

The nature of evidence in education: Intelligent rather than correct

Dr Judie Alison (jalison@ppta.org.nz), Bronwyn Cross (bcross@ppta.org.nz), Lynette O'Brien (lobrien@ppta.org.nz) and Rob Willetts (rwilletts@ppta.org.nz), NZ Post Primary Teachers' Association

Abstract

“The idea is that of an educational science in which each classroom is a laboratory, each teacher a member of the scientific community... The crucial point is that the proposal is not to be regarded as an unqualified recommendation but rather as a provisional specification claiming no more than to be worth putting to the test of practice. Such proposals claim to be intelligent rather than correct.” (Stenhouse)

In the devolved schooling system that operates in New Zealand in which each of the 2400 schools has its own employing board of trustees, it can be difficult to assert any central direction or authority. One of the ways the New Zealand Ministry of Education endeavours to “steer” the system is by way of “evidence-based” research. This can be problematic firstly because the Ministry has significant sway over the nature of research as a monopoly purchaser and secondly, because it is fundamentally a political organisation directly accountable to the Minister of Education. For example, the Ministry is charged with monitoring teacher vacancies to enable effective planning for teacher supply but this research can be compromised by its responsibility to its political masters who would prefer to see teacher shortages downplayed.

As unionists working for the Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA), the union that covers secondary teachers, we sometimes find ourselves in dispute about the approach taken to research by the Ministry and the conclusions it draws. As well as publicly questioning Ministry research, PPTA also attempts to provide a counter-balance by either undertaking research itself or commissioning its own research.

This presentation explores the issue of integrity in respect of educational research and goes on to consider a specific piece of PPTA research into school climate which seeks to identify which New Zealand schools are the best places to work. In a system where boards have hiring and firing powers, and teachers are able to apply for positions at the school of their choice, the results are likely to give a new twist to the notion of league tables.

Introduction

One of the current buzz phrases in government circles these days in New Zealand is ‘evidence-based decision-making’. In education, this is presented as meaning that educational research is to be used to inform the development of policy and practice. On the surface, this would seem a highly rational position and one that a teachers’ union might well support, however the reality is a lot different. Some of the questions that we believe need asking are: What counts as evidence? How is that

evidence arrived at? Who decides what evidence is gathered? Who funds the gathering of the evidence? How is that evidence used in policy development?

In our view, 'evidence-based decision-making' in education is strongly ideologically-based, and for that reason teachers and their unions should adopt a healthy scepticism about it, while accepting that much of the 'evidence' is in fact very useful and in no way rejecting the value, per se, of high quality educational research.

When the government is the monopoly purchaser of educational research, the danger is even greater. O'Neill (2004) argues:

The Ministry of Education is a monopoly commissioner of educational research, thus to a great extent it alone decides what research will be conducted, how, and for how long. Well-regarded and credible educational field research is expensive: it takes place over several years, used multiple methods, gathers baseline data, includes control groups, monitors educational change over time, including the period following the withdrawal of research funding, and is undertaken by people who have no vested interest in the results. As far as I am aware, no current educational research projects in New Zealand meet these criteria.¹

This paper begins by describing the ideological framework within which 'evidence-based decision-making' sits in New Zealand politics. It then sets out some of the risks that our union sees in the current policy discourse about 'evidence-based decision-making'. We provide some examples of the effects of the discourse. We then go on to discuss the strategies that we have put in place to ameliorate the worst effects of this policy emphasis, and report in detail on one particular union research project.

The ideological framework

Neo-liberal discourses continue to prevail in New Zealand politics, despite electoral changes over the last two decades from Labour to National to Labour and back to National governments. The underlying concepts of neo-liberalism, such as those associated with managerialism and public choice theory, are still dear to many people in positions of power in New Zealand.

Managerialism has been described as a 'tight, loose, tight' approach to system-level management: the first 'tight' is the government setting expectations for outcomes, e.g. that schools will show that they are delivering improved student achievement especially for the group deemed to be under-performing; the 'loose' is devolution, e.g. that it is up to schools to find ways to deliver that improved student achievement; the second 'tight' is that the government demands accountability for delivering on the expectations, e.g. that schools must perform or suffer consequences such as a negative Education Review Office report. New Zealand's highly devolved schooling system in which every school has its own employing board of trustees, loosely termed 'Tomorrow's Schools' after an initial report that set it in motion, is a classic example of managerialism in practice.

In New Zealand education policy there is a prevailing discourse that quality teaching is the major determinant of student achievement. This can be seen as fitting within a managerialist discourse in its tendency to individualise the responsibility to the

¹ O'Neill, J. (2004) *Airbrushing educational research for other agendas*, retrieved from <http://www.teacherswork.ac.nz/documents/qpecagm2004.doc>

teacher and then seek to make that teacher individually accountable, in a complex system of surveillance, for the achievement of their students. This has been termed 'the politics of blame' (Thrupp, 2009). If government policy focuses exclusively on the individual teacher in their individual classroom without also addressing the context surrounding that teacher in terms of social, micro-political and economic factors, it risks finding only partial solutions to the challenge of improving student achievement. On the other hand, finding solutions may not be a government's primary goal:

The politics of blame are useful to governments because they can seem to be doing something about the problem of underachievement without having to tackle more fundamental and difficult issues to do with poverty and inequality. Teachers on the other hand become scapegoats for problems beyond their school.²

A further example of neo-liberal discourses in education is the emphasis on education as a tool for delivering a strong economy. This is something which has been much more in evidence over the last three decades throughout the developing world, as neo-liberal ideas have taken root in education. (A connection which Alison Wolf challenges.³) This emphasis can lead to an excessively functional approach to education, and also means that when the economy is not strong (e.g. currently as we feel the impacts of the global financial crisis) teachers and schools become the first target to blame for youth unemployment. Again, the individual teacher, or at best the school, is portrayed as failing to engage their students sufficiently to keep them at school long enough to optimise their life chances, and failing to enable their students to succeed in the world after school.

The risks in 'evidence-based decision-making'

The political focus in New Zealand on evidence-based decision-making within a discourse of 'quality teaching' that frequently becomes the 'politics of blame', combined with a situation where the government is the monopoly purchaser of educational research, has the following effects on the research environment:

- It devalues the role of teachers' professional judgment, and means that teachers are pressured to base their decisions on what can be measured, on explicit rather than tacit knowledge, leaving them feeling insecure and under surveillance
- The emphasis goes onto finding out 'what works?', which can result in simplistic 'solutions' to complex issues
- Quantitative data is privileged over qualitative data, and desperate attempts are sometimes made to produce quantitative data to support largely qualitative research findings
- Government agendas dominate in decisions about what research is commissioned
- Research 'evidence' becomes a political weapon in the hands of politicians and media, who are likely to grossly over-simplify results for their own ends and to trumpet research that 'proves' their prejudices and ignore research which doesn't
- The urge to produce 'evidence' can subtly influence how researchers 'read' their own results and shape their conclusions
- Even those researchers who have independent funding sources will, when deciding what to research, have one eye on what kind of research is likely to

² Thrupp, M. (2009) Tunnel vision. *NZ Education Review*, 14:31, August 14 2009, p.8.

³ Wolf, A. (2002) *Does Education Matter? Myths about Education and Economic Growth*. London: Penguin.

contribute to a CV that enables them to pick up lucrative government contracts in future

In the next section, we discuss four examples of how this can play out in the research environment, and the risks to research quality, integrity and ethics that can result.

Examples of the risks

Example 1 - TLRI

The New Zealand Ministry of Education funds the significant majority of the educational research done, either through directly commissioning research or through the Teaching and Learning Research Fund (TLRI), a fund of some \$2m annually which is held 'at arm's length' by being allocated by the New Zealand Council of Educational Research but within parameters determined by government. (The vulnerability of the Fund to political swings is demonstrated in the fact that the Fund's website currently says: "The Ministry of Education has advised that the amount of funding available for the TLRI will be 5% lower in 2009-2010 (\$1.9m) and 12.5% lower in 2010-2011 (\$1.75m) reflecting reprioritization of research funding."⁴)

The principles set require that proposed projects "... must align with current and future priorities for teaching and learning within and across the early childhood, school, and tertiary sectors. Of special interest is a focus on deepening our understanding about how we might address current inequities in educational outcomes and on creating the teaching and learning processes that will support success for all types of learners in the 21st century."⁵ The emphasis here is clearly within the 'quality teaching' discourse discussed above, and while there is considerable value in quality research that interrogates teaching and learning processes, the emphasis smacks of ideology if it is pursued to the extent that the contribution of other factors to student achievement, e.g. school mix, socio-economic status, parental attitudes and so on are ignored. (Whether this is happening or not is a matter for debate.)

The fact that the New Zealand government has been brave enough to devolve some funding into a relatively independent fund is to be applauded. However, the independence of the fund is debatable. The Advisory Board consists of a representative from each of: Ministry of Education, NZ Teachers Council and Education Review Office, plus representatives of 3 universities. Its role is to:

- be the strategic leader of the Initiative, creating a vision and strategies to achieve the desired outcomes
- set priorities and criteria for research programme funding and recommend these to the Minister
- ratify the process for deciding on the research programme to be funded
- recommend to the Minister the research proposals to be funded
- advise and liaise with the programme co-ordination function in the implementation of the Initiative
- recommend associated activities to enhance the research capability and the professional linkages between researchers and practitioners
- provide advice on how to achieve and facilitate the impact of the research programme in their own sector networks
- review the outcomes of the Initiative at appropriate milestones and adjust the strategic management of the initiative when required.⁶

⁴ <http://www.tlri.org.nz/>, accessed 18/8/09

⁵ <http://www.tlri.org.nz/tlri-principles/>, accessed 17/8/09.

⁶ <http://www.tlri.org.nz/management/>, accessed 18/8/09

The fact that it can only “recommend to the Minister the research proposals to be funded” rather than make the final decisions is a concern. Furthermore, while some very useful work has been done through TLRI funding, the kind of projects that can be funded is strictly limited to projects that fall within the ‘quality teaching’ discourse, and research that challenges the policy context within which teaching occurs is strictly off-limits.

Example 2 – Te Kotahitanga

This research and professional development project has attracted considerable academic interest and media attention in New Zealand and overseas, and has resulted in a wide range of publications.⁷ It is a programme of ongoing in-school professional development for secondary school teachers to assist them to treat their students as ‘culturally located’ individuals. The programme encourages teachers to adopt particular pedagogical approaches that are claimed to help Maori students, and incidentally many other students, to learn more successfully. The professional development is based on research by Professor Russell Bishop of Waikato University, and continues to be under his overall guidance. It has received considerable funding from government over a number of years, even though until recently there was no independent evaluation of the project, only the monitoring done by Bishop’s own team to meet milestones and justify continued funding.

The professional development has a number of elements that PPTA would endorse for any such programme: it is ongoing, intensive, tests and challenges teachers’ underlying theories, involves a cycle of classroom observation and feedback, and fosters collaborative problem-solving among teachers. It is also reasonably well-resourced in terms of teacher time, at least in its initial years in a school.

On the other hand, the ‘truth claims’ for the research are highly debatable. To justify ongoing funding, the Ministry of Education demands that the programme provide evidence of improved student outcomes that can be linked to the professional development delivered. This is very hard to provide, because the particular schools selected for Te Kotahitanga, i.e. low decile schools with high Maori populations, are invariably schools involved in other initiatives as well, e.g. literacy and numeracy professional development, student engagement initiatives, truancy initiatives, etc. Furthermore, not all teachers in any given school are participants in the professional development, so students will be taught by anything from one to six teacher participants across a diverse range of subjects, which is likely to influence the amount of effect the programme has on their learning. This means that the quantitative measures used, e.g. attendance data, achievement against standardised tests of literacy or numeracy, etc are of dubious value in ‘proving’ the efficacy of the programme. There has been qualitative data provided that tends to suggest that the programme benefits teachers and students, or at least that they perceive it to do so. It is evident, however, that government has demanded quantitative data ‘proving’ improvements to student achievement to supplement this qualitative data in order to justify funding on this scale, and quantitative data has indeed been delivered by the project. The fact that the quantitative data proves little, however, does not seem to matter.

⁷ E.g. Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S. & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga: the experiences of Year 9 and 10 Maori students in mainstream classrooms. Report to the Ministry of Education.* Rangahau Matauranga Maori: Maori Education Research. Wellington: Ministry of Education; Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Powell, A., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kotahitanga Phase 2 – Towards a whole school approach.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Furthermore, the Ministry of Education has this year contradicted its own position on 'evidence-based decision-making', in that it has budgeted for a professional development programme for principals that is supposedly 'based on Te Kotahitanga' and seeks to achieve the same outcomes, but bears very little resemblance to the original programme. There is no evidence that fidelity to the original programme will be a feature of this new initiative, and therefore no way of knowing whether it will have any positive impacts for Maori students in the schools whose principals participate.

Example 3 – *Picking up the Pace and Shifting the Focus*

The political climate can influence the way that researchers 'read' the evidence in their conclusions. Some research in South Auckland primary schools by Helen Timperley and Stuart McNaughton of Auckland University, *Picking up the Pace*⁸ and *Shifting the Focus*⁹, was roundly criticised by a group of academics from Massey University as making claims that the evidence did not support. To what extent this happens because the researchers themselves misguidedly believe their own conclusions, or because they are aware that these are the findings the government wants, is no doubt infinitely variable.

Certainly, the Minister of Education at the time, Hon. Trevor Mallard, leapt on the Timperley and McNaughton findings with inordinate enthusiasm and continued to quote its disputed 'findings' for at least two years. This was no doubt because the research claimed that teachers in low-decile schools could, with professional development that inculcated the right pedagogies and attitudes, enable their students to achieve at the level of the average child, 'proving' that 'quality teachers' are far more important than socio-economic background of students. The Minister was absolutely resistant to the idea that the critique of the research, which pointed out some really obvious and serious flaws, had any basis. Ministers, of course, are advised by their officials, so one might conclude that the officials gave no credence to the critique either.

It is of concern that there are researchers in New Zealand who firmly believe that they have failed to pick up research work from government sources because previous research has published findings which are not palatable to government. Some researchers have had to fight for their academic integrity when government contracts have produced findings inconvenient to the government of the day. There have been claims that this has happened under governments of both political complexions.

As Thrupp describes it:

While researchers who over emphasise the power of teaching probably often mean well, there are also opportunistic reasons for researchers to stress the power of teaching. New Zealand does not have much education research funding apart from that provided by the Ministry of Education and with the ministry as keen on quality teaching as it has been for the last decade, to emphasise this in research or professional development projects is to be 'on-message'. There are research contracts to be won, personal and institutional statuses to be improved,

⁸ Phillips, Gwenneth, Stuart McNaughton & Shelley MacDonald, (2002). *Picking up the Pace : effective literacy interventions for accelerated progress over the transition into decile 1 schools*. Auckland: the Child Literacy Foundation and Woolf Fisher Research Centre.

⁹ <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/assessment/5747>, accessed 17/8/09

salaries to be increased and political and professional influence to be gained.¹⁰

Example 4 – Best Evidence Synthesis on Community and Family Influences

The New Zealand government has been funding since 2003 an extensive programme of research to identify the ‘best evidence’ of what delivers improved outcomes for students, especially for those students currently under-achieving¹¹. This programme fits firmly within the ‘evidence-based decision-making’ discourse, and is in the same academic stable as the projects that emerge from the EPPI Centre in the UK. To the New Zealand programme’s credit, it is less restrictive about the kind of research it will deem to provide ‘best evidence’, allowing for well-founded qualitative research data to be included. Research projects have looked at teaching in general, at family and community influences, at two particular curriculum areas (Social Sciences and Mathematics), at teacher professional learning and at educational leadership. Sadly, the findings of these projects do not necessarily translate into improved government policies. The BES on teacher professional learning¹², which provided the ‘evidence’ to justify ongoing, intensive, well-resourced in-school professional development, has been largely ignored. It seems that when governments don’t want to spend the money, it doesn’t matter how good the ‘evidence’ to justify spending it is, even when it is the government’s own ‘evidence’.

Furthermore, the BES programme provides a good example of how research that does not connect with politicians’ or policymakers’ prejudices tends to be ignored by them. In 2003, when the first two Best Evidence Synthesis reports were published, Alton-Lee’s *Quality Teaching for Diverse Students*¹³ and Biddulph, Biddulph & Biddulph’s *The complexity of community and family influences on children’s achievement in New Zealand*¹⁴, it was very difficult to get the Minister or government officials to give equal focus to the latter synthesis. This appeared to be because the first synthesis supported the concept that changing individual teacher behaviour improved outcomes for students, whereas the second one attributed part of the blame for student outcomes on issues beyond the classroom. In reality, the solutions to improved student outcomes must lie in the areas covered by both syntheses, and in other areas as well such as the quality of school leadership and the quality of ongoing professional learning, both the subjects of later best evidence syntheses.

Part of the problem here is that politicians grasp at simple explanations because they produce better sound bites. We in the profession know that education is an intensely complex matter and there are no simple answers; this is not a message which modern day politicians want to hear. A second part of the problem is that politicians may not even be aware of the ideological basis of some policy ideas, so that they sometimes appear thoroughly schizophrenic, supporting quite contradictory policies.

A union response

PPTA responds to the research and policy context we find ourselves in by undertaking or commissioning our own research projects. We would have to

¹⁰ Thrupp, M. (2009) op cit.

¹¹ <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515>, accessed 17/8/09

¹² <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515/15341>, accessed 17/8/09

¹³ <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515/5959>, accessed 17/8/09

¹⁴ <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515/5947>, accessed 17/8/09

concede that in doing so, we are seeking to serve our own political agenda, and no doubt there is a consistent social democratic discourse underpinning the union's research in the same way that there is a consistent neo-liberal discourse underpinning the government's research. At least this provides a counter-balance.

Examples that show the range of research projects undertaken or commissioned by PPTA over the last two decades, most of which is also published in the union's name, include:

- A longitudinal study of worker democracy in schools, the Shared Decision-Making Project.¹⁵
- An evaluation of school qualifications initiatives, including a survey of teacher attitudes, that was highly influential in the development of the current qualification, the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA).¹⁶
- Focus group research with teachers about their first three years' experience with the new qualification, the NCEA.¹⁷
- A literature review on professional standards, jointly commissioned by the two New Zealand teacher unions to inform the debate around the type of standards that should be developed for graduating teachers and teacher registration.¹⁸
- Survey and focus group research on issues in the teaching of Technology.¹⁹
- An independent evaluation of the Te Kotahitanga project (see above).²⁰
- A literature review on student behaviour management.²¹
- Focus group research on parents' perspectives of secondary schools and secondary teaching.²²

It can be seen from this list that the union's research interests are very wide-ranging, covering a full spectrum of professional and industrial matters, and the decision to undertake or commission research is often an important strategic move in response to particular pressures at the time. As an example, the evaluation of Te Kotahitanga was commissioned because of an increasing number of inquiries/complaints that the union had been receiving from members in schools in, or considering entering, the programme. These tended to centre around a feeling of being forced by school leadership to participate. As a second example, the focus group research on the first three years of NCEA arose out of a perception that political controversy about it was looming and that the union needed to be equipped with detailed information about where its members stood; this perception proved well-founded and when the media storm arrived, the union was in the ideal position of knowing more about teachers' and schools' experiences of the qualification than any other player.

While not denying that, as with all other research, union decisions about what research is undertaken are made in an ideological context, we do seek to behave

¹⁵ E.g. Capper, P. (1994) *Participation and Partnership: Exploring shared decision-making in twelve New Zealand secondary schools*, Wellington: NZPPTA.

¹⁶ Allen, P., Crooks, T., Hearn, S. & Irwin, K. (1997) *Te Tiro Hou: Report of the Qualifications Framework Inquiry*, Wellington: NZPPTA.

¹⁷ Alison, J (2005) *Teachers talk about NCEA: Research report on focus groups with secondary teachers*, Wellington: NZPPTA

¹⁸ Thrupp, M. (2006) *Professional standards for teachers and teacher education: Avoiding the pitfalls*, Wellington: NZPPTA and NZEI

¹⁹ NZPPTA (2006) *Technology: Theory without practice?* Wellington: NZPPTA

²⁰ Openshaw, R. (2007) *Evaluation of Te Kotahitanga – Phase 3*, Wellington: NZPPTA

²¹ Towl, P. (2007) *Best practice behaviour management: A view from the literature*, Wellington: NZPPTA

²² Windshift (2007) *Parents' perspectives of secondary school teaching*, Wellington: Windshift

ethically, to produce high quality research, and to share our findings whenever possible. At the very least, we hope we are providing some balance to debate. Our website, www.ppta.org.nz, carries the reports of all published research projects done since about 2004.

From time to time we have had to make difficult decisions at the outset of a project about whether it is to result in publication or not. All of the research listed above, both commissioned and in-house, was published. It would be hard to persuade researchers to take on a commission that would never be published and which they would not be able to list in their academic CVs, so having once commissioned research as for publication, as long as it meets quality standards, even if the results don't necessarily suit our agenda totally, it will be published.

Research that is solely for internal use is only ever done internally by staff. Examples of this would be:

- An annual survey on recruitment and retention in secondary and area (year 0-13) schools to monitor changes in the number of applicants, suitability of applicants, subject shortage areas, positions which are unfilled or inadequately filled, losses from teaching and principals' expectations for ongoing recruitment and retention.²³
- A periodic survey of secondary teacher opinions and issues to identify changes in professional and industrial pressures on teachers, shifts in attitudes, voting patterns and union participation etc
- An annual survey of secondary teacher education institutions to monitor intakes, subject distribution, student demographic profiles
- A survey of work outside timetabled hours
- A survey of secondary schools to identify the loss rates of new teachers in their first three years
- Periodic surveys of membership attitudes to industrial action
- Surveys of the implementation of new collective agreement initiatives
- A survey of the consultation processes around proposals to change individual school operations and the impacts of the consultation on the likelihood of implementing the proposal and teacher attitudes to the change.

This research tends to focus on teacher recruitment and retention and ensuring that PPTA is up-to-date with how teachers view their work environment.

Union research example 1 – industrial climate research

Under the devolved 'Tomorrow's Schools' model of school administration in New Zealand, responsibility for hiring and firing teachers lies with the approximately 2,500 parent-led boards of trustees who run schools. National collective employment agreements set the baseline terms and conditions for teachers, but boards oversee the day to day management of the school via the principal who is the board agent. The intent of the Tomorrow's Schools reforms was to establish autonomous "self-managing schools", so regional support structures like the Department of Education were abolished and the new Ministry of Education was restricted to a policy-only role. Although this position has had to be modified over time and there has been a consistent trend to increase the capacity of the Ministry of Education to intervene in the operations of individual schools, it is still the case that local industrial matters

²³ This is necessary to balance the data the Ministry of Education collects which is inclined to understate the problem of shortages, perhaps because its political masters expect it to pre-empt possible pay claims.

remain the business of each board of trustees. Intervention, occurs relatively rarely²⁴ and only when dysfunctional management reaches a financial, educational or industrial crisis point (or more commonly all three) which threatens the sustainability of the school.

As a consequence, PPTA finds that, from time to time, it has to support members in schools where the industrial environment has become toxic. Often these incipient breakdowns can be predicted at a very early stage from a number of relatively common factors, several of which relate to the management style of the principal, especially a newly appointed principal. Representations from the staff in such schools to the Board of Trustees (the school's governors, who may have recently appointed the principal) can be dismissed initially as complaints from a disgruntled few. By the time the Board becomes convinced that there are serious concerns related to industrial management practices and felt by a wide cross-section of staff, serious damage may have been inflicted on the school.

PPTA saw the need to develop an objective tool with which to assess the industrial environment to provide a school-wide assessment of the industrial environment, both as a self-diagnostic tool for those seeking to find ways to do better than they already are, and as a mechanism to allow teachers in unsafe environments to be able to open up discussion around their working environment in a more secure manner.

Such a tool would also allow teachers considering job offers or applications to obtain an objective response to their question about what a particular school is like to **work** in, as opposed to **teach** in. We stress that this is not a survey of what the school is like to teach in. Some of the more difficult schools to teach in have strong and supportive working relationships, while some schools with relatively easy to teach students are unpleasant places to be when you step outside the classroom.

There is also a possibility that principals in schools where there is a focus on creating safe and harmonious working environments that enable teachers to focus on teaching and learning would see the tool as a means of enhancing industrial relationships.

Early this year PPTA developed a trial survey tool²⁵ which was sent to a number of volunteer schools. As a result of feedback from that trial the survey was modified and the revised version is now available for use. It is composed of 92 questions of which all but four can be responded to on a simple point scale. The other four questions each ask for three terms to describe and summarise broad aspects of the industrial environment, with common examples provided from the trial. Overall, the survey gives a picture of the school culture built up through a range of questions designed to shed light on the management style, including whether the terms and conditions in the applicable collective agreement are met, the emotional environment, and the physical conditions. There are two separate questions for teachers in integrated (special character) schools.

²⁴ "Since the implementation of legislation on statutory interventions in October 2001, 392 interventions have been initiated in schools. Ninety-eight of these statutory interventions were current at the end of 2008." *New Zealand Schools: Ngā Kura o Aotearoa (2008)* Report of the Minister of Education on the compulsory schools sector in New Zealand. Ministry of Education September 2009 Retrieved from <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2523/57149/6>

²⁵ NZPPTA (2009) *Industrial Climate - Teachers' Survey* (Attached as Appendix A)

The questionnaires are designed to be completed anonymously.

A spreadsheet is provided with the questionnaire to allow direct entry of data at the school level as an alternative to sending the completed surveys to PPTA national office for entry and analysis. It automatically highlights areas where the averaged score falls below a satisfactory level, or where more than 30% of responses are negative. It generates summaries which allow analysis of school performance across individual questions and over broader areas such as relationships, information flow, professional autonomy, adherence to collective employment provisions. These summaries and identified areas for review can be transferred directly into a report to the principal/staff/board of trustees.

At a national level, data collected by each school can be accumulated to:

- identify best-practice schools which can act as models for other schools,
- provide a measure against which prospective employees can assess alternative job offers,
- monitor changes in the industrial environment in schools,
- more formally identify the precursors of dysfunctional relationships to provide early warning to boards and teachers.

The finalised survey tool has been trialled in one school so far. Relationships in this school had become severely strained after the appointment of a new and inexperienced principal. The school was showing signs of an incipient stand-off between the board, the teachers and the principal, a situation that is not uncommon under Tomorrow's Schools and has resulted in a number of landmark legal cases since 1989.²⁶ If the relationship between the principal and the teaching staff in a school breaks down, the board is in the invidious situation of having to manage conflicting responsibilities to the principal they have often just appointed, to the teachers whom they employ, and to the community who do not want to see their children's education derailed by internecine warfare. As the majority of board members are parental volunteers this can be a very challenging situation, particularly when the most expedient solution seems to be for the Minister of Education to sack the board.

The work environment analysis tool, when completed, provided evidence of a very high level of dissatisfaction in the workplace. It had been completed by 95% of teachers so the Board could not ignore the findings, which up until then it had been attempting to do. The result has been closer monitoring of the principal and greater assistance with the job. It is too early to say whether this has been sufficient to mend all fences, but a destructive public row which would have caused enrolments in the school to plummet has been averted.

One lesson taken from the trial was that a protocol around the use of the tool is an absolute requirement. The information collected is potentially very dangerous to individuals in the school and to the school itself. It is not our intention to create a new form of league table. Thus, the draft protocol²⁷ sets out the process for use including who may authorise its use, who must be consulted prior to its use, how it is to be used, who owns the information (PPTA) and how it is to be distributed. The latter point has caused some discussion because the protocol establishes that a copy of

²⁶ A useful summary of the landmark cases is contained in: Anderson, Carol, *School Boards of Trustees in the New Zealand Employment Courts. Problems of bias and procedure.*

Retrieved from <http://www.sgsl.co.nz/assets/Bias+and+Boards+of+Trustees+for+PDF.pdf>

²⁷ Attached as Appendix B.

the general report is to be held on PPTA central files and otherwise copies are restricted to the chairperson of the school's PPTA branch, the principal and the PPTA Field Officer. While the PPTA branch chairperson may share the findings verbally, they may not make copies until a process of constructive engagement for addressing concerns has been developed. The principal, though, may choose to distribute the report to board members. It was felt this distinction was necessary in order to facilitate an environment that allowed concerns to be addressed by the parties that have the most power to address them. PPTA members in the school who completed the survey, however, remain unhappy that they still do not have a copy of the report.

The school is still working through responses to the tool but it appears to have been successful in making the board of trustees aware of a relationship problem that would have had serious consequences for the school if the board had continued to ignore it. There is a chance now of averting the inevitable public meltdown because the responses have been put in place before the parties assumed totally entrenched positions.

PPTA will continue to explore the use of this tool in 2010, including the development of national data about workplace trends. It appears to offer an important counter to the earlier expressed concerns about the risks of "evidence based decision- making" (p3). It provides the quantitative data so privileged by this form of research but in a context that validates teachers' voice and challenges the simplistic conclusions that politicised research invites.

Union research example 2 – Evaluating branch effectiveness for teachers' quality of working conditions

This piece of research has interesting synergies with example 1 above. It was commissioned in September 2009 and the first phase of fieldwork conducted in November, with the remainder to take place in 2010. The research involves a sample of nine secondary schools in the Greater Auckland area, selected to represent a range in terms of socio-economic composition of students, size, urban/rural, and union density. The working hypothesis is that the effectiveness of union organisation at a branch [= site] affects the quality of working conditions for teachers in a school. The research questions are:

- Are there differences in the effectiveness of union organisation in schools of different types?
- In particular, are there differences in union effectiveness in terms of school size, school decile?
- What factors contribute most to greater or less Branch effectiveness?

This is a very good example of a research project that may well not be published outside the elected structures of PPTA, as its intent is to identify possible weaknesses and to allow PPTA to improve organisational structures and activities in order to better support our members.

Conclusions

The current interest in many Western countries in 'evidence-based decision-making' produces a level of government enthusiasm for educational research that is probably unprecedented. Clearly educational research is an area that an effective teachers' union simply must be informed about and actively engaged with. Research, especially when commissioned by the state, has the potential to significantly influence teachers' working conditions, for better or for worse.

It is our belief that unions should, indeed must, conduct and/or commission research of their own, in order to ensure balance in the information available. More than that though, we would hope that our involvement will assist in moving the debate beyond simple polarities to an acceptance of complexity because as Oscar Wilde put it: "[T]he pure and simple truth is rarely pure and never simple."



A checklist of the school as an employer

This questionnaire is a companion to the checklist tool [What is our School Culture Like? – A Checklist for Analysing a School's Culture](http://www.educationallleaders.govt.nz/Culture/Understanding-school-cultures/What-is-our-School-Culture-Like-A-Checklist-for-Analysing-a-School-s-Culture) 15 January 2009 on the Leadspace website. (<http://www.educationallleaders.govt.nz/Culture/Understanding-school-cultures/What-is-our-School-Culture-Like-A-Checklist-for-Analysing-a-School-s-Culture>)

The Leadspace tool focuses on the cultural issues, beliefs, practices, norms and values which prevail in a school and how these might impact on student learning. This PPTA survey focuses on the employment relations culture in the school, the nature of the school as a workplace and the impacts of that culture on teachers as employees.

The summary will identify and profile the strengths and weaknesses in the nature of the employment relationship at your school, as perceived by teaching staff.

The school profile will allow the site to identify areas in which improvements to working relationships and operations can be made and the national summary will allow employers and employees to identify and learn from the best practice schools.

Completing the survey

This survey is to be completed anonymously. Survey results will be collated and a report arising from the data will be in summarised form.

This survey is about what the school is like as a work place for you as a worker and how you are treated as an employee. It is not about what it is like to teach in the school, or what the students are like that you teach.

The questions give an in-depth picture of your school as an employer. Most of these questions are to be answered on a 5 point scale. There are 4 very short answer questions. You may elect to complete the survey in one sitting, or complete it in sections over a period of a week.

Please mail it back (NO STAMP IS REQUIRED) to:

FREEPOST 103122
WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT SURVEY
PO BOX 2119
WELLINGTON

If you do not wish to complete the survey please return it to your PPTA Branch Chairperson.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

The workplace (*a response is required to validate the rest of your responses*)

1. Full name of school

This survey is about what the school is like as a work place and the employment relationship between yourself and the school as an employer.

It is not about what it is like to teach in the school, or about what the students that you teach are like.

Please use the following scale to respond to each of the following questions:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| Always | 5 |
| Usually | 4 |
| Sometimes | 3 |
| Rarely | 2 |
| Never | 1 |
| Not sure/Not applicable | N |

2.	I feel that I have a good general working relationship with the principal.	
3.	I feel that I have reasonable opportunity for discussions with the principal.	
4.	I feel safe when meeting formally with the principal.	
5.	I feel that I have good working relationship with senior managers. <i>(Other than the principal)</i>	
6.	I feel that I have reasonable opportunity for discussions with senior managers. <i>(Other than the principal)</i>	
7.	I feel safe when meeting formally with senior managers. <i>(Other than the principal)</i>	
8.	I feel that I have good working relationships with teaching staff. <i>(Other than senior managers / principal)</i>	
9.	I feel safe meeting formally with teaching staff. <i>(Other than senior managers/principal)</i>	
10.	I feel that I have a good general working relationship with the school board.	

30.	I feel that there is consistency in the messages given by the senior managers (other than principal) over time.	
31.	I feel that there is a consistency in the messages given by the principal over time.	
32.	I feel that my specific health needs are taken into consideration by the school.	
33.	I am free to decide whether to participate in extracurricular activities outside the school day.	
34.	I feel that I receive good support in dealing with difficult parents.	
35.	I feel physically safe in this school.	
36.	I feel emotionally safe in this school.	
37.	I feel that a good physical environment is provided for me to work in.	
38.	I feel that I am provided with adequate resources to work effectively.	
39.	I feel that my health, safety and welfare are taken into consideration by the school.	
40.	I feel that there is a receptive response to health and safety and welfare issues when they are raised with the principal.	
41.	I feel that I can be involved in the decision-making processes in the school if I wish.	
42.	I feel that I can be involved in consultation on professional matters if I wish.	
43.	I feel that I receive recognition by the principal for my professional achievements.	
44.	I feel that I am provided with clear information on the school's financial situation.	
45.	I feel that I have a say in the professional development that I undertake.	
46.	I feel that my appraisal process is fair and supportive.	
47.	I feel that I have professional freedom to determine my activities out of scheduled class time.	
48.	I feel that I have adequate access to clerical and support staff.	
49.	I feel that I can be involved in annual consultation on the use of units.	
50.	I feel that I can be involved in annual consultation on the use of management allowances.	
51.	I feel that I can be involved in decision-making about the introduction of new initiatives if is wish.	

Always	5	
Usually	4	
Sometimes	3	
Rarely	2	
Never	1	
Not sure/Not applicable		N

52.	I feel that the work I do in my own time is acknowledged by the principal.	
53.	I feel that I am recognised and treated as a professional.	
54.	I feel that I am only expected to attend meetings where my involvement is actually necessary.	
55.	I feel that meetings at this school are well managed.	
56.	I feel that meetings at this school are kept to a reasonable length.	
57.	I feel that meetings at this school are purposeful.	
58.	I feel that I am free to contribute to discussion at staff meetings.	
59.	I feel that I am kept informed of any changes to school systems and processes.	
60.	I feel that I am kept informed of coming school events in a timely way.	
61.	I feel that I am adequately supported by the school's student discipline system when I need it.	
62.	I feel protected from bullying and harassment.	
63.	I feel protected from sexual harassment.	
64.	I feel protected from racial harassment.	
65.	I feel that I get adequate notice upcoming required tasks.	
66.	I feel that what is expected of me in my work in the school is made clear.	
67.	I feel that the systems for providing information on matters of school operation are efficient and effective.	
68.	I feel that the school management works to minimise non-essential administration tasks that I have to do.	
69.	I feel that the school management endeavours to manage the pace and frequency of new initiatives.	

Please use this scale to answer the next 4 questions:

- Always**
= 5
- Usually, without prompting**
= 4
- Usually, if reminded**
= 3
- Sometimes**
= 2
- Never**
= 1
- Not applicable/Not sure**
= N

70. If I agree to forgo non-contact time for a genuine reason I get an agreed compensation.	
71. The school pays me the allowances and reimbursements required by the Agreement.	
72. I am paid reasonable and actual expenses if called back when the school is closed for instruction.	
73. The school is active in ensuring that all of my collective agreement entitlements are provided.	

Please use the indicated scale to answer the following questions:

- Yes**
= 1
- No**
= 0
- Not applicable/ not sure**
= N

74. I have no more than the appropriate maximum number of timetabled teaching hours per week. <i>(See endnote for maximum teaching hours per week)</i>	
75. The school contributes towards the cost of my laptop.	
76. The school contributes towards the cost of my teacher registration.	
77. The school contributes towards my subject association fee <i>(including Guidance, AP/DP or principal organisations)</i>	
78. I feel that I was able to be engaged in consultation over the school timetable policy.	
79. I have duty-free breaks of <i>10 minutes, 30 minutes, and 10 minutes</i> each day in addition to my non-contact time.	

80. I feel that there was a reasonable explanation to me of why the school endeavoured to keep my class sizes to an average of 26 but were unable to do this.	
81. I feel that there was a reasonable explanation to me of why it was not possible to give part time non-contact in proportion to a full time teacher.	
82. I feel that I receive(d) a good induction, mentoring and support programme as a recent PRT in this school.	
83. I get some employment conditions in excess of entitlements. (e.g. health insurance, school-funded sabbaticals, etc)	
84. I have access to an employee assistance programme (outside personal, professional support in difficult times paid for by the school).	
85. I am called back for no more than 5 days per year for administration/meetings when the school is closed to students.	
86. I am called back for professional development for no more than 5 days per year when the school is closed to students.	
87. I receive an agreed compensation because my average class size over 26. (Response is 'N' if average class size is not over 26, or if you have only one class)	
88. I would recommend the employment practices in this school to teachers considering jobs here.	

In each of the next four questions you are asked for four descriptive responses of single words or short phrases. Do not use synonyms (e.g. either 'great' or 'wonderful' but not both). Under each question are terms used by teachers in the trial survey. These are examples only.

89. What 4 words or terms summarise the management style at the school?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • •

EXAMPLES: Accessible, accountable, ambitious expectations, approachable, arrogant, autocratic, capable, caring, collaborative, committed, communicative, consistent, consultative, controlling, demanding, detached, dictatorial, dismissive, disorganised, distant, effective, efficient, fair, flexible, fluid, friendly, good, haphazard, hardworking, helpful, hierarchical, honest, inclusive, inconsistent, indifferent, inefficient, informed, innovative, instructional, intimidating, lacks team work, lacks understanding, laid back, lax, leaderless, limited communication, low trust, mediocre, no empathy, non-consultative, organised, personal, poor communication, pragmatic, professional, progressive, pseudo-consultative, reactive, reasonable, reflective, relaxed, reserved, secretive, strict, supportive, top heavy, transparent, trust, unaware, unfair, uptight, unrealistic expectations, well organised.

90. What 4 words or terms summarise your physical working conditions?

-
-
-
-

EXAMPLES: Acceptable, adequate, average, barely professional, basic, challenging, comfortable, could be better, could be cleaner, cramped, crowded, damp, demanding, dire, disorganised, excellent, fair, good, good resources, grudgingly provided, large class sizes, needs renovating, not enough room, not equal, office area non-existent, ok, pleasant, poor physical conditions, poorly resourced, primitive, professional, reasonable, safe, safe and friendly, satisfactory, school not comfortable, semi equipped, substandard, under resourced, unprofessional, unsatisfactory, untidy, very good, well resourced.

91. What 4 words or terms summarise the emotional working conditions in the school?

-
-
-
-

EXAMPLES: Caring, challenging, comfortable, content, encouraging, fair, fearful, friendly, generally good, good, inconsistent, lack of support, pleasant, rewarding, safe, satisfactory, sometimes unfair, stressful, supportive, taxing, tense, unfair, unhappy, united, unsatisfactory, unstable, very good

92. What 4 words or terms summarise how do you feel about being an employee in the school?

-
-
-
-

EXAMPLES: Challenged, collegial, comfortable, confident, content, disappointed, disillusioned, empowered, frustrated, generally satisfied, generally fulfilled, good, happy, hopeful, isolated, let down, monitored, motivated, not really appreciated, okay, overwhelmed, overworked, pleased, poorly supported, positive, pressured, professional, proud, purposeful, put upon, reassured, relaxed, respected, roller coaster, safe, satisfied, secure, settled, stable, stressed, supported, taken for granted, too many jobs, too much change, trying, unappreciated, undervalued, unheard, unrecognised, unrewarded, unsettled, valued.

Special Character.

Questions for teachers in designated special character (integrated) schools.

93. How would you expect the special character of your school to be reflected in its relationship with you as an employee?

-
-
-

Please use this scales to answer the next question:

Always	5
Usually	4
Sometimes	3
Rarely	2
Never	1

Not sure/Not applicable N

94. Does the school's employment relationship with you reflect your expectation of its special character?

**ENDNOTE: MAXIMUM CONTACT TIME OVER 5, 6 or 7 DAY
TIMETABLES:**

FULL TIME TEACHERS

Status	No permanent unit			1 PU*			2 PU*			3 PU*		
	5 day	6 day	7 day	5 day	6 day	7 day	5 day	6 day	7 day	5 day	6 day	7 day
Fully registered	20.0	24.0	28.0	19.0	22.8	26.6	18.0	21.6	25.2	17.0	20.4	23.8
SCT – full time	16.0	19.2	22.4	-			-			-		
Full time PRT Y1	15.0	18.0	21.0	14.0	16.8	19.6	13.0	15.6	18.2	12.0	14.4	16.8
Full time PRT Y2	17.5	21.0	24.5	16.5	19.8	23.1	15.5	18.6	21.7	14.5	17.4	20.3

**NB HoDs may have an hour per week less contact for each PRT for whom they are responsible.*

Example (highlighted in table above): A fully registered teacher with 1 unit who has a 6 day timetable cycle should have no more than 22.8 hours (22 hours and 48 minutes) contact in those 6 days.

PART TIME TEACHERS

Total timetabled hours per cycle*			Maximum contact hours per cycle**					
			PRT Y1			Other teachers		
5 day	6 day	7 day	5 day	6 day	7 day	5 day	6 day	7 day
22.25	26.70	31.15	16.75	20.10	23.45	19.25	23.10	26.95
22.00	26.40	30.80	16.75	20.10	23.45	19.25	23.10	26.95
21.00	25.20	29.40	16.75	20.10	23.45	19.25	23.10	26.95
20.00	24.00	28.00	16.50	19.80	23.10	19.00	22.80	26.60
19.00	22.80	26.60	15.50	18.60	21.70	18.00	21.60	25.20
18.00	21.60	25.20	15.00	18.00	21.00	17.50	21.00	24.50
17.00	20.40	23.80	14.50	17.40	20.30	17.00	20.40	23.80
16.00	19.20	22.40	13.50	16.20	18.90	16.00	19.20	22.40
15.00	18.00	21.00	12.50	15.00	17.50	15.00	18.00	21.00
14.00	16.80	19.60	11.50	13.80	16.10	14.00	16.80	19.60
13.00	15.60	18.20	10.50	12.60	14.70	13.00	15.60	18.20
12.50	15.00	17.50	10.00	12.00	14.00	12.50	15.00	17.50
12.00	14.40	16.80	12.00	14.40	16.80	12.00	14.40	16.80
Under			Paid hours			Paid hours		

Less 12 minutes per day for each permanent unit.

 Less 48 minutes per day for SCTs

Example (highlighted in table above): A PRT year 1 teacher is employed for 18 hours in a 6 day timetable. Of those 18 hours s/he should have no more than 15 hours contact.

*NB – The 11% part time salary loading does **not** count towards calculating the contact and non-contact hours.

**NB – Times given in the table above are the maximum permissible contact hours. For part time teachers employed for 12 hours or more the school is to

endeavour to provide 1 hour of timetabled non-contact for every 4 hours of teaching.

Fractions of hours as minutes

Hours	0.1	0.15	0.2	0.25	0.3	0.35	0.4	0.45	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8	0.85	0.9	0.95
Minutes	6	9	12	15	18	21	24	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	54	57

Appendix B

Work environment analysis tool: Protocols for use

General intent

1 The tool is intended to assist employers and employees in identifying areas of strength and weakness in the work environment with the purpose of engaging in a process for strengthening work place practices and relationships.

2 Where areas of concern are identified in the report the field officer will seek to engage the employer and the branch in a constructive process of improvement. This will be done with discretion and consideration for natural justice. Constructive workplace relationships are seen as a priority and in the overall interests of the school.

Preparation

3 The tool will be made available primarily through the local field officer.

4 Any other request for the tool to be provided will be redirected to the local field officer.

5 The provision of the tool will occur after discussions between the field officer and the branch chairperson and between the field officer and the principal. These discussions will include:

1. The purpose of undertaking the exercise
2. Clarification of who is requesting the report (the branch chair, the principal, the BOT)
3. The nature of the exercise
4. The nature of the report which is produced
5. The ownership of the report at each stage
6. The process of discussion to be followed after the report is prepared.
7. The development of processes for improvement which are likely to follow
8. The protocols in this document.

6 The field officer must be sure that the survey tool would be completed by a significant majority of the teachers at the school.

7 The field officer must ascertain that the person(s) requesting the report agree to the protocols.

8 The field officer in consultation with the DGS will then make an assessment of whether it is appropriate to proceed further with the request.

9 The field officer must gain authority from the DGS Membership to issue the tool, after confirming that the preliminary steps have been taken.

10 The DGS Membership will approve in writing the issuing of the tool after determining that the preliminary steps have been taken and that the protocols will be properly adhered to.

11 The President will be notified of any request to use the tool by the DGS or FO.

12 The AO responsible for the analysis and report writing will be kept informed of any requests made, accepted and declined, in order to track the use of the tool.

Using the survey tool

13 The survey tool will be supplied in hard copy to all teachers in the school, with the school clearly identified on the survey documentation (including the principal and other senior managers and also including non-members).

14 The field officer will supply enough hard copies for all the teachers at the school.

15 The branch chairperson will be responsible for distribution of the survey forms on behalf of the Association.

16 A sufficient period for teachers to complete and return the survey forms will be provided.

17 No additional marks will be made on the papers in the distribution process. The Field Officer will stress this in explaining the process to the branch chairperson.

18 A collection method that does not identify those returning the form will be used.

19 Teachers will have the option of returning the forms directly to National Office.

20 The surveys will be returned to PPTA National Office.

21 National Office will undertake the analysis and report writing for each school undertaking the survey.

The report

22 The report is the property of the PPTA.

23 The report will identify areas of strength and weakness in the schoolwork environment. These will be summarised in a General Report.

24 A detailed breakdown of responses to each question will form the second part of the report, Part B.

25 The Part B report is confidential to the compiler and the field officer.

26 At no stage following the preparation of the report are changes permitted other than to correct production errors.

27 Four hard copies of the report including the General Report and Part B will be produced for the field officer, branch chairperson, principal and PPTA central files. (The generator of the report will hold one electronic copy of the compiled data.)

Using the report

- 28 The field officer will arrange to meet with the branch chairperson and the principal (together when the request to use the tool was a joint request, otherwise singly with the requester first unless by mutual agreement otherwise).
- 29 At the first meeting only the general report will be provided to either party.
- 30 The report will be provided in hard copy at this meeting.
- 31 The meeting will discuss the general findings of the report, implications, and the process(es) to be followed to address any areas of concern indicated (if any).
- 32 After the first meeting the general report is the property of the branch chairperson, the principal and the PPTA.

Reporting following the first meeting

- 33 Following the meeting, and after discussion with and advice from the field officer, the branch chairperson may give a verbal report to the branch on the general report.
- 34 At this stage no copies of the report in hard or electronic form are to be made by the branch chairperson, except by mutual agreement of the principal.
- 35 The principal may choose to give a verbal report to the board and may choose to distribute copies of the general report in hard or electronic form.
- 36 The field officer will report back on the outcome of the first meeting to the Deputy General Secretary Membership (DGSM). The DGSM will report progress to the president.

Continuing the process

- 37 The field officer will seek to establish a constructive ongoing engagement between principal and branch chairperson to address any issues of concern identified in the report.
- 38 The process will be agreed in consultation between the field officer, the branch chairperson and the principal.
- 39 When a constructive process of improvement is agreed the full report may be made available to the branch chairperson and to the principal to provide guidance on where improvements can be made and on the priority for addressing specific problems. The full report is then the property of the branch chairperson, the principal and the PPTA. No copies are made except by mutual agreement.
- 39 When a constructive process of improvement cannot be mutually agreed the full report will be made available to the party seeking to engage and the field officer will work with that party to seek to address specific problems.
- 40 The full report is then the property of the engaging party and the PPTA.

41 If the branch chairperson has the full report s/he may outline in general terms specific matters of concern to the branch. With the agreement of the field officer s/he may make and circulate copies of either the general report or the extended report to the branch members as appropriate.

42 When the field officer, following consultation with the President and the DGSM, concludes that one party does not wish to resolve concerns identified in the report, the field officer shall discuss with the other party the options available to them.

43 The non-participating party will be advised of the outcomes of those discussions and shall retain the right to respond in writing to the report and to have the written response attached to the report at that point and subsequently.

Use of the information by PPTA

44 PPTA may elect to use the data collected for the report to identify good practice schools.