

**THE DELIVERY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
IN-HOUSE OR OUTSIDE PROVIDERS?**

**PERSPECTIVES ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
FROM BOTH PROVIDERS AND RECEIVERS**

A NARRATIVE

M Tribe
November 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study set out to establish the success of the provision of professional development to teachers in a mid sized rural secondary school. The school had a short-term history of employing teachers who had expertise in fields outside of the curriculum areas and who were willing to assist other teachers on the staff to enhance their own pedagogical practice. All of these teachers had moved onto other positions but were all involved in teacher education. The study was designed to establish the effectiveness of those teachers whilst at the school, their effectiveness of each in their new role and any change in perception of the effectiveness of the individuals between their time at the school and mid-2007.

The study also included a survey on the effectiveness of a new method of gaining curriculum expertise that was being introduced across all sectors of the educational community as a result of a professional development programme that was a part of a JSIF programme. Whilst employing teachers from within the schools as curriculum experts, it came from a different perspective. A comparison of the perceptions of the two approaches was made.

Perceptions of the effectiveness of those who had been employed in one capacity within a school and who subsequently became experts in a new field were uniform. There was a reluctance to accept these teachers in a new role and there was a relatively high degree of scepticism on the value of what they had to offer. This was as much to do with an inability of teachers to accept that there could be professional growth in their colleagues as much as there was a reluctance to accept the changing role of the teachers involved. Those who had expertise they were willing to share felt that they were lone voices in the wilderness and that those outside were either unwilling or unable to hear. This was seen to be the case.

In each case the in-school experts left the school and became very successful in their field in other areas and were accepted by other schools, yet the reluctance to accept them in their former school continued, effectively reducing the value of what they were attempting to do. It has taken many years for them to be accepted and this has as much to do with changing personnel in their former school as their own personal growth, acceptance in other schools and support from highly respected mentors and supervisors.

The in-school development of curriculum experts through a programme of upskilling and support has proven to be more successful. Teachers, who have been selected to be lead teachers, who have an interest in the curriculum area have been given specific training and have had their skills enhanced. This has included regular feedback sessions to all other staff members who in turn have been able to see for themselves how the lead teachers have gained expertise. That the lead teachers have been given visible support from a facilitator has given credence to the process of training and the development of expert status has been accepted. This visibility and regular and structured professional development for all other teachers has proven to be the key to the success of the approach taken.

The study confirmed that perception can be a problem for many who wish to change roles within a school or even outside it. These perceptions can be very hard to overcome and may well have a long term effect. However, with careful and thorough preparation roles can be changed. If well managed such change can occur reasonably quickly and can be long lasting. The key to such change is to make it visible and to support it.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this exercise was to investigate the perceived value of professional development delivered to teachers by differing providers. The two categories of provider compared were those who operate outside of a school and those who are currently members of the teaching staff of a school, when there are equal skills and qualifications.

This report will look at this issue from the perspective of both teachers receiving the professional development and those delivering, be they in or out of school.

BACKGROUND

The Northern Taranaki district took part in a Network Review of Education in 2003, following which a significant sum of money was made available to enhance the provision of education within the district over the following three years. This money, almost five hundred thousand dollars, was to be spent on upskilling the teachers and other education personnel. To that end an integrated programme of professional development was planned and put out to tender. This was to include teachers and teachers' aides in all education sectors in the community from early childhood to secondary. The programme concentrated on literacy and numeracy across these sectors and there was a significant component devoted to streamlining the movement of students between sectors, both early childhood to primary and from primary to secondary education.

Whilst there was a high level of buy in to the programme, despite what appeared to be a large amount of money available to finance the programme there was still a need to economise and to use local resources where possible. Many of the programmes were delivered by the Centre for Educational Development from Massey University College of Education and a highly regarded educational consultant from the Hawkes Bay and a range of people from these organisations have been used to deliver various aspects. However, there was also a need to use the expertise of local teachers and to train a number of others to become "in-school experts" and to further deliver aspects of the programmes developed by these outside providers.

The immediate issue that arose was the difference placed on the value of the professional development delivered by the various providers. It was observed that teachers perceived more value in that which was delivered by the outside provider, rather than the local teacher, despite equal or better qualifications in many cases. This had an impact on the delivery, as those programmes that were delivered internally had lower rates of attendance and less completion of required tasks, despite the co-ordination between the local and outside providers who were working in accord to produce an integrated programme. However, a further opportunity presented itself through the use of outside providers; that of the "outside expert" training teachers within the staff of the contributing schools to act as the conduit for professional development delivery, thus altering the concept of the in-school expert. This added a new dimension to the professional development programme and threw up another set

METHODOLOGY

The methodology is remarkably simple and involves three processes.

1. A number of providers, who have taught in local schools and are now external providers, have been interviewed to establish their perspective of any changes that they may have experienced with their change in role. In each case they have provided professional development opportunities within the district prior to their taking up another position which, in turn, has resulted in them delivering professional development as an outsider. In many respects this is from a secondary school perspective, as those interviewed were originally secondary school teachers, despite a wider approach following their leaving the secondary service. A profile of these providers can be found in Appendix 1.
2. A number of teachers, who have undertaken professional development with the above, were interviewed to establish if there has been a difference in the perception of the effectiveness of the programmes under offer in different situations. Those interviewed were a mixture of senior administration staff, heads of department and basic scale teachers, with experience in the school ranging over six or more years. A profile of those interviewed can be found in Appendix 2.
3. A “visiting expert” who has introduced a programme of establishing “in-school trainers” across the schools in the Tararua district was interviewed to find her perspective on the success of the scheme. This was followed up by interviews of a number of those who had been trained to establish their views on the success of the scheme and two interviews of those who are receivers of this new method, for the district, of delivery of professional development. A profile of these people is in Appendix 3.

There was a basic set of questions asked of each person, in an attempt to get consistency. See Appendix 4. However, the varying replies and subsequent follow up on some of the comments resulted in a wide ranging conversation with each of those interviewed and whilst there was a thread of consistency in the replies, it must be accepted that the original questionnaire is only a starting point. Much of the report contains information and comment that is unrelated to the questions but is, nevertheless, pertinent to the findings. Hence, this report is a narrative rather than a quantifiable or statistical analysis of data collected in a structured manner.

FINDINGS

The findings are presented in two parts.

- i. Those concerned with the provision of professional development by ex-teachers of Dannevirke High School.
- ii. Those concerned with the in-school training of curriculum leaders as a part of the JSIF professional development programme.

PART 1

The teachers who had been at the school and have subsequently moved to other fields all expressed a similar feeling, in that whilst they were at the school their expertise was not necessarily recognised. Two were heavily involved with aspects of curriculum development and teaching and learning the third held a commercial franchise that supported learning and was designed to up skill students to enable them to learn more effectively. Each of these teachers had come to the school in a different capacity to that in which they eventually became “experts”. Two had been appointed Heads of Department in core curriculum areas and had subsequently used their academic qualifications and personal interests to develop new skills and expertise. The third had been a long serving member of the staff, being Head of Department in a small curriculum area and then moving into the transition programmes and delivery of alternative curriculum. He had bought into a learning franchise and had been employed by the previous Principal to deliver aspects of that programme to senior students, as a part of enhancing the students’ curriculum experience. Each of the three felt that the majority of the teachers had found it difficult to accept that each of these people could work outside of what could be considered to be their normal curriculum area, let alone become an expert in this new field. The three found it frustrating and this led to their seeking alternative opportunities and their subsequent leaving the school. One went to a College of Education as an adviser and professional development coordinator in his area of expertise, one to an independent boys’ school as the curriculum coordinator and the third into a running private educational consulting business, based on his franchise.

The impressions that these three held of their own positions were reflected by the staff who were interviewed. In each case it was felt that the skills that each of the three held, whilst obviously genuine given the success that they enjoyed after leaving the school, were not fully appreciated. Whilst it can be argued that professional development was still in the process of being moved from the practice of attending the one day, off-site course to school based, thematic, on-site programmes, there were issues involving each of the three teachers. Many teachers could not accept that these three teachers had matured professionally and had up-skilled themselves, putting themselves in a position where they could competitively put themselves forward as creditable professional development providers. This was despite each of these people being used by other schools, colleges of education and the coordination of professional development programmes in the district. The teachers tended to associate professional development facilitators with people who were regarded as high powered consultants, official advisors at colleges of education or those paid by the Ministry of Education to deliver specific programmes in the one day or short course model. The concepts offered by these three were not accepted, their skill level was not accepted and much of this had to do with the perceptions that the teachers had regarding what they knew about the three personally. Many found it hard to overcome the conflict that they had between the supposed expertise of these three and the professional and personal behaviour that they observed in the everyday setting. There was no mystique, something that accompanied the stranger.

This perception existed well after the teachers left the school for new opportunities, some of which included the school albeit in a different capacity. When the private consultant and the college of education advisor came to the school their sessions were poorly attended, unless attendance was declared mandatory by management, as there was a degree of scepticism on the value of what was on offer, as staff felt it was a continuation of what had occurred in the past. This had a twofold impact in that the professional development they offered was not fully taken on board thus nullifying its effectiveness and there was a reluctance from these two to return to the school, which in turn meant that those who could benefit missed out.

However, as a comparison the perception of these three as facilitators of professional development outside of the school was vastly different. In each case they reported that what they had to offer was highly valued in other schools and that they were in high demand. This was independently confirmed and the perceptions that each of the three had of their acceptance in other areas was supported.

The teacher who went to another school, where he was appointed as a curriculum expert, was fully accepted. His qualifications were recognised and his curriculum expertise respected. His work with the students gave credence to the theories he was espousing and the pedagogical practice he was employing. Whilst there was very little difference between what he was doing in the two schools, the change in perception and acceptance between the two was remarkable. His own perception of his effectiveness at his new school was supported by teachers at the school and the Principal. In his own words, being appointed as an expert made all the difference.

Similar experiences were enjoyed by the others two. Both worked in a range of schools, covering the rural/urban, single sex/co-ed continuum and a full range of decile ratings. Whilst operating in different fields, it was obvious to each of them that they enjoyed the confidence of the teachers with whom they worked. This was supported by a range of teachers and Principals with whom I spoke on an informal basis. The level of support these two ex-teachers received rose as they both developed enhanced delivery structures, which in both cases involved giving a greater degree of ownership to the teachers in the schools where they were working and taking a step back from the actual delivery, being more in the role of a facilitator.

However, there was one change that emerged in the perception of what these two facilitators had to offer our school. In both cases after a period of time away from the school, both came to recognise that the school had moved on from where it had been when they were members of staff. With this realisation there came an adaptation of methods of presentation and a less making assumptions based on prior experience. There were also more teachers who had not worked with them and were not swayed by personal perception and were thus more accepting of what they had to offer based on what they were presenting. To those who had worked with the college of education adviser there also came a differing perception and enhanced status when he was lauded and supported by a highly regarded educator. This saw a breaking down of some of the barriers that had existed and a gradual, although in some cases grudging, acceptance that he was indeed an expert in his field. This was further overcome when he took over the role of his advocate and supporter in a formal appointment process. In the case of the consultant as new staff came on board there was less of the feeling of the "same old; same old" and despite little change in some of what was on offer, there is a greater acceptance of what he is doing for the students. However, as he is a commercial enterprise and the school must find the resources to fund his programme his presence in the school is not a great as that of the free to school programme provided by colleges of education, which has slowed his acceptance rate.

Despite these changes, the relatively stable teaching staff at the school still means that these ex-teachers still have a perception barrier to cross and no matter their skill level, the changes that they

have made, personal and professional growth and acceptance in other schools, the job they have to do at our school is more difficult than it is for others. It is a matter of perception, nothing else.

PART 2

The network review of the Dannevirke district resulted in a very significant amount of money being made available for professional development. This had to be spread across all sectors of the educational community and it was expected that there would be cross-sector cooperation. The delivery of the professional development was coordinated by a consultant employed by the Ministry of Education and was based on a needs analysis carried out soon after the confirmation of the restructuring of education in the district. A significant amount of the professional development was provided by the local college of education and was coordinated by one of the ex-teachers from the secondary school. The professional development programme was coordinated by a management group, working with the consultant, and this group sought to take advantage of as wide a range of providers as could be afforded as well as to have a range of approaches to the delivery of the programmes.

One of the non-college of education providers has coordinated a numeracy programme. This programme has been provided across both the primary and secondary sectors and has involved teachers at all year levels. This has seen a wide disparity in both existing expertise and understanding of the principles and teaching ability of numeracy skills. This means that a one size fits all approach has not been possible and that a method of ensuring that there is a high base level of skill in the schools has been necessary. Therefore, the facilitator has concentrated on developing lead teachers within the schools, who then have the responsibility to disseminate what they have learned to the teachers in their schools. The facilitator used cross-sector training for the work with the lead teachers and then moved into the individual schools to carry out specific in-school training with both the lead teachers and other teachers. In the secondary school the lead teachers were expected to pass on the knowledge and skills to all curriculum areas in the school. In the secondary school this was done by using time in the regular staff meetings and in a monthly professional development staff meeting, which is attended by all teachers. This process started in mid 2006 and is expected to continue to the end of 2008.

Given the experiences of using in-school personnel in the past there was a degree of scepticism on the success of such an approach. The school had two lead teachers, a relatively young HoD and a Year 2 teacher. Both were given financial incentives to compensate them for the time and effort they would put into the process, something that had not been asked for or expected, but both did acknowledge at the start that they thought it would be a very difficult job to complete successfully.

However, the expectations that were held by many did not eventuate. Whilst this was surprising to the lead teachers in training, it was also something that enabled the programme to enjoy a high level of success. The question that was then asked by those involved was “Why did this approach succeed?”

The answer that was universally supplied was that whilst it had been accepted that the lead teachers under training had not been seen as experts, it was accepted that the facilitator was. Accordingly when she passed on her expertise to the new lead teachers, other teachers knew that what was being taught was relevant, giving the programme credence. The training was visible, it was regular and it was supported. One teacher commented that she was impressed that when the newly trained lead teacher was observing her take a lesson based on the skills that she had just passed on, the facilitator did not observe or evaluate the teacher, she watched and evaluated the responses that the lead teacher made to the teacher and continued the training of the lead teacher, thus continuing the upskilling of that person. The individual teacher was not the target of the facilitator, she was the

responsibility of the lead teacher, the lead teacher the focus was and that was the area of interest. By doing this the facilitator reinforced the lead teacher training and position, further enhancing the notion of the lead teacher being the expert in this school. In turn this gave both the lead teacher and the programme more credibility.

The perceptions of the process were slightly different between the primary and secondary sectors. In the secondary school the teachers involved had the advantage in that they were acknowledged as being in the field of mathematics and therefore by default in numeracy, in that they have formal academic qualifications in mathematics and taught exclusively in this area. The only obstacle they had to overcome was being accepted as an expert in numeracy. That the programme of training had a high degree of acceptance and was seen as credible meant that this was not a significant issue. In the primary sector there was a different perception, especially in the smaller schools. As all teachers are expected to have a high level of expertise in all curriculum areas, the designated mathematics/numeracy expert had to prove their credentials in this role of specialist. Despite having to possess a high level of expertise in all curriculum areas, there was another factor that had to be overcome, and something that was unexpected. A number of teachers professed themselves to “be hopeless at mathematics”. This made the job of the lead teacher more difficult as they not only had to train the teachers in the strategies of enhancing numeracy in the school; they also had to teach basic mathematics skills. As an aside, it is interesting to note that no teacher admitted that they were hopeless in the literacy based subjects, yet in some cases there was almost pride in that they were not well skilled in mathematics. The lead teachers felt that as all teachers had to be involved their job was made harder than they expected, given the above.

However, despite this, all the primary teachers talked to felt that the in-school training of lead teachers by an acknowledged expert was a very good move and it was accepted that the lead teacher was an expert in this field. Whilst there had been an initial reluctance to accept the programme, once it was seen to be valuable it was accepted as very successful and the way to train further curriculum experts.

This view was uniform across the two sectors and was supported by the ex- teacher who had become a consultant who was beginning to use the same approach in his own business.

Whilst the intent in using school based experts had been the same over recent years, the second approach was accepted for one significant reason. The new lead teachers had the same prejudices to overcome, in that they were familiar and that their personal and professional behaviour was well known. The significant difference was in that their gaining of expertise was visible, understood and supported. Teachers were in at all levels of the gaining of the expertise and that the facilitator was also visible in giving the lead teachers support. There could be no questions on how they gained the expertise or on the validity on the grounds on which they claimed expert status. Whilst these may not be valid reasons for accepting expert status, the simple fact that teachers are human and want verification of positions made the second approach to gaining expert status much more acceptable.

IMPLICATIONS

The implications in regard to the schools in the Dannevirke district are remarkably clear; one has to look carefully into how a provider of professional development gains expert status. It is also important that one understands the implications of teacher perception in regards the provider of educational services. This study did not look into the impact that size of the community in which the schools are located; it simply looked at the teacher and their role within the school. However, in a small community it is very difficult to separate professional and personal lives and there is often a very close relationship between the two. Unlike a larger area where the teacher often only has

contact with the school and its community during working hours and can maintain two separate lives, this is often impossible in a small town or district and this can have a real impact on the perceptions held of teachers by both members of the profession and others alike. In this study, that each of the teachers maintained a permanent home in the town also impacted on the perceptions held about them; they did not leave when they left the school, they still maintained a presence even if it was not a professional one.

However, there are significant implications that have emerged from this study, no matter how unscientific it has been. These are:

- i. Teacher perceptions, be they valid or not, play a significant role in the acceptance of a provider of professional development. If a person is not accepted, no matter how good they may or may not be, for what ever reason it will be difficult for them to succeed.
- ii. The changing nature of professional development over recent years means that those seeking professional development and those providing it need to look at appropriate approaches and methods of delivery
- iii. It has to be accepted that factors outside of education may well play an significant part in the success of any professional development that is offered in a school
- iv. Expertise is something that has relative value placed upon it. It can not be taken for granted that a person who is accepted as having expertise by one part of the profession will be automatically granted the same status in another.

These findings can probably be applied to other schools. I am sure that these experiences are not unique. The findings were not entirely unexpected, as simple observation had thrown up some interesting patterns. However, a systematic investigation did prove to a certain degree that what had been simple observation did actually exist. It is important, therefore, that providers of professional development are aware of such perceptions and what could possibly be called prejudices. Whilst some of these things may not be valid, the fact that those involved are human means that they are real. Just as the Education Review Office does not allow its officers to review schools in which they have previously taught, maybe education service providers may well have to look at the reception that their advisors will receive in schools where they have been teachers in the past. Conversely, schools may also have to be careful when using previous teachers as facilitators, as factors outside of professionalism may well have unforeseen outcomes.

However, it can also be seen that teachers within schools can be very effective providers of professional development and training. The key to such success is that all involved are aware of the role that each individual plays and how this role is determined and supported. If the teacher has credibility and recognised expertise, they will succeed in what they attempt.

CONCLUSION

There is nothing particularly surprising in the conclusion. The expectation was that there would be a certain degree of reluctance to accept those who had moved from the school to become to return as advisors. There had been a reluctance to accept their status whilst they were at the school and to see a change simply because they had moved setting was not something that most would accept. That they had not been accepted as experts whilst at the school was more surprising, as one may well have expected that as professionals teachers would have accepted those who had an interest and a high level of expertise in a particular field and embraced what they had on offer. However, as one respondent said, they were a “prophet in their own land” and this is probably the most succinct summary I came across. That they were able to gain a higher level of acceptance as experts was the result of a changing environment, professional growth in both camps and outside acceptance flowing though.

That those being trained within the school in an ordered and highly structured way were accepted with ease is simply a function of understanding. Whilst the expectations were that this would take time, that the process of acceptance was much shorter than envisaged can be put down to good preparation from the facilitator and a strong practice of support during the programme. The lead teachers became disciples and spread the word, something that has worked in successfully other settings.

This study, whilst confirming what had been assumed in some quarters also threw out a “curve ball” in that it also gave an indication that the concept that the school had adopted for the professional development of teacher could be successful. Notwithstanding the perceptions and prejudices of teachers, change can occur and if well managed can be very successful. In a metaphorical sense, if the ground is fertile, well prepared and the seeds are carefully tended, something spectacular can grow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report could not have been prepared without the co-operation of a large number of people, all of whom were willing to give of their time and be open and honest with their answers.

In particular I would like to acknowledge the contributions made by the following individuals and groups.

The Managing Director of UCANDO

The Director of Curriculum, Scots College, Wellington

The Literacy Advisor, Massey University College of Education

Mr Allan Carr, Academic Dean, Dannevirke High School

The Senior Leadership Team, Dannevirke High School

The Managing Director of Advisors Plus

The teaching staff of Dannevirke High School

The Principals and teachers of the Primary schools of the Northern Taranaki district

Members of the Dannevirke JSIF Committee

APPENDIX 1.

Profiles of those providers who have been a part of the Northern Taranaki education system and who are now in other educational situations.

1. Interviewee one was a teacher at Dannevirke High School for many years, beginning his teaching career at the school. He had progressed through the educational promotional ladder and was appointed to the position of Assistant Principal with responsibility for Quality Control and alternative teaching programmes.

As a personal sideline he had purchased a franchise for “Accelerated Learning” and taught aspects of the programme in the school at Year 9 and Year 13. However, with increasing demands on the curriculum combined with a need to reduce staff, this formal aspect of the curriculum was dropped in 1999 and the programme became a series of workshops rather than a regular timetabled spot.

He also worked in a range of other schools in the weekends as an educational motivator using accelerated learning the basis of his programme. He had been used as a motivator for staff, both teaching and non-teaching, in teacher only day workshops over a number of years in an attempt to broaden the educational horizons of staff and to attempt to give them tools to understand learning styles and to develop alternative pedagogical strategies. This met with limited success, from his perspective.

Following a period of illness and a desire to broaden his personal horizons he left teaching in 2004 and set up his own consulting business, based on the principles of Accelerated Learning. He is now in high demand throughout the country and is used by Dannevirke High School in the role of a “visiting expert”. He has also developed an extended structure in which he trains personnel within the school to deliver aspects of his programme, supplemented by his own personal input on a regular basis.

He is able to provide a perspective from that of being a teacher who has developed specific skills, has moved on and is now a part of the corporate world relying on market forces for his success rather than being a part of the wider educational system.

2. Interviewee two was also a teacher at Dannevirke High School. He had been appointed to a position of Head of Department in a core curriculum area in 1997, this being followed by appointment to the position of Assistant Principal with responsibility for curriculum in 1998. In this role he developed an interest in the teaching of literacy. To that end he organised a co-ordinated programme of literacy professional development for the teachers of senior classes in the local primary schools and those teaching junior classes in the secondary school, in 2001. This was the first programme of its kind in the district and began a period of co-operation amongst the schools that had previously been thought to be impossible. This programme was supported by the Massey University College of Education and in particular Russell Aitken, a recognised advisor in literacy education. This programme was recognised as being at the leading edge of professional development in 2001 and was valued by all who took part.

In 2004 he left Dannevirke High School and joined the MUCE Centre for Educational Development as a Literacy Advisor. As a part of this role, he developed, in conjunction with Russell Aitken, a programme of professional development for teachers to assist students in the transition to high school from Year 8. This was seen as important as all the primary schools contributing to secondary education in the district were full primaries, not contributing, and for all students it was their first change in school sector. This programme of professional

development was based on the development of literacy education and involved all teachers working together to develop a set of common understandings, and appreciation of the skills and procedures use in the two sectors and the construction of a common curriculum. There was also a greater coordination and sharing of diagnostic data to enable students to be tracked more successfully and to enable greater differentiation of curriculum at the secondary level to cater for educational needs of students.

This programme formed the basis for a major programme of professional development funded through the JSIF programme that has operated since 2005 and has included all schools in the district.

His perspective is from that of being an “inside expert” who has developed a programme and who has continued in a similar role, but in a different educational context, contributing to a vast number of schools rather than local schools where he is known in a different manner.

3. Interviewee three was also employed at Dannevirke High School as a Head of Department in a core curriculum area. He was a highly regarded teacher of a senior subject and he enjoyed a very high level of success in his curriculum area through his innovative teaching programmes and his belief that all students can enjoy success if taught appropriately. His success in external examinations was amongst the highest in the school, and when combined with his teaching style and engaging personality saw his subject become the most popular option in the senior school. However, whilst enjoying a very high profile in his curriculum area and being a very competent teacher, he also has advanced qualifications, PhD level, in cognitive processes. As a part of his career he had been a consultant to industry in Australia, teaching learning skills to a range of personnel to improve their working effectiveness. This included Ford Australia and the Australian Armed Forces.

As a part of his responsibilities within Dannevirke High School he was also charged with developing a programme to enhance the pedagogical strategies of the teaching staff to broaden their “tool kit”. This was a supplement to the programme that interviewee one had introduced. This was attempted in an educational environment that was challenging, during the time of the introduction of NCEA and the hostile industrial environment of the early years of the new millennium. When combined with the natural conservative nature of the teachers in a small rural school he found this a challenging task and was frustrated by the lack of steady progress that he was making. However, despite his own perception that he was not making headway he was employed by MUCE as an advisor to run courses in this area for teachers from throughout the Central Districts region, an indication that his skills were acknowledged and appreciated in the wider educational community.

In 2004 he left Dannevirke High School and was appointed to the position of Director of Curriculum at an independent boys’ school in a large New Zealand city. This, too, was a conservative and traditional school, but was being led by a very innovative Principal who recognised the need to move forward and was prepared to create a role in the school and allocate resources to this end. In this role he was charged with introducing new pedagogical strategies for meeting the demands of the new curriculum and appraisal systems to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies.

For the purpose of the project he is able to provide a perspective from that of being an insider in a school where his talents and skills were not initially recognised or accepted as his appointment was in a different area to that position where he was appointed as an inside expert, rather than as a skilled teacher, and was expected to deliver certain outcomes.

APPENDIX 2

A summary of the profiles of those teachers interviewed at the greatest length, having experienced professional development with all or some of those in appendix 1, over recent years.

1. A senior administrator at Dannevirke High School who has worked with all three of the inside providers and two of those who have been used by the school and JSIF cluster over the last two years. This teacher has an academic background in areas outside of the providers and contributes from the perspective of comparing effectiveness of the delivery and changes with the different status.
2. A senior teacher at Dannevirke High School who has had experience working under interviewee two and has subsequently taken his previous position. This teacher has a real interest in the teaching of Literacy and has assumed responsibility for the programme within the school. He is currently acting as an Assistant Principal with responsibility for academic matters. He provides a personal and professional perspective on the changes he has observed with the different status of two of the providers.
3. A recently appointed Head of Department at Dannevirke High School, who worked with all three providers whilst at school and subsequently within the JSIF programme. She is also working with the trainer in appendix 3 and is able to provide a perspective of the effectiveness of two different professional development models.
4. An Assistant Principal at Dannevirke High School who has worked as an assistant teacher, Head of Department under interviewee three and now has responsibility for curriculum delivery within the school. She is also a consultant for Massey University and brings a perspective of having worked with the providers and how this relates to being a provider in her own right.
5. Two Principals of primary schools that contribute students to Dannevirke High School. Both have been Principals in the district for at least ten years and both took part in the original professional development programme in 2001 and are integrally involved in the current work being undertaken under the JSIF programme.
6. Three teachers in contributing primary schools. These teachers took part in the original professional programme in 2001 and are involved in the current JSIF programme. Their experience ranges from 8 to 21 years.
7. A teacher in the school where interviewee two currently works. He taught at Dannevirke High School in the late 1990s, but did not work with interviewee two. However, he understands the educational culture of Dannevirke High School and was able to provide a perspective of the acceptance of the teachers of the two schools.
8. A range of other teachers and Principals, who were contacted informally to provide supporting information.

APPENDIX 3

A summary of the profiles of those involved with the JSIF programme in which “in-school experts” are trained and supported by the outside provider.

1. This person was contracted by the JSIF Committee to provide professional development in the field of numeracy across the whole school sector. This was to supplement the NUMP programme that the primary schools had all been involved with and to introduce new numeracy strategies to teachers of Mathematics up to Year 11 at Dannevirke High School. She is an acknowledged expert in this field and runs her own private company to deliver professional development. That she and her company are fully booked for the next eighteen months is testament to the success she enjoys and the confidence that schools and teachers have in her.

She has introduced the concept of providing basic support to schools but training personnel within individual schools to maintain the programme and upskill other teachers. This is a similar concept to interviewee one in appendix 1 but was not introduced to the district by him.

2. The Head of Department as in profile 3, appendix 2. She is being trained as an in-school trainer by the above provider.
3. An assistant teacher in the Mathematics department at Dannevirke High School who is currently working as a trainer within the school under the tutelage of the main provider.
4. Two assistant teachers in the Mathematics Department of Dannevirke High School who are working with the two who are being trained as in-school experts. This is to establish a perspective of the success of the concept from those being trained.
5. Two teachers from the primary schools who have been trained as in-school experts and are delivering programmes to their teachers.

APPENDIX 4

There are several sets of questions for the various participants. However, those who were being interviewed in more than one role were asked all relevant questions.

Set 1.

Questions for those who have been teachers at Dannevirke High School and have moved to other positions.

1. As an inside provider:
 - How do you rate ability/expertise as a designated expert and in-school provider of professional development?
 - How do you rate your acceptance as a provider of professional development within the school and why?
 - How do you rate your effectiveness as a change agent through your professional development, and on what do you base this rating?
 - What, if any, roadblocks did you encounter when providing professional development to the staff and how did you overcome them?

2. As an external provider: These questions were asked of those who are no longer teaching.
 - How do you rate your level of expertise in your field and how does this compare with when you were a teacher?
 - What are the significant differences?
 - How do you rate your acceptance as a deliverer of professional development in the district by:
 - a. those with whom you worked prior to taking up your current job
 - b. those with whom you have not worked with as a teaching colleague
 - Explain any differences, from your perspective, in how people react to you and accept your programmes when compared with your experiences as a teacher.
 - Any other comments that you would like to make in regards to being a provider of professional development to teachers in the Tararua district and other areas.

3. To the provider who has moved to another school but remained as a teacher: in lieu of the second set of questions.
 - What differences do you note between Dannevirke High School and your present school in terms of:
 - a. How is the teaching staff different in its reception of professional development?
 - b. What do you think is the difference in acceptance of what you are trying to do in regards to professional development?
 - c. What differences do you see in your role between the two schools, given you are essentially doing the same job?

Set 2.

Questions for those who worked with the three in school providers of professional development.

1. How did you rate each of the three as professional development providers when they were teachers at Dannevirke High School? Please consider:
 - Did you acknowledge their expert status? Why/why not?
 - Did you feel there was any conflict between the roles of teacher and professional development provider? If so please explain.
 - Why do you think that MUCE used them as professional development advisors?
2. Now they have moved on what changes have you noticed in their delivery of professional development?
 - Why do you think that?
 - Do you feel you react differently to them in their new positions?
 - How do you compare these people with other providers of professional development, who are also acknowledged as “experts”?
 - What aspects of their work have changed since they have assumed their new role?
3. Comments or other points you wish to make.

Set 3.

Questions for the outside provider who is training “in-school experts”

1. Why do you use the in-school training approach as the basis of your professional development?
2. How successful do you feel it has been in the Northern Taranaki schools?
 - What are its strengths?
 - What are its weaknesses?
 - What changes would you make given your local experiences?
3. Are there any differences in the acceptance of your ideas in other areas you have used it?
4. Any further comments or points you wish to make.

Set 4.

Questions for those who are working with the in-school trainer.

1. What are the strengths/weaknesses of this approach to professional development from your perspective?
2. What do you like/dislike about this approach?

Those being Trained

- How did you get selected?
- How did you sell the concept to

Those receiving in-school professional development

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach being used for numeracy training?
- What are your preferences for in-school

members of your department and who were going to receive professional development from you?

- What roadblocks have you encountered in using this approach?
- How do you think the receiving teachers have reacted to the approach?
- Has this approach been successful as a means of introducing professional development?
- How has this approach changed your planning, teaching and general delivery of the curriculum?

professional development?

- What would you change if given the opportunity?
- How has this approach changed your planning, teaching and general delivery of the curriculum?