



SABBATICAL REPORT

KEY COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE APPRAISAL *which promote teacher ownership and engagement and lead to professional growth*

AUTHOR: Anne Lye, Churton Park School

SABBATICAL TIME: Term 3, 2014



Acknowledgements:

I would like to acknowledge and thank the Churton Park School Board of Trustees for supporting my application for Sabbatical leave. It is a big call to let your Principal “leave the school grounds” for such a long period of time and I felt very privileged to be given this opportunity. This was made possible because of the professionalism and skill of the Leadership Team, particularly Di Patchett who took the responsibility of Acting Principal during this time, supported by Jude Phillips and Maree Goodall. I am grateful for their professionalism and skill. As well, thank you to all the dedicated staff at Churton Park School who bring their best every day, ensuring our school maintains its focus and high standard.

I am very grateful that the Ministry of Education support sabbatical leave as an option. Having time to read, reflect and consider different options away from the day to day pressures of a busy school, along with the chance to have some personal time to rejuvenate, is a real and valued privilege.

Finally I wish to thank my professional colleagues who willingly share their thinking, open up their schools and their practice and contribute time and effort to enhance the learning of colleagues and the effectiveness of the profession. It is this very attitude, extended to me but also applied to school appraisal, which promotes ownership, engagement and growth.

PURPOSE:

School leaders have a key role in establishing effective teacher appraisal systems and teacher performance has a strong link to student outcomes. Research within New Zealand has found that some of the biggest differences of teacher effectiveness are actually within schools. Teacher appraisal is intended to improve the quality of teaching and obviously, as a consequence, raise student achievement. However across the sector there seems to be a “have to do this, rather than want to” approach. Finding a way to have teachers own and engage in the process, where it is seen as a valuable experience which enhances professional practice and leads to improved student outcomes, will ensure benefits for all within the school community.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE:

Performance management systems were first introduced in schools in 1987 and annual appraisal of principals and teachers became mandatory in 1997. The guidelines specify that effective appraisal involves observation of teaching, self-appraisal and opportunities for discussion and while in the context of self-managing schools, Boards of Trustees are responsible for overall personnel management, the process needs to be delegated to a “professionally competent person or persons”, usually the Principal. Each teacher needs to participate in this formal appraisal process at least once within a twelve month period. The current framework of standards used for teacher appraisal focusses on professional values, knowledge, practices and relationships and includes an expectation that teachers analyse and reflect on evidence to improve their teaching practice. These align with the Registered Teacher Criteria, which also place a much stronger focus on student learning outcomes.

Appraisal is used for a variety of different purposes within the New Zealand context – teacher attestation and registration, salary progression (quality assurance and accountability aspect) as well as also supporting personal development and school capability (improvement focus). The intended overall purpose is that all students in New Zealand schools experience effective teaching. The right to an effective education is a fundamental right of every child so how do we utilise all these factors to enhance teaching quality in an effective, manageable and worthwhile process within New Zealand schools.

ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN:

During the five weeks of my sabbatical study I

- completed focused professional reading with a focus on appraisal, leadership interactions and research into aspects of effective appraisal processes. These included
 - Teacher Appraisal: Missed Opportunities for Learning (Claire Sinnema's doctorate)
 - Leadership – the product of interactions (Dr Wendy Bamford's 2012 sabbatical report)
 - Redefining Appraisal – giving teachers ownership of their practice (Janelle McKenzie, 2012 thesis presented for doctorate)
 - A different practice of Accountability – Kay Tester (Educational Leadership in Action article)
 - Linking Charter Targets to Appraisal in Primary Schools (Education Review Office National Evaluation Report 2013)
 - Supporting school improvement through effective teacher appraisal (Education Review Office National Evaluation Report May 2014)
 - OECD Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, New Zealand Country Background Report 2010
 - Appraisal of Teachers Project; New Zealand Teachers Council
- using learning from the above professional readings, developed a set of questions to ask each Principal visited
- visited and interviewed Dr Wendy Bamford in relation to her sabbatical in 2012 – the implications and subsequent implementation within Wanaka Primary School
- visited and interviewed local Wellington principals implementing two different styles of appraisal

FINDINGS:

As early as 1988, Picot claimed in his report that there was a lack of responsiveness to learners and a lack of accountability for educational outcomes. At the time, this was not just a New Zealand concern, with international rhetoric sharing similar views and this led to reforms focused mainly on curriculum, accountability, governance, market forces and the status of teachers.

A timeline highlights these same issues were being worked through in NZ:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1989 | Tomorrow's Schools - Boards of Trustees (Governance – decentralised decision making) (New Zealand's own unique model) |
| 1990 | Funding follows students to their school of choice, privatised support services (Market forces) |
| 1992-2000 | New New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Curriculum – centralised curriculum) |
| 1997 | Personnel aspect broadened to encompass appraisal of teachers with BoT's being required to implement performance management policies and complete appraisals of teachers (Status of teachers) |
| 1998 | ERO external inspection (accountability, status of teachers) |
| 2003 | Schools planning and reporting expectations to MoE (accountability) |
| 2010-2014 | National Standards assessment and public results (Centralised assessment) While still very controversial in educational settings, many parents view them positively. |

The intention of the Ministry of Education, by introducing appraisal in 1997, was to provide a process whereby Boards of Trustees could ensure teachers were meeting teaching, school-wide and

and management responsibilities. Notably, in these initial guidelines from the MoE, the concept of student outcomes or achievement were conspicuous by their absence. This led to appraisals being focused on teacher behaviours and tasks, rather than on the impact of teaching on student achievement.

There has been wide-spread dissatisfaction with this traditional approach to appraisal. Over time, there has been greater recognition that appraisal is the intended vehicle for improving teaching and that improvement of teaching should lead to improvement of student achievement. This was reiterated in the recent ERO National Report, “Supporting School Improvement through Effective Teacher Appraisal”, where it is acknowledged that highly robust appraisal processes balanced professional accountability with a strong desire to make improvement for students.

Substantial research shows that major variation in student achievement lies in classroom teaching and the significance of this impact is confirmed by the NZ researcher Hattie. (1999) Further, variation in performance between teachers and classes within schools has been highlighted (although this was not evident at our school, noted by recent ERO reviewers).

In a recent National Report, ERO have recommended to the MoE to support schools to extend the focus of appraisal to include both accountability (summative) and improvement (formative) through a range of identified measures. This dual focus can cause tension and confusion, and it has been clear for some time that teachers feel a lack of ownership in the process, that appraisal is a bureaucratic process that is “done” to them.

The accountability factor is further muddled by the development of Professional Standards for Teachers, which outlines the Government’s expectations of professional performance, and the Registered Teacher Criteria (RTC) which sets out mandatory criteria for teachers seeking to gain full registration. These are typically mixed and matched as part of appraisal and then used to formally attest to a teacher’s competence. In Chapter 5 (which focused on teacher appraisal) of the OECD’s Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes in the New Zealand context, there was recognition that establishing “agreement on a coherent set of professional standards would assist in the definition and exemplification of quality.” Since then Tataiako has been introduced to schools, which is the MoE’s guide to developing cultural competence for teachers, and these are closely aligned to the RTC. From my research, I noted that many schools align their appraisal practice to the Registered Teacher Criteria and, as modelled by the Teachers Council at introductory sessions for school management, have established a list of what would indicate evidence in practice. Initial efforts are also underway to make explicit links to Tataiako.

Claire Sinnema, in her research into appraisal in NZ schools, found that this “competence” factor often became the main focus, with schools developing a range of somewhat simplistic approaches to meet this accountability framework. These included signing off tick boxes for a range of identified behaviours (she found the average number of indicators was 46) which were often either surface or compliance based. Lengthy discussions could ensue on factors that made little significant difference e.g. improved furniture arrangement, tidy cloakbay, timetable on wall.

“...they find something that’s popular, that’s easily demonstrated, so it’s strategic selection. Nearly everyone chose ICT because you could go from “I can’t even turn on the computer” to “look I can use the internet” in a very short time and you’ve got all sorts of very clear evidence.”

In this research, nearly 20% of teachers with a personal ICT goal had no reference to the impact of learning in the classroom. As part of my study, leaders spoken to confirmed they had moved from

this tick box approach, one principal acknowledging that previously there had been “a 15 page tick list accountability process”.

These “goals” were usually “signed off” at the end of a school year, as a summative process. This timing of appraisal allows little opportunity to productively use data as part of a formative appraisal approach. As a result, Sinnema states that there are missed opportunities for learning, particularly for experienced teachers who are patently competent but not given enough challenge/support to continue to develop their teaching capability.

“..useful in the supervision of teachers new to the profession or teachers who exhibit specific weaknesses in their practice...teachers who are past their initial induction and have proven their competence, continued use of clinical supervision is of minimal value. There is no need to continually demonstrate that they are competent and there are no critical weaknesses that require correction. Rather supervision for experienced, competent teachers needs to focus on ongoing professional growth and refinement of practice.” Hannay and Telford, 2003

This finding is also acknowledged by ERO, stating that most schools had compliant appraisal systems that included all the accountability aspects, but showed little evidence of overall school improvement.

However, these are still important aspects of school life which do have an impact on the collective effectiveness of educational practice. It has to be recognised that it can be hard to sustain expectations and that everyone, over time, loses motivation. Appreciating this, schools are increasingly moving to unobtrusive monitoring of these aspects through team and staff meetings. These provide opportunities for sharing of planning, looking at student workbooks and classroom walk throughs, to name a few.

Many teachers are highly competent and this focus on accountability through appraisal has meant that there is little personal relevance in it for them. The use of indicators as mentioned above has allowed the “playing of the game” of appraisal, which has lessened teacher commitment. This is a real shame as much time and effort (both precious commodities in the very busy life of a teacher) is being put into a process which would appear to have little real impact. There is the constant dilemma in school life of where to focus your energies and to ensure effort, there needs to be an undisputable benefit. This is not to say that teachers have not, or do not want, to participate fully in appraisal with a view to improve practice or have a focus on student learning. In my research, two principals new to their schools, both stated that their staff had requested a review and focus on appraisal processes as they felt them to be ineffective.

Worthwhile and meaningful conversations, questions, and risk taking are often shared collegially outside of the appraisal context. Many recognise that it is the interactions with teaching colleagues in both formal and informal settings that are important in shaping teachers instructional changes and bringing about any improvement in student outcomes. School leaders spoken to recognised the high value of talking and conversations, quoting teachers need to see the need before they will change their practice. Data has the ability to help teachers “see the need”.

As identified above, the over-riding component of inquiry into compliance matters, such as co-operation with colleagues, contribution to wider school life, effective communication, timetable on the wall, have been an inherent part of the appraisal over time. However there have been significant moves away from this approach in recent years. Teachers are much more often asked to share a story about their learning during the year, what impact it has had on their teaching and what they see as

their next steps. In very few instances though, is the evidence produced in relation to analysed student data.

Leadership is a key mechanism in determining whether appraisal serves learning or compliance purposes. School leaders who were interviewed as part of this sabbatical had a real commitment to ensuring appraisal was about teacher improvement, not from a deficit view point but as a process that linked strongly to the philosophy of life-long learning and to making a difference for students. They also saw it as a significant way of valuing their teachers' professional commitment and competence, with a view of enhancing the professionalism of teachers.

The impact of school culture contributes significantly to both the influence and effort of any process. The role of leadership in relation to school culture is well recognised in educational literature and is central to establishing an improvement focus. Fullan (2011) cautions "Culture is the driver, good appraisal is the reinforcer, not the other way round."

Stoll and Fink (1996) identified the key elements of an effective culture which positively influence school improvement.

- Shared goals – we know where we are going
- Responsibility for success – we must succeed
- Collegiality – we are working on this together
- Continuous improvement – we can get better
- Lifelong learning – learning is for everyone
- Risk taking – we learn by trying something new
- Support – there's always someone there to help
- Mutual respect – everyone has something to offer
- Openness – we can discuss our differences
- Celebration and humour – we feel good about ourselves

While there are times when leaders can feel the need to meet the expectation that they will solve problems, and make "life easier" for staff, school culture is established through shared values and beliefs. Maintaining teachers support and trust is vital. Rosenholtz 1985 maintained that teachers who felt supported in their ongoing learning and classroom practices were more committed and effective than those who did not receive such confirmation. A high sense of efficacy meant teachers were much more likely to be willing to inquire into practice and adopt new classroom behaviours.

Schools have readily seen the value of assessment FOR learning and have made the move to formative practice, using assessments to set forward-focused goals and next steps for students' learning. Appraisal FOR learning would apply the same pedagogy, with teachers using evidence and looking through the lens of what they do, that makes a difference for learning. This would necessitate a move towards a much more inquiry based approach, which would allow teachers to inquire into their practice, with a view to what is making the difference. The principles of inquiry – willingness to learn, being open to new ideas, challenging beliefs, and having deliberate and productive questioning and reasoning would seem to link well to the required elements of observation, self-appraisal and interviews as mandated by the MoE.

While Sinnema contends that the focus should be on what is considered the most important and fundamental to the teacher appraisal process, and that is the impact on student learning, how does this align with school practice and processes and are student outcomes the most, or only, important factor in a child's classroom experience? Certainly, all educational professionals would state categorically that there are many other factors that have a significant influence on student learning,

other than what happens in the classroom. The influence of these factors should not be discounted or minimised, and must be addressed in continued conversations with those who are able to do something about them. However, as professionals this does provide a context for discussion about what is within our control, and what change we can facilitate. Formative approaches within appraisal would seem more likely to have an impact in this regard than summative approaches, which can seem to either judge or ameliorate any influence a teacher made have had. Significant research, endorsed by the MoE, reports that quality teaching is the largest single education system influence on student achievement specifically, according to Hattie (1999), teacher's use of critical innovations, their provision of feedback and the use of specific and challenging goals with students. Indeed, Locke and Latham (1990) found that challenging goals for teachers led to greater effects on performance.

The need for teachers to see value in the process, requires that some rigour is applied and Sinnema suggests that "less is more" and to focus on what is important. The gains of this would include not only the likelihood of improving student learning but also teacher satisfaction. Deep goals which involve an inquiry process in which the appraisee examines their current situation, plans changes and improvements, carries these out and evaluates their effectiveness through data based reflection would constitute a "challenging goal". Using data means that assumptions and speculations of teacher practice are not left to chance.

"data can help us confront what we may wish to avoid and what is difficult to perceive, trace, or gauge; data can substantiate theories, inform decision, impel action, marshall support, thwart misperceptions and unwarranted optimism, maintain focus and goal orientation, and capture and sustain energy and momentum. Data can help us answer the question, "what do we do next?" Schmoker

This use of data was reinforced in the New Zealand context when Timperley (2004) found that the sustainability of professional development was found to have the greatest impact on student achievement when teachers analysed student data in the context of a professional learning community. In this environment, teachers are able to

"examine together how well students are doing, looking at work and assessment data" with a view to making continuous refinements. This link to professional development is a key component of ensuring continuous improvement within a supported environment."

Timperley and Wiseman reported that school wide professional development that resulted in highest student achievement were those characterised by features of learning communities.

"teachers had shared norms that their children could and should be at national levels of achievement, focus constantly on student learning and teachers talked about and reflected on their professional practice. Practice was deprivatised and achievement data was available for all to see, with the dialogue among teachers based on that data."

This aligns with the five elements that typify professional communities which are: shared norms and values (noted above), a focus on student learning, collaboration, deprivatised practice and reflective dialogue. Professional learning communities are described by Sykes (1999) as

"the presence of shared norms and values cultivated through reflective dialogue, the deprivatization of practice, referring to open scrutiny of individual teachers practice through dialogue, observation and feedback, and examination of students work; a school wide focus on student learning; and high levels of collaboration around curriculum development, coordination of instruction and assessment of student learning.

"the first questions... What are students learning well? What are they not learning well? Which students are learning well and which students are not learning well? These questions

can be answered by data analysis. The second question asks why some students are not achieving. The answer to this question does not come from an analysis of the student data outcomes but from a reflective look at teaching practice.”

The move to Modern Learning Environments within schools, supported by the MoE, has provided greater ability to meet the elements of professional communities, particularly deprivatising classrooms and nurturing collaboration. Further, it is recognised that the rewards of community tend to be internal rather than external, affirming the claim of greater teacher satisfaction.

Schools visited were using the Ariki protocols to develop professional learning communities. These protocols were credited with ensuring high quality thinking was applied to the work of educators through the opportunity to question, discuss, challenge and reflect shared conceptions of practice. Pedagogy and evidence of practice is open to the scrutiny of others, within schools with teacher Quality Learning Circles and across schools with middle leadership and Quality Learning Circles. This approach aligned well with the cultural norms identified by Stoll and Fink and also fulfilled the key elements noted earlier of professional learning communities.

These protocols give the opportunity for teachers to capture real life teacher practice formally, rather than the informal off-chance conversation.

“Paths to improvement are linked to everyday practice.”

“The principal provides critical instructional leadership in a supportive environment where innovation and risk taking are encouraged.”

“There is a collective responsibility for the progress and achievement of our kids and our teachers and can examine data on student performance and classroom interactions.”

Teachers have ownership and take responsibility for their own learning while also supporting their colleagues. A major principle of Ariki is not just to improve practice, but to help teachers develop their thinking about learning, and their teaching, with a view to continuous improvement. It also provides for a strong link to school professional development. Another strength is the face to face relationships that occur as part of the process, lessening the sense of bureaucratic control.

The focus of appraisal for learning should not be confused with holding teachers accountable for results only. It must be emphasised that the accountability is not for the results themselves. What is important is the quality of the teacher’s process of inquiry into the effect of their teaching on their students learning, and the subsequent reflection about their own teaching. The practice of inquiring into thinking is the focus, much as we have done as a school through the Accelerated Learning in Literacy initiative. Looking deeply into student achievement results can help determine impacts of changes in teaching practice and identify what aspects of teaching need to improve. Using Teaching as Inquiry provides a framework for this process.

If we are going to use inquiry into data as a tool for continuous improvement, this puts some responsibility on the school to provide teachers with the skills to select, interpret and analyse data effectively. This raises the question, is this something that the leadership of the school tend to take responsibility for?

There has been a move over the last few years for school leadership to involve staff in analysing data through the development of the school annual plan, particularly the aspects related to teaching and learning. This also allows the collective opportunity to model the development of school goals and charter targets, using evidence through the analysis of school data, reflections about the impact of professional development and practice and provides coherence with school review. ERO found high

quality teacher appraisal had a strong link to the goals of the strategic plan, to the annual plan, to the principal's performance management system and to decisions about teacher professional learning and development.

“Learning requires modelling. Leaders must lead by modelling the values and behaviours that represent collective goals. They must be able to model the learning they expect of others. Leaders should be doing and be seen to be doing that which they expect or require of others to do and should expect to have their own practice subjected to the same scrutiny they expect of others.”

However, this approach has been compromised by the MoE requiring information in November. At this time of the year, student achievement data is still being collected and, at such a busy time of the year, does not provide the opportunity for teachers to own the process. Thankfully there has been some movement on this, with targets and annual plans now requested by the 1st March.

Recent government initiatives also make this a much more weighted process with concerns and unease about the potential for this process to be used even more directly for pay, advancement, opportunities. Research suggests teachers' participation in decision making is positively related to school effectiveness (Rosenholz 1985, Sickler 1988). ERO also recommended that school leaders, design the appraisal system WITH teachers, so they have the opportunity to gain a full understanding of both the purpose and usefulness of appraisal. This collaborative process would hopefully allow for shared ownership and greater commitment while ameliorating some of the inherent concerns noted above.

Increasingly student voice has been mentioned as a possible aspect of the appraisal voice. Schools were introducing this in different ways, with questions targeting teacher behaviours e.g. does the teacher think you are good learner, what do the teachers do when you take a problem to them in the playground; or on their engagement in class e.g. is your school work challenging? These were not a required or formal part of the appraisal process.

What is apparent is that unless a school culture develops and strengthens teacher ownership and engagement within the appraisal process, leading to new behaviours that reach into everyday practice within classrooms, there will be continued undervaluing of appraisal and limited change to business as usual.

IMPLICATIONS and BENEFITS:

Research affirms for me that effective appraisal is about enhancing teacher quality with a view to raising student achievement. Current bureaucratic approaches which focus on accountability do little to achieve either of these, and instead become an exercise that detracts from high-trust, purposeful collaboration.

High quality appraisal systems engage teachers, are transparent, connected and supported through school wide initiatives and have a focus on improving, rather than proving, practice. Making the process meaningful for those experienced, competent teachers who are doing a great job already is paramount.

An empowering, honest culture is crucial and provides for appraisal FOR learning. Within a high-trust environment, teachers are encouraged to be innovative, risk taking is promoted and supported and inquiry into practice, including the analysis of data as evidence, is part of the identified process. It is apparent that professional learning communities have the power to support this inquiry oriented leadership and practice and should be an integral part of any school appraisal process.

The protocols evident within the Ariki Learning Community empower rather than control, with the ability to ask the right questions rather than provide the right answers. The ability to engage teachers in this process, so they can speak about personal innovations and passions, promotes that sense of ownership which is so critical. A clear example was shared at one school visited, where the sharing of data is very open, not only at year level, but also at class level. This led to recognition that one class had the lowest writers three years in a row. The explanation that, “I always get the lowest writers” was challenged through questioning – how do you know that? What evidence do you have to support that? The teacher reviewed the data, initiated a survey of students which highlighted their perspective that writing wasn’t “exciting”, along with limited opportunities for publishing. Intensive support was offered by the school and the analysis of data showed that student achievement improved.

Ensuring appraisal policies and documentation are clearly understood aids ownership. Reviewing this together as a staff, developing a shared understanding that the key purpose is personal growth and that incompetency is addressed through a different process, promotes engagement. While documentation should be explicit, in that policies should dictate that the focus on student learning through teacher inquiry will be evident, with at least one goal reflecting the schools target and aligned to the charter, it should also allow for teachers to generate their personal learning outcomes.

Documentation needs to be explicit and should include

- Information regarding appraisal goals (e.g. challenging, specific, referenced to student learning and aligned to school professional development and achievement targets)
- a Professional Learning Community component which allows for teacher inquiry.
- Set out the appraisal cycle, with consideration given to the length and timing so that the process is more formative than summative, and provides for shared celebration
- a process for collecting and collating evidence in relation to appraisal goals
- the appraisee’s responsibility to share information at the appraisal discussion that shows professional growth
- an on-going commitment to learning together, which could include staff meeting opportunities for professional dialogue about “teacher learning about student learning”
- Make shifts in appraisal approaches as a means of developing or enhancing a professional learning community
- Reflect a focus on student learning and an evidence based approach in appraisal documentation

This would align with evidence that shows setting challenging appraisal goals connected to both school targets and professional development, deep analysis of student achievement information and the impact of teaching practice in a collaborative learning environment makes a significant difference on the efficacy of effective teachers and impacts student learning.

However, sustaining effective appraisal is more than just establishing it in documentation. Revisiting it with all staff at beginning of each year ensures it becomes embedded. Reminders that Professional Learning Communities allow individual teachers to tell a story and talk about their practice, their research, their question and what that means for them. It is not about the mundane (e.g. how we are sorting out school lunches), complaining about school systems or perceived problems within the school. It may seem strange to include these comments here but it is vital that this is addressed or the Learning Community can become ineffective, sabotaged by default. This is not to pretend these other issues do not impact on school life but there must be other processes within the school to resolve them.

The involvement of leadership reflects the value and import of appraisal. Leaders need to be willing to spend time training new staff. Sitting in on a learning community, and then having training brings context to the process. Attending these planned meetings, supporting and maintaining the focus on deep questioning (e.g. could you ask that another way? How could you take that question deeper? what are you going to do now?) helps maintain the integrity of the process and reflects the value placed on the process.

Remembering to provide an opportunity for shared celebration helps cultivate that sense of collaboration, the shared norm of how we do things around here to support one another.

Change takes time and as already alluded to in this report, time is a luxury in schools. 46% of principals surveyed as part of the ERO national report, identified time as the greatest hindrance to effective appraisal. Finding time to include appraisal tasks in an ongoing way, such as timetabling Ariki meetings in place of staff or team meetings, or including tasks within meetings, helps manage this frustration. Finding ways to do it differently, and making it manageable, promotes engagement. Surveying staff about the value of appraisal, how it is impacting their teaching and their thinking, would also help leadership keep in touch with the staff view of effectiveness and also provide on-going review.

CONCLUSIONS:

The concept that it is being “done to you” is sure to mean that the process is ineffective and ineffectual. Those who are involved in the process must see it as being there to support them, and ultimately their students. It needs to be acknowledged that while data is measurable and important, “success” is also bigger than just data. Some students take time to consolidate, take time to grow and then “the learning” becomes connected and “made sense of”. While the input from previous teachers cannot be measured, it has helped build the knowledge and is a valuable component of the learning journey. Further, the positive contribution of our students to society, in a range of different (perhaps immeasurable) ways, cannot be underestimated as an outcome of effective teaching.

An appraisal process that looks to address the implications and benefits included above, within a culture that is focused on improvement, has coherence across self-review, guidance in policies and procedures and provides organisational support for appraisal, will be incorporating the key components of effective appraisal.

REFERENCES:

Ariki Project retrieved from www.arikiproject.ac.nz

Bamford, Dr W. (2012) Leadership – the product of interactions Sabbatical Report 2012

ERO.govt.nz (2013) National Report - Linking Charter Targets to Appraisal in Primary Schools

ERO.govt.nz (May 2014) National Report - Supporting School Improvement through Effective Principal Appraisal

ERO.govt.nz (May 2014) National Report - Supporting School Improvement through Effective Teacher Appraisal May

- Fullan, M. (2011) Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform. CSE seminar series
- Hannay, L.M. & Telford, C. (2003) Making the conceptual shift: teacher performance appraisal as professional growth. Educational Action Research
- Hattie, Prof J. (1999) Influences of Student Learning, Paper presented at Inaugural Lecture, University of Auckland, NZ
- Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P (1990) A theory of goal setting and task performance. New Jersey
- McKenzie, Dr J. (2012) Redefining Appraisal – giving teachers ownership of their practice (A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Massey University, Palmerston North, NZ)
- Ministry of Education (1997) Performance Management Systems; PMS1: Performance Appraisal
- Ministry of Education (1998) Teacher Performance Management: Primary school teachers, primary school deputy/assistant principals. A resource for Boards of Trustees, principals and teachers.
- New Zealand Teachers Council and Evaluation Associates (2013/14) Appraisal of Teachers Professional Development Project
- OECD (2010) Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, New Zealand Country Background Report
- Picot, B. (1988) Administering for excellence: Effective administration in education. Ministry of Education.
- Rosenholz (1985) Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education.
- Sickler, J. (1988) Teachers in charge: Empowering the professionals.
- Timperley, H.S. & Wiseman, J. (2002) The sustainability of professional development in literacy.
- Schmoker, M. (1996) Results: the key to continuous school improvement. Alexandria, V.A.
- Sinnema, Dr C (2005) Teacher Appraisal: Missed Opportunities for Learning (A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, University of Auckland, NZ)
- Stoll, L., Fink, D. (1996). Changing our schools: Linking school effectiveness and school improvement. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Sykes, G. (1999) Teacher and student learning: Strengthening their connection
- Tester, K. (2012) A different practice of Accountability (Educational Leadership in Action article)