication of performance appraisal in their school was a focus on student data and this had a positive influence on student achievement. Comments included:

*Sheila: It’s exactly what you said, that children’s needs are at the centre of everything we do.*

*Noah: I can give you an example, so in my early years, I think my first or second year of teaching, it was a different school, and we didn’t have any of these things in place, and I got to the end of the year and I realised a child hadn’t moved in reading. I was like ‘holy $#%^, how did that happen?’ That would never happen now, it just would not happen, because there is
continual discussions and you are directed to notice what’s going on for your kids.

Appraisees also noted that when appraisal goals were reinforced at various meetings, and the ensuing discussions meant that staff were focussed on developing meaningful goals that were part of their everyday routine. Appraisee comments included:

Noah: In our team meetings we’re constantly having those discussions about target students and improved learning.

Sasha: And it’s always there at team level and in our minutes that we had a discussion around them [student targets and achievement].

Half of the appraisees from each school also noted that classroom observations and regular discussion about targets was another major influence on improved student achievement. Noah noted that:

The way that we use observations of other teachers to inform our practice and to get ideas and develop our practice has a positive impact on our own students.

Question Ten asked: Would you say your appraisal system is mostly about development or mostly about meeting standards? Or is it a balance of both? Why do you think this?

The participants identified their perceptions of the balance between teacher development and teacher accountability within their schools current performance appraisal system. These are represented in Table 5.10 on the following page.

This question elicited a large amount of discussion amongst the participants. Participants found it challenging to give weightings to ‘accountability’ and ‘development’ as they felt it was very contextual and time dependent. Therefore all participants based these percentages on their ‘average’ teacher on any ‘normal’ day. They also acknowledged that there may be teachers that had a greater weighting towards accountability in their appraisal if there were ‘issues’ around quality assurance.
Table 5.10  Question 10: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data  
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal North</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal South</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naya</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average % (nearest %)</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPRAISERS**

**APPRAISEES**

Principal responses

Principals explained their rationale for their weighting of accountability and development within their performance appraisal systems.

*Principal North:* To get it so it fits for everybody, there would possibly be some [teachers] that sit at 30-40% assurance then there’s others where the planning is still being looked at but essentially you could just tick it off, and skip that bit, so they are almost 95-100% development. So school-wide I would say 10-20% assurance, and 80-90% development.
Principal South: *I think they are fairly evenly balanced in my mind and what I am looking for, they are reasonably well balanced.*

**Appraiser responses**

A majority of appraisers felt that their current performance appraisal system was 70% development and 30% accountability. Appraisers explained their rationale for their weighting of accountability and development within their performance appraisal systems.

*Nadia:* A much bigger move towards the teacher development, we just expect them to be accountable. We hope they expect themselves to be accountable, but every now and again, it may be more 50/50, if that’s what is required.

*Saul:* I’m more about teachers thinking and inquiring into their practice and being better teachers so for me personally it would be more focus on reflective practice. I’d say 70/30 in favour of development.

**Appraisee responses**

Five out of eight appraisees identified that their current system was heavily weighted (70%) towards the development aspect of performance appraisal. The remaining three participants stated that it was a more even balance than that. Appraisees explained their rationale for their weighting of accountability and development within their performance appraisal systems as:

*Sasha:* My personal feeling is that it leans more towards the teacher development end because that’s what we talk about most often.

*Nina:* I think it’s the blurry line of making sure we have the teacher development to make sure we’re meeting those standards for the benefit of our children. I think it blurs into each other I’m sorry, so yeah 50/50.

**Question Eleven asked:** I wonder if you are familiar with the term “accountability”? What does that term mean for you when you think about your appraisal system?

Participant responses to this question are shown in Table 5.11.
Table 5.11  Question 11: Principals’, appraisers’ and appraisees’ data
(N=North School; S=South School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Appraisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers being accountable for actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meetings standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meetings standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals are accountable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being accountable for your actions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Being accountable for your actions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Being professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal responses

Both principals identified accountability as a complex and demanding concept within schools. Both stated that, as humans, we were accountable for all we do on a daily basis and therefore teachers were highly accountable to several stakeholders. Principal North’s summary encapsulated both principals’ understandings of accountability:

_We don’t use the term but there is the underlying thing that you [teachers] are accountable and the responsibilities that go with that are to be professional and working to the best that you can do. You’re accountable to parents, it’s about caring and looking after their children as well as giving them the best education that you can do._

Principal South added an additional statement relating to her accountability of the performance appraisal system in her school stating that:

_**I think as a leader I am accountable for the professional growth of our teachers so from the appraisal side of it, I need to know that they have a robust goal and are actually in an inquiry process of some kind.**_

Appraiser responses

A majority of appraisers reported that accountability was about meeting standards and measuring up to expectations from external stakeholders (MoE, BoT), internal stakeholders (SLT, MM), and lastly personal accountability. Participant responses that convey these sentiments include:

_Nadia: It is meeting the RTC and all that that means. So it is everything put together, you know, learning and teaching, and all the surface features._
Saul: For me it means about being professional, it means following the things that this school decided are important. So if they are accountable, they do them because they see the value in it.

**Appraisee responses**

The three appraisees from North School all identified that accountability was related to student achievement and ensuring that all students are getting the best out of their education. This was best summarised by Naya:

*The first words that pop into my head are ‘accountability to my students and making sure that their needs are meet; and accountability to [principal], making sure the choices that I make in my classroom are the best ones for my students.*

In contrast, the three participants from South School all noted that accountability was about doing your job. “Doing your job” was explained as meeting standards. Steve summed it up as:

*It is a Yes or No! Doing your job or not.*

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**Refining the sub-themes findings into data themes**

In all, forty-four specific sub-themes were identified from the interviews and focus group data. These sub-themes were grouped into seven themes according to the way in which each sub-theme related to performance appraisal in schools. This was achieved in two ways: first, by identifying the key words within the sub-theme; and, second, by understanding the sub-theme in relation to the question being asked. The forty-four interview and focus group sub-themes are presented in Table 5.12 (shown on the following page) in the order that the questions were asked. The table is divided into three columns. These columns identify the question number, the sub-themes and the data themes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Interview and focus group sub themes</th>
<th>Data Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appraisal is for teacher development</td>
<td>Professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attestation is for accountability</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility of attestation and appraisal</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher development / growth</td>
<td>Professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting minimal acceptable standards</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frustration or Anxiety with old approach</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Ownership</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandated changes from MoE.</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘Teaching as Inquiry’</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Dialogue</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-centred</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes (links to the RTC)</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (links to the PS)</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal and attestation links to RTC</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quality Assurance – ensure this happens.</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor / Coach</td>
<td>Professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate professional dialogue</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set goals based on students needs/data</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be organised and ready for observations</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share ideas and discuss the journey</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be professional and reflective</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sharing and collaborative culture</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on student data to drive appraisal</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional approach of staff (engagement)</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Dialogue</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership over process and goals</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-centred</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual roles of attester and mentor</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student focussed goals based on data</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-wide PD is more focussed</td>
<td>Professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration and sharing ideas</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constantly reinforced at meetings</td>
<td>Effective Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observations and discussions of targets</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teachers being accountable for your actions</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals are accountable</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting standards</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being accountable for your actions</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being professional</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The re-organisation of the sub-themes by theme are outlined in 5.13 on the following page. Where the sub-themes are repeated under the same theme, they are only recorded once.

The table is a summary of the data findings and themes, and is divided into three sections that reflect the research questions:

1. What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)?
2. What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important?
3. What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?

This table will be used as the basis for the discussion of the findings in the next chapter.

CONCLUSION

The interdependency of these themes and the fact that they are linked to each other adds to the complexity of performance appraisal. Presenting the data in a table (Table 5.13) does not give justice to this complexity as it appears very ordered. In actuality the themes overlap and in fact inform each other. For example, the theme of “Relationships” has many of the same sub-themes as the “Effective Leadership” theme.

The reality is that these two schools appear to have an effective performance appraisal system in a school culture that promotes teacher development through trusting relationships and clear guidelines for teachers. To achieve this the principal appears to have built effective systems and worked with staff to establish norms of trust, openness and participation. Clearly these themes are all linked and as noted this adds to the complexity of effective performance appraisal systems.
Table 5.13  Summary of findings linking subthemes to themes and research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific subthemes</th>
<th>Data Theme</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Appraisal is for teacher development  
Teacher development / growth  
Mentor / Coach  
School-wide PD is more focussed                                                  | Professional Growth | (1) What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)? |
| Attestation is for accountability  
Meeting minimal acceptable standards  
Quality Assurance – ensure this happens  
Principals are accountable  
Being accountable for your actions                                               | Accountability       | (2) What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important? |
| Mandated changes from MoE  
RTC vs PS  
‘Teaching as Inquiry’  
Professional Dialogue  
Trusting relationships  
Reflective Practice  
Student focused approach  
Sharing and collaborative culture                                                | Effective leadership |                                                                                                                                                   |
| Professional Dialogue  
Collaborative culture  
Reflective Practice  
Student focused approach  
Trust                                                                          | Relationships        |                                                                                                                                                   |
| Responsibility for attestation and appraisal  
Frustration or Anxiety with ‘old’ approach  
‘Teaching as Inquiry’  
Student focused approach  
Set goals based on student needs/data  
Collaboration and sharing ideas  
Constantly reinforced at meetings  
Observations and discussion of targets  
Mentor / Coach                                                               | Systems              |                                                                                                                                                   |
| Staff Ownership  
Be organised and ready for observations  
Share ideas and discuss the journey  
Be professional and reflective  
Professional approach of staff  
Teachers are accountable for your actions                                     | Staff ownership       |                                                                                                                                                   |
| Time  
Trust  
Dual roles of attester and mentor                                                | Barriers             | (3) What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?                         |
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the overall findings from the documentary analysis, semi-structured interviews and focus groups data presented in the previous two chapters.

The research questions provide the sub-headings in this chapter. The discussion for each research question is completed under several sub-headings based on the themes that emerged from the data collection. These themes are displayed in Table 6.1 and are organised according to the research questions.

Table 6.1 Research questions and data themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)?</td>
<td>Accountability, Professional Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important?</td>
<td>Effective leadership, Relationships, Systems, and Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?</td>
<td>Barriers such as: Time, Trust and role clarification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question One asked:
What are the accountability and development purposes and processes in these primary schools and do they differ from the espoused theory (school documents)?

This section will identify the key purposes of performance appraisal in the participating schools as well as the processes or systems that they use to implement the system. It will also identify how these relate to the literature. The systems described by the
participants are also discussed in relation to the difference between the espoused system and the actual practical system.

**Purposes of performance appraisal**

In order to identify the purposes employed by the schools, it was important to discover the schools’ understandings of appraisal. The use of terms such as ‘appraisal’, ‘quality assurance’, ‘attestation’, ‘accountability’, ‘professional growth’, and ‘teacher development’ clearly delineated the perceived purposes of the systems currently in use in the research site schools. In summary, both schools’ systems used two terms: ‘attestation’ for the accountability purpose of performance appraisal; and ‘appraisal’ for the development purpose.

North School had one system related to the dual purposes of accountability and development and this is consistent with the literature that suggest that an integrated approach is essential (Cardno, 2012; Fitzgerald, 2001; Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). In contrast, South School had two distinct systems which dealt with the accountability and development purposes separately. The rationale behind this separation was based on the school’s historical experience of an ineffectual system that was dominated by accountability processes and where there was a tick-box system in place. In response to a school review where the purposes of accountability and development were identified as being quite different, the school leadership team, in consultation with staff, decided that ‘appraisal’ and ‘attestation’ would be done separately with ‘appraisal’ (teacher development) being the major focus for teachers.

Despite the participants from both schools using similar terminology, the data showed there was confusion and variation in the understanding and application of some appraisal terms. This was also true when analysing the documentation across the organisations (participating schools, NZEI, NZTC, MoE, and ERO). The term ‘appraisal’ generated different meanings from different participants in the two schools. This is highlighted by comparing the two responses from the principals. Principal North noted that appraisal is related to ensuring the students were receiving the best education possible (accountability), and that teachers needed to receive training to make sure that this happened (development). However, Principal South stated that
appraisal was about professional growth and there was no mention of the accountability aspect of appraisal. Not surprisingly, these definitions link directly to the processes in the two schools as North School as an integrated performance appraisal system, whereas South School have two separate systems for accountability and development.

In contrast to this variation, research participants from both schools consistently defined ‘accountability’ as being the process of meeting standards and being accountable for their professional actions. This is evident in the following descriptions of ‘accountability’ offered by research participants:

1. “Accountability is about making sure all teachers at South School meet school expectations” (South School Principal);
2. “Accountability is meeting the RTC standards and justifying your actions” (Naya, North School); and
3. Accountability is referred to as evaluation, assessment and monitoring (Ministry of Education, 2010).

This inconsistency and lack of clarity around appraisal terminology is problematic. If New Zealand teachers are all expected to be involved in a similar process based around performance appraisal which meets the dual purposes of accountability and development, the relevant terminology must be clearly and uniformly understood.

**Processes for performance appraisal systems**

A key finding from the data collection was the variation in the processes across the participating schools. Although the literature states that an integrated system is desirable (Cardno, 2012; Fitzgerald, 2001; Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005), there was clear evidence to suggest that this was not happening. The two participating schools had very different processes in place for performance appraisal.

South School had separate systems for accountability and development. This supports the work of Cardno (2012), who claims that schools struggle to effectively integrate the dual purposes of accountability and development, resulting in schools having two distinct systems. As noted above, this separation occurred as a result of school review and the unsuccessful use of an integrated system. Conversely, North School had an integrated system which had dual purposes of accountability and development but the
documentation and participants struggled to clearly articulate the dual purposes such as a lack of clarity around the process for accountability and a greater emphasis on teacher development. A positive feature identified by the appraisers and appraisees from both schools was that the development aspect of the system had a clear process and was deemed as highly effective for all participants.

Both schools, and several other documents stated that the process for teacher development is specifically related to the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 35). This process was the same for both schools and was based on the following strategies which will be discussed in the next section:

1. ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ (Ministry of Education, 2007);
2. Professional dialogue; and
3. Reflective practice.

These strategies were identified by a majority of participants (see Table 5.4 on page 84) as essential for effective appraisal to occur.

A major factor for the variation of process in place in schools may well be the confusion that exists around the two sets of standards (RTC and PS). These standards serve different purposes (RTC for teacher development and accountability, and PS for accountability, attestation, and pay progression) and, as shown in the document analysis, there was ambiguity around their use. When reviewing the documentation from the MoE and the NZTC, it was unclear as to the exact purpose of the PS and RTC. For example, when reviewing the purposes of both sets of standards, the documentation stated that Professional standards for primary teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b) were designed for attestation for pay progression, whilst the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) were created as a tool to facilitate teacher registration and renewal. While there was mention of the RTC being a framework for teacher development to occur, it does not explicitly identify which set of standards should be used.

As a result of this confusion, it is possible that both participating schools have chosen to concentrate their efforts on using the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) within their performance appraisal system. The key reason identified for adopting the use of just one set of standards was the previous confusion
caused by using two different sets of standards within their schools. The principals concluded that the RTC were more relevant to the developmental purpose of appraisal and, as they were more recent, they incorporated more specific criteria unique to the New Zealand context such as:

Criteria 4. Demonstrate commitment to ongoing professional learning and development of personal practice.

Criteria 10. Work effectively within the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand

(New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b, p. 14).

Therefore these schools did not use the *Professional standards for primary teachers* (Ministry of Education, 1999b). This is potentially problematic as the PS are still legislated requirements by the MoE, and appear in the Primary Teachers’ Collective Contract. The key issue to consider here is that neither school complies with this requirement, as the teacher standards being used are the RTC. In conclusion, both schools fail to meet the legislative requirements outlined in the *Performance Management Systems: PMS1: Performance appraisal* (Ministry of Education, 1997).

**Espoused theory versus actual practice**

When reviewing the school documentation and comparing it to the responses from the research participants, it is evident that performance appraisal in both schools is perceived as being effective. Although the two systems are very different, they are both based on the concepts of accountability and development, with a much larger focus on the latter. Teachers in the two schools appreciate this and see value in their respective school’s system as it is perceived to help promote teachers’ own individual learning. In this regard, the espoused theory is in line with the actual practice.

In summary, the findings related to this research question have established the need for leaders to have clarity and understanding of the following components of the performance appraisal system:

1. The purpose of the system/s;
2. The terminology to be used;
3. The process or system to be used; and
4. The legislative requirements.
Research Question Two asked:
What strategies and conditions in primary schools for integrating appraisal and development within the performance appraisal system do principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important?

The key findings related to this question suggest four key themes that are important for successfully integrating appraisal and development. These themes are: Effective leadership; Trusting relationships; Clear systems; and Staff ownership. Although these themes will be discussed separately, ‘Effective leadership’ encompasses the other three themes as the principal will have a direct influence over the concepts of building trusting relationships, creating clear systems and ensuring staff ownership over the appraisal system.

**Effective leadership**
The first theme to emerge from the participant data is that for performance appraisal to be effective, a school must have effective leadership. This thought is consistent with the literature reviewed (Nusche et al., 2012; Robinson et al., 2009) and will be discussed in terms of the data collected from the participants, namely the conditions that a leader needs to ensure are in place in their school. As can be seen in Table 5.13 on page 107, the specific sub-themes are repeated over a number of the data themes. In relation to ‘Effective leadership’, I will explore the notions of external demands (mandated changes from MoE, namely the RTC versus PS); the use of a student-focused approach; and lastly the building of a sharing and collaborative culture.

**External demands**
The first sub-theme identified by participants for effective leadership was managing the external demands placed on schools by the governing bodies, mainly the MoE and their partner agencies, the Education Review Office and the New Zealand Teachers Council. Within the parameters of this research project, these external demands are related to any changes imposed on schools in relation to performance appraisal. The key demand currently causing concern is the inclusion of the two sets of standards. The participant data clearly confirms that this is an issue. This reinforces the existence of the confusion relating to this. It is the principal’s role to help alleviate this confusion.
by ensuring that the systems in place address this issue. To this end, both research schools and their principals do focus their attentions on the use of the RTC as they believe they have the most potential to improve teacher practice in their schools. The Ministry of Education needs to support schools by helping to ‘demystify’ the standards, and help to eliminate the confusion.

Student-based approach
The second key sub-theme relating to the role of the leader was the concept of a student centred approach. 88% of participants (both principals, all appraisers, and five of eight appraisees) agreed that this was a strength of the current system in their schools that should be retained. The main reason for the inclusion of this aspect of performance appraisal is that it clearly linked the development purpose to current practice and gives the teacher a ‘real’ connection to their daily job by focussing on improving outcomes for students. Participants noted that this had not always been the case with previous developmental goals not necessarily being linked to current practice, resulting in effectual appraisal with these goals being seen as trivial and meaningless. This past practice is consistent with the research findings around the leadership of teaching and learning in New Zealand schools conducted by Sinnema and Robinson (2007). Sinnema and Robinson (2007) found that there is generally a lack of student focus in appraisal systems. Therefore, the inclusion of student-focussed goals and improved teacher practice within the performance appraisal system in both research schools is consistent with best practice as outlined by many authors (Cardno, 2012; Education Review Office, 2013; Nusche et al., 2012; Sinnema & Robinson, 2007).

School Culture
The last sub-theme to consider is that a school’s educational leader has a direct influence over the culture and conditions that exist within a school context. It was evident from the interviews and focus groups that the participants felt that several elements, such as a ‘collaborative culture’ or a ‘sharing culture’, were key conditions and indeed strengths that contributed to the effectiveness of their performance appraisal system. Several writers (Cardno, 2012; Robinson et al., 2009; Timperley et al., 2007) concur, noting that when effective systems and processes are in place for performance appraisal, they influence the learning culture of the school for both staff
and students, and promote the concepts of collaboration and sharing. Having a culture focused around collaboration involves effective communication built around the notions of mutual decision-making, thoughtful discussion and trust. It also implies that all participants are learners and that they engage in regular professional dialogue (Sachs, 2003). A school needs a leader that will maintain this focus, ensure there are many opportunities to be reflective, and adjust practice based on meaningful achievement data and staff needs, as well as the needs of the students. The three participant groups all stated that collaborative learning opportunities are essential for the successful implementation of a performance appraisal system.

**Trusting Relationships**

The second key finding relating to strategies valued by principals, appraisers and appraisees, is the building positive relationships within a school. Coupled with this is how these relationships influence the effectiveness of a performance appraisal system. Simply, trusting relationships involve people interacting and communicating, trusting each other and valuing different opinions and ideals (Isore, 2009). Establishing systems based around these simply ideals is extremely important for leaders. Leaders who are able to build a culture of trust within their school enhance the effectiveness of teacher performance appraisal (Tuytens & Devos, 2012). This can be done through collaboration and sharing, and providing teachers with systems and opportunities to do so.

The participants considered two key relationships as important. The first was the appraiser/appraisee relationship; the second was the relationship between the teacher and the principal (and the SLT). Piggot-Irvine (2003) and Sachs (2000) suggest that the relationship between the appraiser and the appraisee must be one of mutual respect and be focussed around personal growth. As argued by Sachs (2000) and Youngs and Grootenboer (2003), this needs to be based around a school culture of collaboration where the sharing of ideas and professional learning is fostered.

The second relationship which is vital to the success of performance appraisal systems is between the teachers and the principal (Piggot-Irvine, 2003). These relationships need to be based on a high trust, professional model where professional autonomy is valued and encouraged (Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Youngs & Grootenboer,
The dialogue and interaction that occurs between the teachers and the principal must be based on honesty and openness so there is no room for misinterpretation or confusion (Fitzgerald et al., 2003). As Tschannen-Moran (2009) states:

where teachers reported a high level of trust in their leader, they were more likely to have higher levels of confidence in the accuracy of the information coming from the leader, a greater desire for interaction with the leader, and a greater satisfaction with communication with the leader. (p.229)

A further consideration relating to the principal/teacher relationship is the need for the principal to have an awareness of the personal attributes and personalities of teachers and how the strategic direction of the school can have an effect on individual teachers (Lashway, 2006). Principals must focus on creating a balanced approach to ensure both the goals of the individual and the goals of the organisation are met (Cardno, 1999, 2012; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001). The link between these goals is referred to as 'mutuality' (Rudman, 2002). The challenge for principals is to ensure that there is alignment between the ‘people’ and the ‘organisation’ so both have an opportunity to grow (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Principals need to ensure their school has a clearly identified and articulated performance appraisal system which will help eliminate this challenge.

Clear Systems
A clear system must be employed by schools if performance appraisal is to be effective. Grootenboer (2000) argues that the focus of appraisal systems “has to be development rather than formal assessment, with the purpose of critically improving the professional practice of the teacher involved” (p.130). In relation to the systems operating in the research schools, the principals, appraisers, and appraisees identified two key practices that are well-established. The first is the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model which is aligned with the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007). This document states that ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ is an essential component of a teacher’s role; that is, to reflect on their teaching and learning programme for students, with the goal being on-going professional growth and improved student achievement. All participants valued the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ component of the performance appraisal systems in their schools.
The second practise, which forms part of the inquiry process at both research schools, is professional dialogue through collaboration and sharing. As noted in the ‘Effective leadership’ section on page 113, successful collaboration leads to improved professional dialogue (Sachs, 2003) which, in an educational context, needs to focus on improved teacher practice and better outcomes for students.

In summary, the characteristics of a school’s system play a significant role in the success of performance appraisal. Part of the system as noted above is the ownership and participation of the teachers in its design. This is the next theme to be discussed.

**Staff Ownership**

As previously noted, there needs to be a clear system in place over which staff have ownership. Grootenboer (2000) identifies “for teachers to be sincerely involved in appraisal, they need to have ownership and control over the process in a supportive and collaborative environment” (p. 130). This ownership theme fell into two essential categories identified by the participants: the first being ownership over the timeline and process for the appraisal; and, secondly, ownership over the appraisal goals based on their teaching and student needs, and not having mandated goals from the SLT.

The first category of ownership over the process links directly to the concept of professionalism and teachers taking responsibility for their actions and being accountable. As noted in the previous sections, systems including ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and collaborative approaches can contribute to this ownership as they encourage teachers to take control of their own learning and professional growth. The notion of staff having ownership and being professional is summarised by Robinson (1992), who claims that collaboration and internal commitment are essential elements of effective performance appraisal. This collaborative approach to professional growth (appraisal) leads to creating schools with high degrees of teacher professionalism. This means that teachers can respect their colleagues’ competence and expertise. Tschannen-Moran (2009) states that “teachers who work co-operatively with one another, are clearly engaged in the teaching process, and are enthusiastic about their work” (p.232).

The greater the involvement and ownership of developing the appraisal process, the greater the engagement and professional approach by the teachers (Fitzgerald et al., 2003).
The second category is the need for teachers to take ownership over their appraisal goals. The participant data reinforced this notion as all appraisees noted that they had professional autonomy to set their goals although they were encouraged to base these around their current students. This level of ownership made the appraisal process more meaningful and relevant and teachers stated that they were more focussed on achieving their goals. Several authors agree (Desimone, 2009; Ministry of Education, 1996, 2010; Piggot-Irvine, 2010; Starratt, 2003) with this sentiment stating that teachers must be involved in the process of setting their own goals as staff are more engaged when this occurs. Ownership over the goals also assists the commitment to the inquiry process outlined above. As Piggot-Irvine (2010) explains in her case study of one school’s approach to appraisal, teachers were committed and dedicated as they had ownership and “were self-directing yet collaborative, non-defensive and open to feedback” (p.242).

Ownership of the appraisal system is important as an effective appraisal system is one that staff are committed to, value and have been involved in the development of in their organisation (Cardno, 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 2003). The involvement of teachers in developing the school appraisal system is identified as crucial to the long-term success of appraisal (Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Tuytens & Devos, 2012). This ownership was apparent with the participants only at their local school level. Teachers do not have a voice at the system level (macro) hence the confusion between the Professional standards for primary teachers (Ministry of Education, 1999b) and the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b).

In summarising the findings in relation to Research Question Two, the important conditions identified by the research participants to have a successful performance appraisal system are: Effective leadership; Trusting relationships; Clear systems; and Staff ownership.
Research Question Three asked:
What challenges do primary schools need to overcome to effectively implement an integrated performance appraisal system?

From the research there were a number of factors identified that could strengthen performance appraisal systems in New Zealand Schools. These are discussed in two groups: those that could be addressed at a school level (micro); and those that are relevant at a national level (macro). It is important to include these macro challenges as they have a direct impact on schools. To begin with, the challenges identified at the school level are: time; trust; and role clarification.

**Time**
If performance appraisal is to be effective, sufficient time needs to be allocated for this to occur. Sixteen out of seventeen participants identified that time was one of the biggest barriers influencing effective appraisal occurring in their schools. As highlighted in participant responses in Chapter Five, it is important to consider that time is required for the following:
1. Time to observe other teachers;
2. Time to discuss and share ideas with others; and
3. Time to inquire into your own practice.

This is supported by Piggot-Irvine (2003) and Sinnema and Robinson (2007) who note that for effective inquiry (learning process) to occur, the greater the time required by both the school and the teacher. Another factor to consider is the level of extra responsibility placed on the appraiser. If the appraiser does not have sufficient time to effectively engage in a meaningful appraisal process, there is a chance that the process may become more like a tick off system. Fitzgerald et al. (2003) concurs, noting that there is a risk that “their appraisal process may revert to a minimalist approach that emphasises checklists at the expense of a more time-intensive professional approach” (p.102).

In summary principals must ensure that sufficient time is available for teachers so they can develop their appraisal around reflective practice (Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003). Additionally, time must be available for the implementation of an inquiry cycle, which promotes professional autonomy.
Trust

Trust is also very important within a performance appraisal system and it falls into two categories: trust of the appraisal system; and trust of the people involved. Firstly, teachers must have trust in the system in terms of the purpose, process and desired outcomes. By this I mean the notion of the transparency of the system (Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005). For example if the school policy states that appraisal is about teacher development, then the process needs to be focused around professional growth and not accountability against teacher standards. In this case there was confusion between the purposes of the appraisal, and this had the potential to cause tension and conflict. This could lead to limited trust in the purpose and process, and damage the relationship between the appraiser and appraisee (Fitzgerald, 2008). Trust can be damaged in an instant and, as Walker, Kutsyurube, and Noonan (2011) postulate, when there is a breach of our expectations of another person and we have a sense of being vulnerable, trust breaks down which can damage relationships beyond repair.

The second form of trust is based around the relationship between the appraiser and appraisee. As mentioned on a number of occasions, trusting relationships is vital if performance appraisal is to be effective. An appraisee needs to have trust in their appraiser. To foster this trust, the appraisal system must be perceived as non-threatening and handled honestly by school leaders (Middlewood, 2001b). Ensuring that the process is based around professional growth and development also supports the notion of trusting relationships. Several writers concur (Middlewood, 2001b; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Piggot-Irvine, 2003) outlining that a high trust approach is essential to allow open, honest and respectful dialogue to occur between the appraiser and appraisee, within the performance appraisal process.

The importance of the appraiser/appraisee relationship cannot be underestimated and in fact must be a key consideration when establishing systems, processes and indeed partnerships for the purpose of performance appraisal (Moreland, 2011; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). As Piggot-Irvine (2003) asserts, “respectful, trust-based open relationships are at the core of appraisal effectiveness” (p.176).
Role clarification

The last challenge that can be addressed at a micro (school) level is to have clearly delineated roles. Appraisers from both North School and South School who participated in this research reported that a challenge in their schools was the fact that they had to manage the dual roles of being both a mentor and an appraiser. This challenge is supported by Fitzgerald et al. (2003) who postulated that some appraisal systems have:

placed teacher-appraisers (and middle managers in particular) in a contradictory relationship with their colleagues. On the one hand, as teachers they have continued to work in a collaborative, collegial and supportive way with their professional colleagues yet on the other hand, as appraisers, they have been required to adopt a hierarchical stance to ensure that an objective and performance driven performance management system was implemented. (p. 94)

The participants felt that this dual role could cause conflict if there were performance issues with staff, and that this needed to be considered carefully when the performance appraisal system was being established. Two other authors (Cardno, 1999; Rudman, 2002) agree that tensions can exist for appraisers when they are placed in a conflicting relationship with their colleagues. This is particularly true if there is a performance issue and either competency or discipline actions are required. In this instance, several authors (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Piggot-Irvine, 2002, 2003) suggest that there is a separate system in place to deal with these issues.

Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) state that “the appraisal process may identify problems related to competence, discipline or dismissal. They will be addressed in accordance with separate procedures specified in collective or individual agreements” (p.49). The role of the appraiser needs to clearly delineate this responsibility to someone outside of the appraisal process.

As well as the challenges identified at a school level, there are also issues at a national or macro level, that have a direct impact on schools and teachers. The key challenge identified by participants of this research is related to the confusion that exists regarding the two sets of standards for teachers in New Zealand, the Professional Standards (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b). There is a lack of understanding and consistency
about the application of these two sets of teacher standards in the research schools and this must be addressed. The New Zealand Teachers Council have attempted to show the links between the two sets of standards and the previous *Satisfactory teacher dimensions* as evidenced in the *Registered Teacher Criteria Comparative Matrix with Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions AND Professional Standards (Primary: Fully Registered Teacher)* (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010a). The goal of this document is to demonstrate the links between the sets of standards, and to help schools understand how they can be used. However, I believe this complicates things more as it adds another set of standards (Satisfactory teacher dimensions) for schools to deal with. The best solution is to consolidate the two sets of standards into one. This is supported by the OECD report on New Zealand education (Nusche et al., 2012) which recommends the simplification of the teacher standards into one set of governing standards:

> The current co-existence of two sets of teaching standards in the country as well as the little clarity about the respective use call for the consolidation into a single set of standards so there is a clear shared understanding of what counts as accomplished teaching. (Nusche et al., 2012, p. 80)

In summary, this research has identified several challenges that need to be considered when attempting to implement a successful performance appraisal system. These are: a lack of time for effective appraisal; the lack of trust in the system and appraiser; ensuring role clarification for appraisers; and lastly the confusion that exists around teacher standards;

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the findings have established the need for school leaders to:

1. Have clarity and understanding of the terms and processes involved in the performance appraisal system (both on an internal and external level);
2. Be an effective leader by creating a school culture which fosters the notions of collaboration, trusting relationships, and staff ownership;
3. Allocate sufficient time for performance appraisal;
4. Have a clearly defined role for the appraisers; and

Another key conclusion is the significant variation across the two research schools.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION
This study explored performance appraisal; more specifically, the ways that two state primary schools meet the dual purposes of accountability and development that characterise teacher appraisal in New Zealand. It considered the perceptions and experiences of principals, appraisers, and appraisees in relation to their schools performance appraisal systems.

This final chapter will provide an overview of the research study, draw valid overall conclusions, evaluate any limitations, and make recommendations for further research. Five key conclusions are presented which are related to the three research questions that have guided this study. This is followed by the recommendations, the limitations of the research, suggestions for future research and a final concluding statement.

KEY CONCLUSIONS

Key Conclusion One: The confusion and variation of understanding and application of terms and processes (both on an internal and external level).

Since the implementation of Tomorrow’s Schools (Government of New Zealand, 1988), performance appraisal systems have been a focus for schools and principals, although it was not made mandatory until 1997. From this time, there has been numerous initiatives focussing on practice relating to the implementation of effective performance appraisal in New Zealand schools. Despite this, there is still misunderstanding about and inconsistent use of terminology and considerable variation in the nature of the appraisal process itself. This conclusion has arisen from this research study, and is also echoed in the literature reviewed, including the OECD report on New Zealand education (Nusche et al., 2012). This misunderstanding and
inconsistency is apparent at both the macro level (that is, in government agencies such as the MoE, the ERO, and the NZTC) and at the micro level (the school itself).

Firstly, at the macro level, an issue identified by Nusche et al. (2012) for schools is the confusion associated with the two sets of teacher standards currently used in New Zealand state schools. These two sets of standards, the Professional standards for primary teachers (PS) (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and the Registered teacher criteria (RTC) (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) were designed for different purposes. The PS were designed for accountability, attestation, and pay progression purposes and as a measure of competency. The RTC, on the other hand, were created for use with teacher development and teacher registration. Despite the different purposes, often one or other of these two sets of standards are used and the other is ignored. This is problematic as these standards were designed for specific purposes. The Ministry of Education needs to provide clear guidelines in the area of teacher standards and performance appraisal so that there is a degree of standardisation across the sector. This would then enable schools, within the self-managing framework, to operate their own context-specific systems within this standardisation. The OECD (Nusche et al., 2012) suggests that the two sets of teacher standards be consolidated to a single set of expectations. Unless this is acted upon, schools will continue to be confused and operate systems based on their own assumptions, whether they be correct or not. This fact is highlighted in the case of the two research schools who both fail to meet the legislative requirements relating to the RTC and PS. Both schools only use the RTC within their appraisal system, as a result of the confusion that exists in their schools when they use both sets of standards.

At the school level, it is imperative that schools have clearly defined processes for performance appraisal that meet the dual purposes of accountability and development. This is supported in the literature (Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005) that concludes that all policy and procedural documentation should clarify the guidelines and required criteria for effective implementation of performance appraisal to occur.

In relation to the system itself, the literature (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Middlewood, 2002; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Sinnema &
Robinson, 2007) identifies the key characteristics of effective appraisal. Appraisal should be:

- An educative process with clear guidelines and a transparent approach;
- Based around trusting relationships;
- Based on objective and informative data which goes beyond the superficial;
- Well-resourced with time;
- Student focussed; and
- Independent from disciplinary aspects.

Adapted from (Middlewood, 2002; Moreland, 2011; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Sinnema & Robinson, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

The appraisal processes in the two schools studied in this research project had considerable gaps relating to these characteristics. The gaps for North School related to: the system which had elements of both accountability and development, yet these were not clearly defined and explained; a lack of evidence to suggest that trust or time were considered; and lastly the omission of any reference to training appraisers or appraisees. The gaps for South School related to: the system which has two distinct processes for accountability and development without any integration; a lack of evidence to suggest that the notions of trust, confidentiality, transparency, or time were considered; the omission of reference to training appraisers or appraisees; and the system failed to separate the appraisal process from discipline proceedings. These gaps were acknowledged by the appraisers and appraisees as problematic, as their systems were not completely transparent and clearly articulated in the school documentation. Teachers must have a clear understanding of the purpose, process and agenda if appraisal is to be effective and this is non-negotiable.

Another finding is that the two schools operated very different systems in terms of terminology, as well as the processes and documentation that were used. North School used two very distinct approaches to meet the purposes of accountability and development, while South School used an integrated approach. The approach adopted by South School highlighted some confusion relating to the use of terminology. The key issue was the use of the term ‘ appraisal’ which described the development purpose only, while the accountability purpose was described as
‘attestation.’ The use of the terms in this way can send mixed messages to the teachers as they associate the word ‘appraisal’ with only their development, yet the legislative requirements refer to ‘appraisal’ as an accountability and development process.

Although there was evidence relating to confusion about terminology, understanding of the legislative requirements and having different systems in place, all participants (from both schools) trusted the appraisal processes relating to the purposes of accountability and development in their respective schools. In both schools these processes were based on individualised learning and the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007). This trust is a key finding of this research and is a vital consideration for school leaders when building a positive school culture. This point leads onto the next key conclusion which focuses on effective leadership and the impact of this on school culture.

**Key Conclusion Two: Effective leadership and school culture have a significant influence over performance appraisal**

Effective leaders must build a school culture that promotes the notions of collaboration, sharing and learning. Three key components were identified that contribute to building this school culture: trusting relationships; clear systems; and ownership.

Trusting relationships are a critical element when building a school culture around collaboration and sharing. This is reinforced throughout the literature related to effective appraisal (Cardno, 2012; Piggot-Irvine, 2003; Sachs, 2000), which identifies trust between the appraiser and appraisee, as well as between the principal and staff, as essential. Piggot-Irvine (2003) believes that when trust is evident, the dialogue between appraiser and appraisee is “non-controlling, non-defensive, supportive, educative and yet confidential” (p.172), and this leads to highly effective relationships based around mutual respect. To further enhance these relationships, an effective appraisal system, which staff have trust in, must be in place.
Therefore the second key component of effective leadership that contributes to successful performance appraisal, is that of having clear systems. The system needs to clearly outline the purposes, processes and expectations of all parties. The inclusion of the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007) is essential in the New Zealand context as it promotes reflective practice aimed at professional growth. The professional growth relating to the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007) may be focussed on improved outcomes for students and the improvement of teaching practice (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007).

Finally, both the literature (Desimone, 2009; Piggot-Irvine, 2010; Starratt, 2003) and the participants of this study, identified that effective leaders ensure that staff ownership is valued and encouraged in relation to both the performance appraisal system and the setting of development goals. The development and implementation of the performance appraisal system, must be undertaken in a consultative manner with staff. This includes conducting collaborative reviews of the appraisal system when it is deemed necessary. As Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) state, teachers perceive their performance appraisal system in a more positive way if they have been collaboratively involved in their organisations self-review and refining of the performance appraisal system. Similarly, staff will engage more willingly if they are involved in the setting of their own goals (Piggot-Irvine, 2010).

**Key Conclusion Three: There is a lack of time allocated to the performance appraisal system**

A lack of time was an area of contention between participants of the focus groups. While some participants believed the existing performance appraisal system was considered manageable within the allocated timeframe, others disagreed and argued that there was insufficient time available. The literature (Cardno, 1996; Piggot-Irvine, 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. This includes opportunities to engage in reflective practice, which Youngs and Grootenboer (2003) assert, is a component of effective teaching.
Time must also be allocated for different purposes. Appraisers require time to meet the appraisees, observe appraisees and have professional learning conversations. Conversely, appraisees need time to meet with their appraiser to discuss observations. Additional time is also required for appraisees to observe ‘best practise’ and to engage in professional dialogue with their colleagues. Coupled with this is the need to allow all teachers, the opportunity to inquire into their own practice and this also requires time.

In addition to allocating sufficient time for appraisers and appraisees to participate in the performance appraisal system, Piggot-Irvine (2003) suggests that school leaders need to display ‘best’ appraisal practice by ensuring that, within their routine, appraisal is given a high priority. This notion is supported by participants from North School who stated that ‘appraisal’ was successful at their school because it started from the “top down” and everyone, including the principal, was involved in the process.

One factor that may impact on the time required for appraisal is the use of the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007). The focus of this cycle is to encourage teachers to regularly reflect and inquire into the effect their practise is having on student learning, and adapt their teaching accordingly (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007). If this approach is adopted, it may bring about the possibility of greater integration of appraisal into day-to-day teaching, and therefore reduce the time needed to release appraisees and appraisers, for one off observations and feedback sessions. In essence, the inquiry framework that is shaping their teaching, which is inherent for appraisal, will help to shift the development purpose of performance appraisal to a more professional approach.

**Key Conclusion Four:** There must be a clearly defined role for the appraiser within the appraisal process

Within a performance appraisal process, there needs to be a clearly delineated role for the appraiser. Initially this can be described in terms of expectations and tasks that form the process. However, as highlighted by the appraisers that participated in this study, serious consideration needs to be given to the specific role of the appraiser in
relation to the notions of accountability and development. This is supported in the literature (Cardno, 1999; Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Rudman, 2002) which identifies that appraisers can be placed in the paradoxical position of both supporting and developing their colleagues, and also monitoring their performance to ensure they meet the necessary professional standards.

This dual role could potentially cause conflict if there is a performance issue and either competency or discipline actions are required. Best practice suggests that if problems related to competence, discipline or dismissal occur, there are separate systems in place to deal with these issues (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Piggot-Irvine, 2002, 2003).

The findings of this study also suggest that the building of positive relationships is another method that can be utilised to help alleviate this issue of contradictory roles. As Piggot-Irvine (2003) states, when the appraiser and appraisee have a strong relationship built on trust and mutual respect, dealing with difficult conversations related to performance can be less confrontational. As noted in key conclusion two on page 125, trusting relationships play a vital role in effective performance appraisal systems.

Another interesting conclusion within this focus on roles, is how the different research participants appeared to have different focuses regarding their function within the appraisal process. Principals appeared to be more focused at an organisational level, and mentioned terms such as systems, culture and ownership. Whereas the appraisers seemed to be more focussed on ensuring that teachers were developing and accountable for their performance. The appraisers noted concepts such as meeting standards, and being accountable. In contrast, the appraisees seemed to focus their role on improving student learning and being accountable for this. This was very apparent in their responses to question 11. These are shown on pages 103 and 104. This also highlights the need for performance appraisal systems to have clearly defined roles, so all stakeholders understand their responsibilities.
Key Conclusion Five: There is significant variation across the two research schools

Despite both research schools being situated in the same geographical area and having similar demographics, the performance appraisal systems adopted by each school are significantly different. While both schools include the dual purposes of accountability and development within their respective systems, they operate quite differently. This is consistent with the findings of research conducted by Cardno (2012) and Fitzgerald et al. (2003) which found that two approaches are common in New Zealand state primary schools.

The first approach is an integrated system where the dual purposes operate under one umbrella. The issue with this integrated approach is that schools have a lack of clarity relating to the purpose and justification of each component, and this leads to one purpose dominating proceedings. This was the case in North School which adopted an integrated approach where the focus for this school was heavily weighted towards the development aspect of appraisal.

The alternative approach is when the two purposes operate as distinct systems because schools struggle to understand the values that underpin each purpose (Cardno, 2012). South School adopted this approach and operated two distinct systems named ‘attestation’ and ‘appraisal.’ The attestation process serves the accountability purpose and the appraisal process serves the development purpose, which includes a significant focus on using the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007) based around teacher reflection. Again this school had a greater focus on the development purpose of appraisal.

This variation of approach is significant as there is inconsistent use of terms and processes. To highlight this lack of consistency, the degree to which each research school meets the criteria of an effective appraisal system (based on Piggot-Irvine’s (2003), and the two additions of ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and focusing on student learning) is discussed next. A table showing the specific analysis can be found in Appendix M.
In Appendix M, the table shows that both schools meet some of the effectiveness criteria, but there are significant gaps. There were different systems in place, different uses of the same terminology, and both schools failed to specifically include the notion of trust within their system. Despite this, all participants (from both schools) had a high level of trust in the appraisal processes in their respective schools. The participants in both schools identified that the processes were based on individualised teacher learning using the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007), and also concluded that the systems were effective and meaningful for them as their goals were focussed around improving student achievement.

In summary, there was considerable variation across the two participating schools but despite the differences, the Education Review Office sees both schools as highly effective and successful.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The findings of this study have led to the development of five recommendations. It is worth noting that these recommendations may be relevant to any state primary school within New Zealand. Even though this is a small-scale study, readers may choose to take these conclusions, and make generalisations that can be applied within their own context.

1. That schools have a clearly defined appraisal process that meets the dual purposes of accountability and development. The schools involved in this research used two very different systems. One was a fully integrated system, while the other had two separate systems for each purpose. Therefore, based on this research, integration is desirable but not essential;

2. That school leaders develop and maintain a school culture that fosters collaboration, trust and ongoing learning. The ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007) is a mandated requirement for schools, and this must be implemented. The school data highlighted that these characteristics (collaboration, trust and ongoing learning) are essential to successfully implement a meaningful and effective performance appraisal system;
3. That principals allocate sufficient time and resources for performance appraisal to occur. This includes allocation of financial budgets relating to non-contact time for teachers to conduct research into their own practice and follow the inquiry process. This also has implications for the Ministry of Education. It needs to increase the funding and resource allocation to schools so school leaders and can provide sufficient time for effective performance appraisal systems to occur;

4. That schools have clearly delineated roles for the teachers involved. This means that the roles of appraiser, appraisee, mentor, and coach are clarified, and all participants in the performance appraisal process understand their specific roles; and

5. That the Ministry of Education, in consultation with the sector groups (primary and secondary), consolidate the *Professional Standards* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and the *Registered teacher criteria* (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) into one set of teacher standards. This will ensure that all schools are using the same criteria for appraisal of their staff.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The first limitation is that because of the small number of research participants, it is possible that the findings and, therefore, the ensuing conclusions, may not be an accurate representation of the perceptions and experiences of principals, appraisers and appraisees in all New Zealand state schools. As Brown (2005) states however, small scale qualitative studies can be generalised and applied to other settings if the readers see clear contextual links. This means that it is up to the readers of this research to evaluate the extent to which the findings and conclusions can be applied to their own settings (Cohen et al., 2007).

The second limitation is that it may have been advantageous to complete the focus group discussions before the semi-structured interviews. This would have allowed me to ask additional probing questions of the interview participants, in order to clarify the raw data and expand on the emergent themes from the focus groups.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research has highlighted possibilities for future research. These possibilities include:

- A more in-depth and wide-ranging study exploring current performance appraisal practice across a larger sample of New Zealand state primary schools;
- Research into the effectiveness of using the Registered teacher criteria for the purpose of teacher development;
- Research into the specific use of the Professional Standards (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and the Registered teacher criteria (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2010b) in New Zealand state primary schools; and
- Research into the use of the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ cycle (Ministry of Education, 2007) within the performance appraisal system in New Zealand state primary schools.

CONCLUSION

This study has explored the performance appraisal systems in two primary schools in New Zealand. The findings and recommendations add to the body of literature relating to performance appraisal systems and will be available to school leaders and schools who may be interested in reviewing their appraisal systems. There is a need for school leaders to take a considered approach to implementing a performance appraisal system to meet the dual purposes of accountability and development.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Principals’ Interview Schedule

Interviewer Introduction, thank you and purpose (2 minutes)

Hello. My name is Mark Whitford and I’d like to thank you for taking the time to be part of this research. The focus of this interview is to gain your opinions regarding the purpose of performance appraisal at both an external and internal level, and how you feel the system in place leads to improved accountability and development of teachers'. This interview should take a maximum of 45 minutes.

General questions (10 minutes)
- How does performance appraisal work in your school?
- How would you define the term “appraisal” in this school?

Specific questions (30 minutes)
- How has this system developed in your school?
- What part/s of the appraisal system would you say allow teachers to improve their practice and develop?
- Are there any parts that link to the professional standards or the Teachers’ Council criteria for registration? What parts do this?
- What is your role within the performance appraisal system in your school?
- What do you see as the strengths of performance appraisal in your school?
- What do you see as the biggest challenges or barriers to performance appraisal in your school?
- How has this performance appraisal system led to improvements in students’ learning?
- Would you say your appraisal system is mostly about development or mostly about meeting standards? Or is it a balance of both? Why do you think this?
- I wonder if you are familiar with the term “accountability”? What does that term mean for you when you think about your appraisal system?
- Is there anything else that you would like to add that I have not specifically asked you about?

Closing (2 minutes)
Thank you for coming today and discussing these issues. Your opinion has given me an excellent insight into performance appraisal in relation to your school.
APPENDIX B – Appraisers’ Focus Group Schedule

Moderator Introduction, thank you and purpose (2 minutes)

Hello. My name is Mark Whitford and I’d like to thank you for taking the time to be part of this research. The focus of this interview is to gain your opinions regarding the purpose of performance appraisal at both an external and internal level, and how you feel the system in place leads to improved accountability and development of teachers’.

In the discussion today, please respect the privacy of colleagues with whom you work. I would ask you not to use the names of specific staff members nor refer to specific examples from your workplace that may identify individual staff members. My expectation is that you discuss general themes that you have observed rather than specific examples.

I am going to lead the discussion today. My job is to ask you the questions and then encourage and moderate the discussion. It is not my job to try and influence or change your opinion.

Ground rules (2 minutes)

To allow everyone an opportunity to express their opinion, I’d like to go over some ground rules:
- The discussion should take approximately 45 minutes
- Please only one person speaks at a time and avoid side conversations
- Please allow everyone the opportunity to answer each question if they so wish
- Please keep what is discussed confidential, we encourage this so that everyone feels that they can express an opinion freely.
- Please state your Research marker (e.g. A1, A2) before you make a comment. This aids the transcription process.

General questions (10 minutes)
- How does performance appraisal work in your school?
- How would you define the term “appraisal” in this school?
Specific questions (30 minutes)

- How has the system developed in this way in your school?
- What part/s of the appraisal system would you say allow teachers to improve their practice and develop?
- Are there any parts that link to the professional standards or the Teachers' Council criteria for registration? What parts do this?
- What is your role within the performance appraisal system in your school?
- What do you see as the strengths of performance appraisal in your school?
- What do you see as the biggest challenges or barriers to performance appraisal in your school?
- How has this performance appraisal system led to improvements in students’ learning?
- Would you say your appraisal system is mostly about development or mostly about meeting standards? Or is it a balance of both? Why do you think this?
- I wonder if you are familiar with the term “accountability”? What does that term mean for you when you think about your appraisal system?
- Is there anything else that you would like to add that I have not specifically asked you about?

Closing (5 minutes)
Thank you all for coming today and discussing these issues. Your opinions have given me an excellent insight into performance appraisal in relation to your school.
APPENDIX C – Appraisees’ Focus Group Schedule

APPRAISEES’ - FOCUS GROUP SCHEDULE

Moderator Introduction, thank you and purpose (2 minutes)

Hello. My name is Mark Whitford and I’d like to thank you for taking the time to be part of this research. The focus of this interview is to gain your opinions regarding the purpose of performance appraisal at both an external and internal level, and how you feel the system in place leads to improved accountability and development of teachers’.

In the discussion today, please respect the privacy of colleagues with whom you work. I would ask you not to use the names of specific staff members nor refer to specific examples from your workplace that may identify individual staff members. My expectation is that you discuss general themes that you have observed rather than specific examples.

I am going to lead the discussion today. My job is to ask you the questions and then encourage and moderate the discussion. It is not my job to try and influence or change your opinion.

Ground rules (2 minutes)
To allow everyone an opportunity to express their opinion, I’d like to go over some ground rules:

- The discussion should take approximately 45 minutes
- Please only one person speaks at a time and avoid side conversations
- Please allow everyone the opportunity to answer each question if they so wish
- Please keep what is discussed confidential; we encourage this so that everyone feels that they can express an opinion freely.
- Please state your Research marker (e.g. A1, A2) before you make a comment. This aids the transcription process.

General questions (10 minutes)

- How does performance appraisal work in your school?
- How would you define the term “appraisal” in this school?
**Specific questions (30 minutes)**

- How has the system developed in this way in your school?
- What part/s of the appraisal system would you say allows you to improve your practice and develop?
- Are there any parts that link to the professional standards or the Teachers' Council criteria for registration? What parts do this?
- What is your role within the performance appraisal system in your school?
- What do you see as the strengths of performance appraisal in your school?
- What do you see as the biggest challenges or barriers to performance appraisal in your school?
- How has this performance appraisal system led to improvements in students’ learning in your class?
- Would you say your appraisal system is mostly about your development or mostly about you meeting standards? Or is it a balance of both? Why do you think this?
- I wonder if you are familiar with the term “accountability”? What does that term mean for you when you think about your appraisal?
- Is there anything else that you would like to add that I have not specifically asked you about?

**Closing (5 minutes)**

Thank you all for coming today and discussing these issues. Your opinions have given me an excellent insight into performance appraisal in relation to your school.
APPENDIX D – Organisation Information Letter and Consent Form

June 2013

ORGANISATION INFORMATION LETTER

THESIS TITLE: Performance appraisal in primary schools: Managing the integration of accountability and development.

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Mark Whitford. I am Associate Principal at Glen Eden Intermediate School in West Auckland and I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management course in the School of Education at Unitec, Institute of Technology.

The aim of my research project is to identify the strategies employed by Auckland Primary Schools that effectively integrate accountability and development within a performance appraisal system. Additionally the research will identify what conditions principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important when attempting to achieve these dual purposes and the associated challenges.

I am requesting your permission to carry out part of this study at your organisation. I would like to interview the principal for 45 minutes and then conduct two focus groups, each with 4-5 participants. The first group would be staff who conduct appraisals and the second a group of teachers who participate in the appraisal process. The focus groups will take approximately 45 minutes. Additionally I would like to view the organisation policies relevant to performance appraisal. These interviews and focus groups’ will be scheduled at your convenience. I will also be asking you to sign a consent form regarding these events.

Neither you nor your organisation will be identified in the thesis. If you wish to withdraw the organisation from the project, you will have the opportunity to do so at any point up to ten working days after the participants receive their transcripts to validate. At your request, I am able to provide you with a copy of the thesis before it is submitted for assessment.

I hope that you are happy for your organisation to participate and that your organisation will gain a useful insight into performance appraisal, as well as information which may be of use in your future strategic planning. If you have any queries about the research, you may contact my principal supervisor at Unitec, Institute of Technology.

My supervisor is Alison Smith, phone 09 8154321 ext. 8936 or email asmith@unitec.ac.nz

Yours sincerely

Mark Whitford

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2013-1034)

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from June 2013 to June 2014. 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 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
ORGANISATION CONSENT FORM

Research Event:

Researcher:  Mark Whitford,

Programme  :  Master of Educational Leadership and Management

Thesis Title:  Performance appraisal in primary schools: Managing the integration of accountability and development.

I have had the research project explained to me and I have had an opportunity to have my questions answered. I understand that everything said as part of this study is confidential and none of the information provided will identify me, the staff or the organisation.

I understand that if I wish to withdraw my organisation from the project, I will have the opportunity to do so at any point up to ten working days after the participants receive their transcripts to validate.

I agree for the organisation to take part in this project.

Signed: ...........................................                    Signed: ......................................

BOT Chairperson                                                Principal

Name: .............................................                    Name: .........................................

Date: ...............................................                    Date: ............................................

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2013-1034)
This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from June 2013 to June 2014. 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 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

THESIS TITLE: Performance appraisal in primary schools: Managing the integration of accountability and development.

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Mark Whitford. I am Associate Principal at Glen Eden Intermediate School in West Auckland and I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management course in the School of Education at Unitec, Institute of Technology. I am requesting your help in the collection of data as part of a thesis course which forms a part of this Masters programme.

The aim of my research project is to identify the strategies employed by Auckland Primary Schools that effectively integrate accountability and development within a performance appraisal system. Additionally the research will identify what conditions principals, appraisers, and appraisees perceive as important when attempting to achieve these dual purposes.

I would like to interview you for about 45 minutes to discuss how performance appraisal is conducted in your school and obtain your perceptions of the conditions that ensure this process is successful in meeting the dual purposes of accountability and development.

Neither you nor your organisation will be identified in the Thesis. The interview will be recorded, transcribed and then deleted. I will provide a transcript (or summary of findings if appropriate) for you to validate before data analysis is undertaken. If you wish to withdraw your participation from the project, you will have the opportunity to do so at any point up to ten working days after receiving your transcript to validate. At your request, I am able to provide you with a copy of the thesis before it is submitted for assessment.

I hope that you will agree to take part and that you will find the experience valuable. If you have any queries about the research, you may contact my principal supervisor at Unitec, Institute of Technology.

My supervisor is Alison Smith, phone 09 8154321 ext. 8936 or email asmith@unitec.ac.nz

Yours sincerely

Mark Whitford

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2013-1034)

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from June 2013 to June 2014. 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 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Research Event: Individual Interview
Researcher: Mark Whitford,
Programme: Master of Educational Leadership and Management
THESIS TITLE: Performance appraisal in primary schools: Managing the integration of accountability and development.

I have had the research project explained to me and I have had an opportunity to have my questions answered. I understand that everything I say is confidential and none of the information that I give will identify me or my organisation.

I also understand that I will be provided with a transcript or a summary of findings (if appropriate) for checking before the data analysis is started.

I am aware that I have the right to withdraw myself or any information that I provided for this research up to ten working days after receiving my transcript to validate.

I agree to take part in this project.

Signed: ...........................................

Name: ............................................

Date: .............................................

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2013-1034)
This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from June 2013 to June 2014. 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 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
APPENDIX F – Focus Group Participant Information and Consent Form

FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

THESIS TITLE: Performance appraisal in primary schools: Managing the integration of accountability and development.

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Mark Whitford. I am Associate Principal at Glen Eden Intermediate School in West Auckland and I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management course in the School of Education at Unitec, Institute of Technology. I am requesting your help in the collection of data as part of a thesis course which forms a part of this Masters programme.

The aim of my research project is to identify the strategies employed by Auckland Primary Schools that effectively integrate accountability and development within a performance appraisal system. Additionally the research will identify what conditions principals, appraisers, and teachers perceive as important when attempting to achieve these dual purposes.

I would like you to take part in a focus group discussion for about 45 minutes to discuss how performance appraisal is conducted in your school and obtain your perceptions of the conditions that ensure this process is successful in meeting the dual purposes of accountability and development.

Neither you nor your organisation will be identified in the Thesis. The discussion will be recorded, transcribed and then deleted. I will provide a transcript (or summary of findings if appropriate) for you to validate before data analysis is undertaken. If you wish to withdraw your participation from the project, you will have the opportunity to do so at any point up to ten working days after receiving your transcript to validate. At your request, I am able to provide you with a copy of the thesis before it is submitted for assessment.

I hope that you will agree to take part and that you will find the experience valuable. If you have any queries about the research, you may contact my principal supervisor at Unitec, Institute of Technology.

My supervisor is Alison Smith, phone 09 8154321 ext. 8936 or email asmith@unitec.ac.nz

Yours sincerely

Mark Whitford

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2013-1034)

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from June 2013 to June 2014. 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 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Research Event: Focus Group

Researcher: Mark Whitford,

Programme : Master of Educational Leadership and Management

THESIS TITLE: Performance appraisal in primary schools: Managing the integration of accountability and development.

I have had the research project explained to me and I have had an opportunity to have my questions answered. I understand that everything I say is confidential and none of the information that I give will identify me or my organisation.

I also understand that I will be provided with a transcript or a summary of findings (if appropriate) for checking before the data analysis is started.

I am aware that I have the right to withdraw myself or any information that I provided for this research up to ten working days after receiving my transcript to validate.

I agree to take part in this project.

Signed: ...........................................

Name: .............................................

Date: .............................................

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2013-1034)

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from June 2013 to June 2014. 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 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
APPENDIX G – Analysis of North School and South Schools appraisal documentation against PMS 1: The principles

Key:  - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement for teacher appraisal in New Zealand State Schools as found in Performance Management in Schools Number 1 (Ministry of Education, 1997).</th>
<th>North School (+, -, ±)</th>
<th>South School (+, -, ±)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The Principles: Board of Trustees should ensure that policies and procedures for the appraisal of teacher performance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Are part of an integrated performance management system operating in the school;</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Are appropriate to individual teachers, the school and wider community;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Are developed in a consultative manner with teachers;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Are open and transparent;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Have a professional development orientation;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Are timely and helpful to the individual teacher;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Give consideration to matters of confidentiality;</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H – Analysis of North School and South Schools appraisal documentation against PMS 1: The features

Key:  - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement for teacher appraisal in New Zealand State Schools as found in Performance Management in Schools Number 1 (Ministry of Education, 1997).</th>
<th>North School (+, −, ±)</th>
<th>South School (+, −, ±)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 The Features of the appraisal Process:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 The board of trustees is responsible for ensuring that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) A policy for the appraisal of teacher performance is in place which is in accordance with the principles;</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Responsibility for the implementation of the appraisal policy and process is formally delegated to a professionally competent person or persons;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) The appraisal process for each teacher is completed in accordance with the policy;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Each teacher participates in the appraisal process at least once within a 12 month period.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2.2 Boards of trustees have a documented policy on the appraisal of teacher performance. This policy must:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.i Specify the person (s) responsible for the implementation of the appraisal policy and process;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.ii Specify the process which will be followed in the appraisal of teacher performance;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.iii Include a statement of confidentiality;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.iv Specify a process for dealing with disputes;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2.3 Boards of trustees (through the person(s) responsible) must ensure that the appraisal process includes the following elements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identification of an appraiser, in consultation with the teacher concerned;</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of a written statement of performance expectations in consultation with the teacher;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identification and written specifications of one or more development objectives to be achieved during the period for which the performance expectations apply;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each development objective, the identification and written specification of the assistance or support to be provided;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of teaching (for those with teaching responsibilities);</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-appraisal by the teacher;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An opportunity for the teacher to discuss their achievement of the performance expectations and the development objective(s) with their appraiser;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appraisal report prepared and discussed in consultation with the teacher.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I – Analysis of North School and South Schools appraisal documentation against PMS 1: The aspects of teacher performance to be appraised.

Key:  - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement for teacher appraisal in New Zealand State Schools as found in <em>Performance Management in Schools Number 1</em> (Ministry of Education, 1997).</th>
<th>North School (+, -, ±)</th>
<th>South School (+, -, ±)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 The Aspects of Teacher Performance to be Appraised:</strong> Boards of trustees (through the person(s) responsible) must ensure that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.1 The performance expectations for teachers must related to the key professional responsibilities and key performance areas of their position</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J – Analysis of North School documentation against the effectiveness criteria for appraisal

The criteria is based on Piggot-Irvine's, (2003) criteria with the additional areas of ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and a student learning focus.

Key:  - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>±</th>
<th>Performance appraisal policy</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>±</th>
<th>North School “Performance Management Folio”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An integrated development &amp; accountability approach</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>Features of development are included in this policy. No specific mention of accountability however it states there is ‘assessment against the requirements’ but it doesn’t state for what purpose.</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>Features of development are clearly included in this policy. The ‘folio’ includes a ‘quality assurance checklist’ which could be interpreted as accountability. There is no reference to this in the policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An educative process</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>The rationale refers to appraisal being a system that improves the quality of teaching and learning by providing supporting and development opportunities.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Development is referenced several times throughout the handbook. This includes goal-setting, and the reflective process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>There is no reference to the notion of trust in the policy statement.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>There is no reference to the notion of trust in any other documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential and transparent processes</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>The policy states that all documentation regarding appraisal are confidential to the teacher. Transparency is not referred to.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Apart from the policy statement, there is no reference to confidentiality or transparency in the ‘folio.’ There is a timeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting deep objectives &amp; collecting objective &amp; informative data</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>The policy states that the appraisee/appraiser will establish mutually negotiated goals. It makes no reference to the quality or orientation of these goals. The policy refers to data gathered by observation. No reference is made regarding the quality and type of data.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>The ‘folio’ has templates for recording goals. These templates provide prompts for appraisees to develop deep and meaningful goals for appraisal. Specific guidelines with data requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-resourced with training and time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The policy states that funding will be made available to implement the appraisal where necessary. No reference to the training of appraisers/appraisees. No mention of time dedicated to the appraisal process.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The goal setting section records resources required for the teacher to meet his/her goals. No reference to the training of appraisers/appraisees. No mention of time dedicated to the appraisal process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Guidelines</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A basic outline of the appraisal process is outlined in the policy statement.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>The outline is expanded on and discussed in greater detail in the ‘folio.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of discipline processes from appraisal</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>No reference to discipline processes. The notion of disputes &amp; mediation is discussed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference is made to this except in the policy document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Teaching as Inquiry’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>This is mentioned in the policy.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Explicitly mentioned in the folio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focussed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>This is included in the policy.</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>Some evidence in the folio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K – Analysis of South School documentation against the effectiveness criteria for appraisal

The criteria is based on Piggot-Irvine’s, (2003) criteria with the additional areas of ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and a student learning focus.

**Key:**  - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>±</th>
<th>Performance appraisal and attestation policies</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>±</th>
<th>South School Appraisal and Attestation Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An integrated development &amp; accountability approach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Features of development and accountability are clearly included in these policy statements but there is no mention of an integrated approach.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These processes are keep separate and the documentation used is also separate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An educative process</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of appraisal is referred to as reflecting on practice. There is no specific reference to development other the inclusion of the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>The appraisal template clearly follows the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model and the language included is based around changing practice and developing pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no reference to the notion of trust in the policy statement.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no reference to the notion of trust in any other documentation associated with performance appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential and transparent processes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no reference to confidentiality or transparency in the policy statements.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no reference to confidentiality or transparency in the policy statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting deep objectives &amp; collecting objective &amp; informative data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The policy makes no reference to the quality or orientation of these goals. The policy references ‘observations’ to gather data but no specific details are given to the quality and type of data to be collected.</td>
<td>±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The other documentation requires appraisees to record their new learning steps. The templates used require appraisees to record their goals. There are question prompt to promote the use of deep goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-resourced with training and time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No reference to appraiser/appraisee training. No mention of time dedicated to the appraisal process.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No reference to appraiser/appraisee training. No mention of time dedicated to the appraisal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Guidelines</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The appraisal policy clearly outlines the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model as the process although there is limited explanation of this.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>The appraisal template clearly outlines the steps that appraisees will take with their inquiry although there is no indication of time or expected content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of discipline processes from appraisal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No reference to discipline processes.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No reference to discipline processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Teaching as Inquiry’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicitly noted in the policy documents.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a major component of the appraisal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focussed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicitly noted in the policy documents.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The goals are based around student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX L – Focus group participants role within appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Role within the school</th>
<th>Role in appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naya</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Appraiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Appraisee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M - Analysis of North and South School appraisal system against the effectiveness criteria for appraisal

The criteria is based on Piggot-Irvine’s, (2003) criteria with the additional areas of ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ and a student learning focus.

**Key:** - (no evidence), + (evidence found), ± (minimal evidence found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>North School</th>
<th>South School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An integrated development &amp; accountability approach</td>
<td>+ An integrated system is espoused. In practice there is a much greater focus on the development of teachers using ‘Teaching as Inquiry’.</td>
<td>- A separate ‘attestation’ and ‘appraisal’ system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An educative process</td>
<td>+ The school rationale refers to the appraisal system as improving the quality of teaching and learning by providing development opportunities.</td>
<td>+ The appraisal system clearly follows the ‘Teaching as Inquiry’ model and the language included is based around changing practice and developing pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>- There is no reference to the concept of trust.</td>
<td>- There is no reference to the concept of trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential and transparent processes</td>
<td>+ The policy states all appraisal documentation is confidential to the teacher. Transparency is not referred to.</td>
<td>- There is no reference to confidentiality or transparency in the school policy statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting deep objectives &amp; collecting objective &amp; informative data</td>
<td>+ Appraisee/appraiser set mutually negotiated goals. Templates are used for recording goals and collecting ongoing data.</td>
<td>± The appraisees record their goals and new learning steps. There are question prompts to promote the use of deep goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-resourced with training and time</td>
<td>- Funding is available to implement appraisal. No reference to appraisers / appraisees training. No mention of the time dedicated to the appraisal process.</td>
<td>- No reference to appraiser/appraisee training. No mention of the time dedicated to the appraisal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Guidelines</td>
<td>+ A basic outline of the development aspect of the appraisal process is outlined. No outline for the accountability process.</td>
<td>+ The steps that appraisees will take with their inquiry are clearly explained. No outline for attestation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of discipline processes from appraisal</td>
<td>- No reference to discipline processes. The notion of disputes &amp; mediation is discussed.</td>
<td>- No reference to discipline processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Teaching as Inquiry’</td>
<td>± This is not mentioned in documentation but it is seen as a component by staff.</td>
<td>+ This is a major component of the appraisal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focussed</td>
<td>± This is explained by staff but not included in the policy.</td>
<td>+ The goals are based around student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>