

## STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER APPRAISAL IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SELF-MANAGING SCHOOL

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE COMBINED AARE/NZARE CONFERENCE

Deakin University, 22 - 26 November, 1992

Ian Calder  
University of Waikato

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER APPRAISAL  
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SELF-MANAGING SCHOOL

Ian Calder  
University of Waikato

### INTRODUCTION

This study forms part of the wider Monitoring Today's Schools project. The overall purpose of the project was to monitor the implementation and impact of the reforms in educational administration in New Zealand which resulted from the 'Picot Report' (Administering for Excellence, 1988) and Tomorrow's Schools, (1988) which found expression in the Education Act (1989).

Principals, teachers and trustees from 15 schools took part in the project

which covered the first three years of the reforms. 13 of the schools were in the Waikato region, and two were in Wellington. There were eight primary schools, two intermediate schools, four secondary and one area school. Two of the primary schools were bilingual schools.

The purpose of the present study was to describe and comment on the implementation of staff development and teacher appraisal policies in the schools which were involved in the Monitoring Today's Schools project. The thrust of the new reforms was to place responsibility for these areas with the schools themselves thus it was a change from a highly centralised system to a locally controlled system.

Staff development and teacher appraisal are not new processes in New Zealand schools. Indeed, the relative ease with which these new policies are being implemented is probably due to the fact that systems were already in place and teachers were familiar with them. For those readers who are not familiar with the New Zealand education system, it may be helpful to outline briefly the policies and practices in staff development and teacher appraisal as they existed prior to the introduction of the Tomorrow's Schools reforms.

#### Staff Development Prior to 1989.

While staff development was the responsibility of the principal of a school, in practice the planning and delivery occurred at three levels - national, regional and local. Funding, and therefore ultimate control, was centralised with the Department of Education. At the national level there was a National In-service Committee which had Department and teacher representation. The courses offered through this body tended to be residential and were held in the Education Department in-service centres in the major cities (Walters House in Auckland and Hogben House in Christchurch, for example). Some of these courses were open but mostly participation was by invitation or through nomination by a local inspector of schools. These courses were free and travel and accommodation were paid by the Department of Education. If the courses were not held in the school holidays, teacher release time would also be provided. The philosophy underlying the selection of teachers to go on such courses was that they would become resource people in their own schools and thus spread the course material.

This organization was duplicated at the regional level. Each Education Board region had an in-service committee with teacher and departmental representation. The committee was chaired by an inspector of schools who had specific responsibility for in-service training in the region. Funding would be provided from the national pool and often national priorities were filtered down to the regions; thus regions did not have full autonomy with

respect to their in-service programmes. The region would be allocated a

certain number of teacher-release days and it was the responsibility of the committee to decide how these would be allocated to schools. At the local level, there was also funding available. Courses at this level tended to be held on teacher-only days, or were associated with staff meetings. Providers would be curriculum advisers, college of education staff and teachers themselves.

There were several problems associated with this system of staff development. Firstly, the needs tended to be the needs as perceived by the school inspectorate, and though these might have validity at regional or national levels, they did not necessarily meet the needs of individual teachers or schools. The specific needs of schools were not usually met other than at the local level and this was the most under-resourced part of the system. A frequent complaint of teachers was that some people seemed to get more in-service opportunities than others. The principle of developing local resource people was not particularly effective. The resource person may not have been given time and opportunity to fulfil this role, and also teachers tend to be fairly mobile, and a resource person would frequently move on.

#### Teacher Appraisal Prior to 1989

Before the administrative changes ushered in by the Tomorrow's Schools reforms, formal teacher appraisal was one of the principal functions of the school inspectors. This appraisal was central to the appointments and promotion of primary teachers and had a long history of development. The system involved teachers being visited and observed teaching by an inspector or inspectors for a period of one half to two days depending on the level of the report being applied for. After the visit, a personal report would be issued which consisted of both quantitative and qualitative assessments against specified criteria. These personal reports were named for the colour of paper on which they were printed: white for basic Scale A positions, green for Division B, and yellow for Divisions C and D. For example, in order to win a position of principal of a large school, an applicant would need a 'top yellow' report. Thus the system was national, normative and very complex and was pegged to years of service. In 1974, the white report was abolished as a criterion for appointment to Scale A positions, and a Green report could be applied for after five years of certificated service, a yellow report after a minimum of 12 years, including three years in a Scale B position. Each report was valid for three years after which time teachers could apply to either have their report confirmed, or to be re-graded. If a teacher had tenure and was content with the position he or she held, or was in fear of re-grading (grades were known to move downwards!) they could simply let their report lapse. Since these reports were only required for positions of responsibility, it tended to be the competent, ambitious teachers who applied for grading and thus this system of appraisal did not touch all teachers. While the inspectors of schools had a reputation for fairness and integrity, there was widespread dissatisfaction with the 'norming'

procedure. Designed to be fair nationally, it caused problems at the local level where school inspectors had only a limited pre-determined allocation of specific grades to distribute. In addition to the personal appraisal of teachers there was also a system of 'school inspections' or reviews, whereby a team of inspectors would move into a school and review the functioning of the whole school.

In secondary schools, formal appraisal occurred as a means of classifying teachers. Beginning teachers started as 'Class A' and during their first two years would be visited by inspectors of schools twice yearly. If their teaching was considered satisfactory, they would then be granted a 'B' classification which was necessary if they were to advance professionally in the State system. Teachers in private schools were not subject to classification, but if they wished to transfer to the State system, they had to apply for classification and could not advance in salary or

promotion until they were classified. Other than the classification form of appraisal, inspectors of schools periodically reviewed departments within a school as part of school-wide reviews as described for primary schools above. Individual teachers in a department were not named in the report. When applying for promotion teachers in the secondary school system relied on qualifications, references, interview performance and the informal network.

In summary, the appraisal system prior to 1989 was clearly linked to compensation through promotion and hence salary, in the primary school system. It was centrally controlled, and the appraiser was someone from outside the school. In secondary schools, appraisal was a form of 'fitness to teach' test, and went no further as far as the individual teacher was concerned. As with primary, the appraiser was from outside the school.

### The New Requirements

The reform of educational administration under Tomorrow's Schools firmly placed the responsibility for teacher appraisal and staff development with the board of trustees of each school. Under the section 'Personnel Development Goals and Objectives' in the Charter Framework (the 'Charter Framework' was part of a document 'Governing Schools: a Handbook for School Trustees which was issued to trustees in May, 1989) trustees were instructed to develop appraisal and staff development policies, viz:

Every year adopt, on the advice of the principal, a staff development programme which specifies clear outcomes and methods for achieving these.  
(Goal D. Objective a)

Other objectives related to the requirement to provide adequate funds and the ensuring of equity objectives in staff training.

The objectives relating to teacher appraisal are noted in Goals B and C of the same section. These goals and objectives refer to the requirements for Boards to be good employers, which means among other things, complying with the State Sector Act 1988. Boards are also instructed to abide by the various industrial awards that apply to their schools.

A paper sent to boards of trustees and principals in 1989 made clear to boards their responsibilities with respect to teacher appraisal:

The Board is responsible for ensuring that procedures for appraisal and discipline are in place and for taking any required action on the recommendation of the principal. (Ballard and Duncan, 1989, pp.3-4)

In the same document, Ballard and Duncan stated that staff appraisal is related to staff development, and is not directly related to compensation. They pointed out that there is a relationship but that it is an indirect one. It assumes that development will lead to increases in skills and knowledge which ought to be recognised and compensated accordingly. This is indeed a key issue, and the direction was perhaps intended to allay teachers' fears that appraisal could be used for promotion, salary and retention purposes.

The New Zealand Education Institute (NZEI), in a report to its Annual General Meeting in 1989, also stressed that appraisal should be an integral part of the process of professional development. The report explicitly stated:

That appraisal should not lead to merit pay for it is unlikely that teachers will admit to problems or constraints, or engage in criticism of the management of their school if their financial prospects are at stake. (p.6)

Similar expressions came from other quarters, and some of these also raised

the issue of confidentiality and ownership of appraisal reports. For example, the Ministerial committee on Assessment for Better Learning recommended in their report that:

Any reports on the outcomes of an individual teacher's appraisal for professional development will be confidential to the teacher and will not be available to those concerned with the formal assessment of teachers for purposes of registration and discipline. (Ministerial Working Party, 1990, p.61).

And in similar vein, the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA) in a report to the annual conference in 1991 affirmed that;

All information generated by the appraisal process should be confined to the people involved and to the purpose stated and be held by the teacher.

As schools worked to form appraisal policies and to implement them, assistance and advice from a range of sources became available. Private consultants were hired by some schools and a commercial consultancy firm 'Metanoics Associates' produced a popular package 'Performance Appraisal in Schools' (Menzies, 1990). Courses were offered by university departments, colleges of education and the Advanced Studies for Teachers Unit. There has been a burgeoning of interest in the appraisal area and the literature on school management and leadership has reflected this. As Peel (1991) has observed, however, things may have moved too quickly. A plethora of 'How to' articles and manuals appeared, but they were not based on a clear understanding of the principles of evaluation:

The educational literature ... seems to adopt a similar approach in rapidly jumping to the 'how to' stage without spending much time on the purposes and goals of evaluation. All this despite clear recognition by researchers that evaluation will not be successful without clear and explicit definitions of the goals of evaluation. (Peel, 1991, p.186)

In spite of the assurances of the various authoritative groups cited earlier, there remained a suspicion among some teachers and other educators that a model of appraisal and accountability of a completely different kind may be foisted on the teaching profession. The difficulty is that there are two kinds of appraisal - "appraisal for judgement, and appraisal for improvement." (Hickcox et al, 1988) Teachers hear some voices telling them that the appraisal systems being put in place in schools are for improvement and are an integral part of staff development, but on the other hand, there are voices (mainly from the political arena and writers to newspapers), calling for the need to weed out teachers who are not producing results:

In accepting performance evaluation ostensibly for development, they may in fact be accepting the thin edge of a wedge. It could be that once legitimacy is established, performance evaluation may subtly change and end up being used for administrative purposes, and to provide the kind of accountability that will lead to fundamental changes in the teaching profession. (Peel, 1991, p.195)

There are also fears that all may not be well in the area of teacher development. One scenario is that the devolution of funding to schools will in reality mask cuts to educational funding. Boards faced with reduced incomes will have to make savings by cutting out "frills". Teacher development may be regarded as a frill by some trustees, and money will not be made available for this purpose.

What do teachers, principals and school trustees think? Are they speaking the same language when they talk about appraisal? Do they agree on issues such as 'who appraises, how often, by whom, and for what purposes?' And,

with respect to the professional development of staff, will there indeed be less of it because of reduced resources and the lack of understanding among board members of its importance? The present study aims to find some answers to these questions and other issues about appraisal and staff development that faced teachers, principals and school boards of trustees in the first three years of Tomorrows' Schools.

## RESULTS

### a) Staff development

The main findings are summarised as follows:

1. The major change in staff development since the introduction of the new reforms has been in the area of control and funding. Schools now have the freedom to decide on their own staff development needs and to budget what they feel are appropriate monies to meet these needs.
2. Staff development has become more school-based, and as such is deemed to be a more efficient use of funds because staff development reaches more teachers than previously.
3. A general perception is that there is now more staff development than there was previously.
4. There were warnings of staff overload from some schools where it appeared that teachers were expected to undertake too much staff development in their already very extensive after school activities.
5. Bilingual schools had the same problems as other schools but had the added difficulty of trying to find resource people to meet their specific needs.
6. Trustees were generally aware of the importance of staff development as the means of improving the quality of teaching offered to their children.
7. The staff development process that seemed to be most accepted and approved, was where a staff development committee was given the responsibility for surveying teacher and programme needs and putting forward for staff approval a development plan which would best meet these needs.
8. The greatest problem in the implementation of the staff development plan was universally the problem of not having sufficient time. Areas where staff development was urgently needed were in new curricula, new assessment practices, policy development, Treaty of Waitangi issues and

management training for senior staff. There was a feeling that staff development was not keeping pace with the rapidity of change.

9. The amount of funding budgeted for staff development varied considerably from school to school, but the variability was mostly due to differences in bookkeeping categories. Slightly more was spent in 1991 than in 1990.

10. In several schools, teachers had course fees paid for university or polytechnic courses.

11. All principals and some teachers were encouraged by their boards to attend professional conferences and received financial assistance to do so.

12. A very striking feature was the range and intensity of some of the staff development undertaken by teachers.

#### b) Teacher appraisal

1. A teacher appraisal programme was in place and being implemented in six out of the 15 schools. In five of the remaining schools there was considerable confusion as to the nature of the programme and as to whether it was actually being implemented. In 4 schools an appraisal policy had not yet been agreed.

2. All of the principals understood appraisal to mean a method of determining teacher needs in order to put staff development programmes in place.

3. Almost half of the trustees felt that appraisal was a means of checking up on teachers and identifying weak and incompetent teachers.

4. In schools where appraisal policies were in place and being implemented, the following were some common features:

- The appraiser was another person or persons
- The appraiser was usually the principal or senior staff
- An interview between appraisee and appraiser was part of the

process

5. Differences in approach were:

- How the policy was determined (top down or bottom up)
- Some schools used facilitators from outside the school
- Which staff were being appraised first
- The amount of time spent in teacher observation

6. There was still considerable suspicion as to what was the principal



reason for introducing appraisal systems into schools.

7. A surprising number of teachers (almost 50 per cent) either approved, or gave qualified approval for the notion of appraisal data being used to determine teachers' retention, promotion or salary. The reason was clearly pragmatic. Teachers seeking promotion missed the external, relatively neutral grading system, and needed something to take its place.

8. Trustees generally felt that good teachers should be rewarded and weak teachers down-graded or dismissed. They felt that appraisal data would help identify such teachers.

9. Approximately one-third of the trustees were consistent throughout in their view that teacher appraisal was for staff development purposes only and that the data was confidential to the teacher concerned, and should therefore not be used for retention, promotion, salary, selection or disciplinary purposes.

10. While student performance was generally seen as a factor in teacher appraisal, almost all of the principals and a considerable number of trustees were aware of the difficulties of implementing such a system fairly. Test marks were generally seen as inappropriate for informing appraisal.

11. Student views of teacher capability was seen as being appropriate information for appraisal only at the top levels of the secondary school.

12. Most trustees were satisfied with the selection procedures adopted by their board. A small number felt that professional educators on the board had too much say in selection.

13. Bilingual schools had problems in recruiting teachers who had the necessary teaching qualifications and skills as well as high levels of proficiency in Maori Language and Culture.

14. The teacher unions had a prominent part to play in the disciplining of teachers. This was especially so with the NZEI in the primary school system.

15. A few trustees resented the role the teacher unions played in disciplinary matters and felt that because of union influence it was virtually impossible to sack incompetent teachers.

16. The majority of the trustees had not any experience of being involved in the disciplining of teachers.

17. The great majority of teachers, and a substantial majority of

principals and trustees were in favour of teacher registration being compulsory for all teachers.

18. Arguments for teacher registration being mandatory centred on issues of professionalism, protection of children and protection of teacher jobs.

19. Arguments against teacher registration being made compulsory for all teachers were that it was unnecessary and also costly to teachers.

20 There was some anxiety that if teacher registration was made compulsory, then specialised areas such as Maori language and culture would be greatly disadvantaged.

## DISCUSSION

### a) Staff development:

This research revealed that there was general satisfaction with staff development under the new reforms. The devolving of funding and

responsibility has been largely a success story, as schools went about targeting their needs, arranging priorities and making budgeting decisions about what staff development to have and for whom.

At the national level, the Teachers Refresher Course Committee became an incorporated society in 1989, and is now an independent body offering residential courses for teachers at all levels during teaching vacations. Last year over 2000 teachers attended such courses in the May, August and January term breaks. The committee continues to fund teachers' travel while registration and course fees are paid by the teachers themselves. It appeared from this research that in fact boards of trustees generally assisted teachers financially to attend courses. Several teachers also had tertiary tuition fees and conference fees paid by their boards.

There is now considerable competition among providers, which is generally seen as a good thing, but it has taken schools a while to sort out which providers give best value for money.

A considerable amount of teacher development today is also provided by agencies who win teacher development contracts from the Ministry of Education. These agencies can be colleges of education, universities, private individuals, the Special Education Service or even schools themselves. None of the staff in the schools surveyed in this research mentioned being involved in these Ministry contracts, but the scheme was in the early stages at that time.

Fears that funding difficulties would mean cutting back on teacher development had not been realised in the first two years of the reforms.

If anything, there was more staff development than previously, and it was perceived as being more effective and was reaching more people. In only one school did a reduction in funding mean a reduction in the amount and quality of staff development.

The links between teacher appraisal and staff development seemed more theoretical than real at the time of this survey. This is probably because teacher appraisal was just getting under way in most schools and had not started at all in some. The link is very important because staff development has been touted as the real reason for the implementation of teacher appraisal programmes. There is a potential source of conflict with this arrangement, however. While at present, staff development committees in each school try to ascertain teacher and school needs, then with the staff prioritise these needs, in the future individual needs which have been highlighted through the appraisal process will be competing for these priorities Elizabeth Battersby comments on this matter:

It is important not to dampen individuals' enthusiasm for particular aspects of their work, even if the areas they wish to develop further are not considered to be a priority by their appraisers. However, it is equally important not to ignore those aspects that must be improved. The aim of achieving congruence between individual needs and school needs must needs guide the negotiation process, therefore. (Battersby, 1991, p.209)

This, however, is only conjecture at this stage and if that is all schools have to worry about with respect to staff development they will indeed be fortunate. Present indications are that teacher development in New Zealand is in a healthy state. As the Secretary for Education, Dr Maris O'Rourke, pointed out in a recent statement in the Education Gazette:

It is very encouraging to see the progress which schools have made over the last three years in determining their own professional development goals and devising programmes to meet these. It would seem that the responsibility for teacher professional development is one which schools have welcomed and responded to extremely well. (O'Rourke, 1992)

#### b) The formulation and implementation of appraisal policies

Many of the principals and teachers who participated in this research made the comment that there is nothing new in appraisal and that good teachers have always appraised their own performance anyway. Indeed, as part of their pre-service training, teachers are taught how to relate evaluations of their teaching back to their original teaching/learning objectives which are expressed in performance terms. In the on-going task of monitoring childrens' learning teachers inevitably, and usually deliberately, also appraise their own performance. Frequently this is done with colleagues in teaching teams or syndicates. So what, then, is new?

The thing that is new according to Brian McEntee, a consultant in the area of appraisal, is the management and accountability climate now operating in schools (McEntee, 1992). The other thing that is new is that there is now a legal requirement for teachers' performance to be assessed. Like justice, it is not enough that it is done, appraisal must be seen to be done. The legal basis for teacher appraisal resides in the State Sector Act (1988) and in the State Sector Amendment Act (1989):

The chief executive of the Ministry of Education may from time to time, with the agreement of the State Services Commission, prescribe matters that are to be taken into account by employers in assessing the performance of teachers. (State Sector Act, 1988)

In prescribing such matters, the Chief Executive of the Ministry is obliged to consult with the Teacher Registration Board, The Education Review Office, and representatives of employers of teachers and teacher organisations.

Such consultation has taken place and a draft document outlining the general principles, and the aims and purposes of appraisal was circulated to all interested parties in April 1992. It is doubtless the involvement of the teacher unions in this process that has produced their strong advocacy of teacher appraisal (See for example, Rourou, No. 13, 1991). The list of aims and objectives for appraisal that appears in the draft document referred to above, include not only objectives related to improving the quality of education and improving individual teacher skills and competencies, but aims related to satisfying accountability requirements. The document then stresses that appraisal procedures may need to differ according to the different purposes of appraisal, and that appraisal procedures should not form any part of competency or disciplinary proceedings as set out in the collective agreements. It would seem from this type of up-front statement that fears of some conspiracy to impose one appraisal system under the guise of another as suggested by Peel (1991. p.186), are not justified.

The whole focus of appraisal policies during the period of this research has been on appraisal for better teaching (often referred to as 'formative appraisal', as distinct from 'summative appraisal' which has to do with accountability and management decisions). Virtually nothing has been said about appraisal for accountability. It is small wonder, then, that a great deal of confusion was evident in schools over this distinction. In schools where appraisal issues had been gone into thoroughly, staff had clearly in mind that they were dealing with formative appraisal only, In the other schools, principals, teachers and trustees had not clearly separated the two purposes of appraisal and this was the cause of much anxiety and led to some strange contradictions in some of the responses (for example, several principals while firm in their belief that the purpose of appraisal was to improve teaching, then said that they were quite happy about using appraisal data for purposes of retention, promotion and salary

determination and would willingly solicit appraisal data to aid staff selection).

#### c) How to Appraise

There appears to be little argument about the need for appraisal. Indeed, any teacher trying to argue that there is no need for appraisal would be like a doctor trying to argue that there is no need for careful diagnosis! In fact none of the teachers in this survey questioned the need for appraisal. The debate is very much about the appraisal process - how to appraise.

Virtually all of the many articles and books dealing with the implementation of appraisal programmes in schools emphasise a careful preparatory stage. During this stage, teacher doubts, suspicions and fears are able to be expressed and talked through. Some of the writers have said that unless this phase is gone through, there is little point in going any further. In a booklet on appraisal by Malcolm Menzies of Metanoics Associates, there is a list of 20 tips for implementing appraisal. Three of these seemed particularly to be a special feature of the schools where an appraisal programme was enthusiastically adopted by staff. These were:

Ensure that the whole Board and all staff are familiar with the various issues, through reading or through discussion at meetings or teacher-only days.

Clarify for the school in question the roles and responsibilities for planning, implementing and carrying out appraisal.

Identify staff fears and spend time addressing these.

(Menzies, 1990, p.56)

The staff in the schools where appraisal seemed to be well accepted invariably mentioned the lengthy discussion and talking through that had gone on, and several teachers mentioned that their initial resistance had disappeared. Thus, in terms of how to implement an appraisal scheme, there seems to be plenty of advice and help available that if followed carefully will work.

#### d) Who Appraises?

Getting general acceptance of the principles of appraisal seems fairly non-controversial and is mainly a process of allowing enough time and obtaining good advice. The issue of who appraises is less simple, and schools had addressed this matter in different ways. It did seem to be taken for granted, however, that the appraiser must be another person, either a peer,

the principal or other senior staff. Only two secondary teachers questioned the validity of such appraisal, yet what is known as the 'credibility gap' has appeared as an issue in other countries. Sometimes the issue is focussed on classroom observation, and sometimes it just has to do with the credibility of the appraiser even in the interview situation with an appraisee. Several teachers hinted at this during the interviews when they mentioned that their colleagues are not trained in classroom observation as were the school inspectors. Montgomery (1988) mentions that in England considerable resentment had been caused when colleagues were too frank and judgemental, but that on the other hand, cosy chats with lots of warm fuzzies do not constitute valid appraisal either. In the U.S.A., Medley and Coker (1987) researched the reliability of principals' observations of teaching staff. They found that principals' observations and consequent ranking of teachers on an effectiveness scale only correlated 0.2 with independently measured learning outcomes. While research of this nature can be notoriously suspect when the dependent variable(s) which comprise the measures of the 'learning' are examined, nevertheless it is well known that it is difficult to get agreement on what constitutes good teaching (MacKay, 1982; Wragg, 1983). McEntee (1992), also warns against too much emphasis on peer appraisal and criticises the NZEI policy for its emphasis on external judgements:

A formal review by a colleague, however well well-intentioned, is a distortion of good teaching practice as we know it in New Zealand. By all means make collegial involvement a very strong feature of appraisal, but as on-going support rather than a quasi-inspection. The difference is real, and highly important. (McEntee, 1992, p 4 )

One of the principals in this study warned about the danger of education being oversimplified, and pointed out that education is much more complex and subtle than can be reflected in checklists (see p.15). Montgomery also warns about simplistic notions of teaching that may arise:

There may be lofty aims such as developing each individual to his or her fullest potential - but how can that be converted to tangible objectives? - and then decide on the best means so that these objectives are met? (Montgomery, 1988, p. 86)

Thus the issue of who appraises, and what it is that they appraise, seem to be issues which had not been considered carefully by many of the schools in this survey. This was particularly evident in the school where a principal took it upon himself to appraise all the teachers in the school by means of a 2-3 hour classroom observation: "I told them we are doing it. No question about it at all! It is the principal's right to visit classrooms."

To be fair, most of the 'How to' articles stress the role of the appraiser as a facilitator, whose task is to aid the appraisee in making objective self-appraisal. Even so, the ability to provide non-judgemental, quality

feedback, is an ability that has to be learned and certainly does not come naturally to most people. This is an area where there could well be some staff development in the future.

The other area that needs considerable thought with respect to staff development, is in assisting teachers to take control of their own summative appraisal. Secondary teachers have always had to do this, but primary teachers have relied for a long time on the external grading system and this research certainly revealed a gap to be filled. The pity will be if formative appraisal comes to be used for this purpose, simply because teachers can see no alternative.

There is still much education to be done with respect to such issues as the confidentiality of appraisal data. This in turn is related to keeping quite distinct the main purposes of appraisal.

Quality, valid appraisal is healthy. It may be difficult to establish links between such appraisal and improved teaching (Edwards, 1992, p.2), but it can target better, more effective staff development, and improve communication and teacher morale. Further, it may help us to know ourselves, as Burns observed:

O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us  
Tae see oursels as others see us  
It wad frae monie a blunder free us  
An' foolish notion.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, J. (1991). Appraisal: Linking Appraisal and Professional Development in Schools. Visiting Teacher Fellowship Report, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Ballard, R. and Duncan, P. (1989). The Role of the Principal and Trustees in Tomorrow's Schools. Wellington: Department of Education.

Battersby, E. (1991). School Based Staff Appraisal, In N. Alcorn and R. Peddie, (eds.) Theory and Practice in Educational Administration, Proceedings of the First New Zealand conference in Educational Administration, pp.201-210. Auckland.

Edwards, W. (1992). Appraising teachers: Is there light at the end of the tunnel? Set No.1. pp.1-4.

Ewing, J.L. (1965). The Appointment and Promotion of Primary School Teachers in New Zealand. Department of Education, Wellington.

- Lange, D. (1988). *Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Educational Administration in New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.
- MacKay, A. (1982). *Project Quest: Teaching Strategies and Pupil Achievement*. Occasional Paper Series, Centre for Research in Teaching, University of Alberta, Edmonton, pp.42-44.
- McEntee, B. (1992) *Teacher Appraisal: A Positive Process for Development?* McEntee Education Consultancy Ltd. Auckland.
- Medley, D. and Coker, H. (1987). How valid are principals' judgements of teacher effectiveness? *Phi Delta Kappan*, Oct. pp. 138-140.
- Ministerial Working Party Report on Assessment for Better Learning (1990). *Tomorrow's Standards*. Learning media: Ministry of Education, Wellington.
- Montgomery, D. (1988) *Teacher appraisal*. *The New Era*. 68, (3). 85-90.
- NZEI (1989) *Report to the Annual General Meeting*. Wellington, NZEI.
- NZEI (1991). *Community Curriculum Concerns*, Rourou, No. 13.
- O'Rourke, M. (1992) *Education Gazette*, Vol. 71. No. 16, 15 Sept. Ministry of Education, Wellington.
- Peel, S. (1991) "Performance Evaluation of Secondary Teachers Under Tomorrow's Schools", in *Theory and Practice in Educational Administration*, eds. N. Alcorn and R. Peddie, *Proceedings of the First New Zealand Conference in Educational Administration*. Auckland.
- Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hawk, K., Kaii, T., Marriot, R. and Poskitt, J. (1990). 'There's No Going Back': Collaborative Decision Making in Education, Final Report. Hamilton: Curriculum Review Research in Schools Project, University of Waikato.
- Taskforce to Review Education Administration (1988). *Administering for Excellence*. Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer. ('Picot Report').
- Weindling, D. (1989). *The Process of School Improvement: Some Practical Messages from Research*. *School Organisation*, 9. (1) 53-64.
- Wragg, E. (1983) *Effective Teaching*. IT-INSET Conference, Cambridge.

yr person or persons

- \* The appraiser was usually the principal or senior staff
- \* An interview between appraisee and appraiser was part of the process





Paper Presented at the Joint AARE/  
NZARE Conference, Geelong, 1992