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INTRODUCTION

The study aims to investigate the effectiveness, as determined by the school-based personnel involved, of the performance review process for classroom teachers. This process is currently being implemented in Victorian government schools in conjunction with the Professional Recognition Program (PRP). Teachers are allocated a reviewer who meets with them early in the year to discuss the parameters within which the review will take place, the data which will be collected, and the means by which this will be undertaken. A mid-year meeting is arranged to review progress, and perhaps to re-negotiate the initial agreement, after which, at the end of the year, the review is held. The review process, whilst subject to the Guidelines published in the Handbook, "Professional Recognition Program for Teachers" (1995), and based on the Professional Teaching Standards developed by the Standards Council of the Teaching Profession, varies from school to school in the data used, the methods by which it is gathered, and the process through which teachers are provided with feedback on their performance.

The review program is implemented in the context of a micropolitical environment. The study also aims to discern the effects, if any, of the review process on staff collegiality, motivation and morale.

This study is not yet complete. Data has been gathered in the form of interviews of teachers and administrators from the participating schools, document studies, and where appropriate, observations. An analysis of the data is currently being undertaken, approximately half of the transcripts having been coded. QSR NUD-IST 4 is being employed in the analysis.

SUMMARY OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE:

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

The term, "performance appraisal" is the one being employed to describe the processes being undertaken in Victorian schools at the present time. The terms "evaluation" and "appraisal" are used almost interchangeably in much of the literature dealing with the topic, however the term "appraisal" appears to be preferred to designate the procedures currently being trialed and implemented in Victoria. The term "evaluation" seems to imply some kind of hierarchical intervention, whereas "appraisal" appears to denote to a greater degree, professional dialogue between colleagues - perhaps between peers. Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1994) make a distinction between the two as follows:

• **evaluation** is "summative assessment for determining whether teachers move from one position to another within a career path," and
• appraisal is "formative assessment for improving the performance of teachers within their current position, and for accountability." (p.12)

They argue that, "by themselves, appraisal schemes are usually not powerful enough to raise the quality of teaching; to achieve its purpose, appraisal must be linked to evaluation and embedded in a process of career development." (p.12)

In non-government schools whose students are educated at considerable expense to the parents, and which rely on what might be termed "customer satisfaction" for continued viability and an enhanced reputation for growth, the concepts of accountability and productivity might be expected to be at the core of an appraisal program, and the professional development of the teaching staff, leading, one might assume, to high quality teaching and learning, to be an equally important consideration. In government schools, although in the climate of "restructure" which prevailed at the time of introduction of the appraisal/review process, the notion of productivity was an important consideration, the primary focus of appraisal would appear to have been the professional development of teaching and non-teaching staff, this to be accomplished by means of self-reflection, assisted by peers and perhaps by superiors, and planning for future development. The Professional Recognition Program (PRP), a relatively recent innovation incorporating the annual Performance Review, conducted in most schools by Principal Class personnel sometimes assisted by teachers at Leading Teacher Level Three, has provided a "top-down" framework within which both primary and post-primary schools are striving to reconcile the dual demands of professional development and professional accountability.

The information concerning performance appraisal to be released by the Directorate of School Education, Victoria is contained in the documentation relating to the "Professional Recognition Program". This was introduced in the "Handbook" (May-June 1995), and has been expanded in the booklet outlining the Accreditation process for Leading Teachers, and Performance Management Guidelines (1996), and subsequently, in the Guidelines booklet (1996). These documents substitute, deliberately it would appear, the term "review" for "appraisal". Whilst dictionary definitions may be misleading in the attempt to assign intention to terminology, it is nevertheless interesting to note that the Macquarie Dictionary defines the term "review" as, "an inspection or examination by viewing, especially a formal inspection...." The initial document further states that the annual review of teachers will be conducted by "the principal, assisted by a process of peer review". This suggests some degree of departure from the purpose of "professional development" which is cited as the primary focus of many of the appraisal programs which were being implemented in many government schools around the state prior to the implementation of the Professional Recognition Program.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER SUPERVISION IN VICTORIA.

During the second half of the nineteenth century in Australia, inspectors were a dominant feature of schooling. Although it would have been proposed at the time that their role was one of quality control, they were viewed to be filling the role of "economic watchdogs". Gitlin and Smyth (1989, 17) refer to teacher evaluation at that time as, "an example of scientific management and bureaucratic control at its autocratic best." They further maintain that, "the drive for efficiency was attributable, in part, to an attempt by the State to legitimize its right to be the 'proper' provider of education in the face of continuing hostility by the Church to maintain what it saw as its traditional prerogative."

In Victoria, the purpose of inspection was the regulation and supervision of the system now described as "payment by results." This system had been introduced from England in the middle of the nineteenth century. Teachers were paid a base salary, plus additional
"bonuses" for the performance of their students on standard tests, on the regularity of school attendance - then regarded as being indicative of effective and successful teaching, and general observed classroom and administrative competence. This endowed the inspector with a high degree of power, and the individual officer was often perceived by teachers as being ruthless, capricious and arrogant (Gitlin and Smyth, 1989, 19). That teachers employed a variety of ruses and strategies in order to "beat the system" could hardly be a cause for speculation, since their livelihoods depended, at least in part, on their receiving a favourable report.

Inspection was retained in both secondary and primary schools, until the mid 1970's in Victoria, the aim being the award of an assessment or "mark" which would entitle the teacher to apply for a position of greater seniority, and hence, a higher level or remuneration. It was abandoned following a determined program of militant action orchestrated by teacher unions, beginning in the late 60's. Evaluation for promotion in government schools prior to the institution of the PRP, has taken the form of teachers presenting an application to school-based panels, which may lead to an interview for those who are "shortlisted." This system still persists for promotion to Leading Teacher Levels Two and Three, and the Principal class. There has been no system of performance appraisal for teachers who have not been applicants for promotion, except that cynically referred to by teachers as the "knife in the back" method, feared by teachers in schools whose falling enrolments have necessitated the declaration of teachers "in excess" by heads of departments, and ultimately by principals.

Prior to the introduction of the Professional Recognition Program many schools, both government and non-government, had initiated and implemented staff appraisal programs, sometimes in consultation with educational consultants or bodies such as the "Professional Development Consortium," a co-operative involving Monash University and teacher unions representing both government and non-government schools. The rationale for such initiatives was to an extent, "It's coming ! Let's do it right - preempt it !" The "Schools of the Future" initiative of the Liberal state government included provisions for the performance review of teachers within the framework of quality control and accountability. The Performance Recognition Program Handbook in its references to "performance review" indicates that such reviews will not only determine the professional advancement of teachers, but will also be used when decisions are reached concerning remuneration increases. It is interesting to compare this initiative with the "payment by results" incentive of the mid nineteenth century in terms of the methods by which teacher performance are determined, and the reliability of the assessments made, particularly as they effect student learning outcomes.

GOALS/PURPOSES OF PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL.

The goals and purposes of professional appraisal may be summarised in two categories: evaluative and developmental. The evaluative purposes include decisions on pay, promotion, demotion, retrenchment and termination. The developmental purposes include research, feedback, management and career development, human resource planning, performance improvement and communication (Schuler, Dowling, Smart and Huber, 1992, 207).

Productivity improvement is of concern to almost all organisations, and what employees do or do not do influences the productivity of the employing organisation. Performance appraisal in industry is viewed as being important because "an effectively designed (appraisal) form serves as a contract between the organisation and the employee, and helps act as a control and evaluation system enabling appraisal to better serve a multitude of purposes" (Schuler et al., 1992, 207) These purposes are outlined as follows:
• **Management development**, providing a framework for future employee development by identifying and preparing individuals for increased responsibilities.

• **Performance measurement**, establishing the relative value of an individual's contribution to the company, and helping to evaluate individual accomplishments.

• **Remuneration and benefits**, helping to determine appropriate pay for performance and equitable salary and bonus incentives based on merit or results.

• **Identification of potential**, identifying candidates for promotion.

• **Feedback**, outlining what is expected from employees against their actual performance levels.

• **Human resource planning**, auditing management talent to evaluate the present supply of human resources for replacement planning.

• **Communications**, providing a format for dialogue between superior and subordinate, and improving understanding of personal goals and concerns. This can also have the effect of increasing the trust between the supervisor and the employee.

Other purposes of performance appraisal are demotions, terminations, internal recruitment and research. Literature pertaining to industrial and business settings may have a limited application when transposed to educational environments. How can a teacher's "productivity" be measured, for example? A return to the system of "payment by results", would not be deemed to be a satisfactory solution to the problem, in view of its historical context. That this may occur to an extent, is a fear expressed by primary school teachers in connection with the introduction of Learning Assessment Program (LAP) which has been introduced into the primary schools by the current state government. The appraisal and evaluation of teacher performance must be viewed in terms of its unique context, not merely in terms of process and product. This would appear to preclude the transposition of performance evaluation processes from industrial settings to educational institutions, and to necessitate the consideration of teacher appraisal/evaluation as a unique issue. The literature concerning the performance appraisal/evaluation of teachers is agreed in its insistence on the necessity of such processes.

Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1994) state that there are two basic reasons why teacher evaluation is necessary.

1. Teachers must be **accountable** - be able to make explicit what they do and why.

2. Teachers must develop professionally - the context and the knowledge base of their work is shifting constantly.

"These two purposes are not mutually exclusive. Each is a facet of professional responsibility" (op. cit., 15).

These two purposes of evaluation or appraisal, which are outlined above as being similar if not identical, are referred to as **summative evaluation** - evaluation for the purpose of obtaining information for the making of personnel decisions, and **formative evaluation** - evaluation for guiding professional career development (Scriven, in Ingvarson and Chadbourne, 1994).
TEACHER APPRAISAL AND PROMOTION IN THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOL MICROPOLITICS.

The literature contains several definitions of micropolitics, most focussing on the strategic use of power in organisations to achieve preferred outcomes. Smylie and Brownlee-Conyers (1991), quote Hoyle's distinction between micropolitics and administration/management as follows:

"micropolitics is more likely to focus on

(a) individual and group self-interests than on organisational goals and

(b) power and influence among individuals and groups than on the structure of authority in organisations, and

(c) informal strategies exercised at the individual and group levels than on formal procedures exercised at the organisational level.

Micropolitics concerns itself with hidden agendas, with the implicit rather than the explicit, and with those activities that occur among individuals and groups outside rather than inside the formal structures of an organisation." (op. cit., 160)

Given this definition, it may be hypothesised that individuals and groups might be constrained to subvert formal procedures and processes to their self-interests even where formal operating procedures exist, but exist without safeguards to prevent their being subverted to the agendas of the special interest groups or individuals.

Blase (1993) maintains that loose coupling theory points out that the capacity of formal bureaucratic mechanisms e.g., policy, to control teachers is limited. The difficulties that administrators experience in exerting influence on teachers have been attributed to factors such as spatial isolation in the workplace, prominence of psychic rewards from work with students, work overload, the complexity and conflicting nature of principals' role demands, lack of opportunities for the promotion of teachers, and the scarcity of external rewards.

Other factors may well be related to the difference between the school as a workplace, and the business or industrial setting in which bureaucratic mechanisms may be expected to be more effective, in view of the fact that supervisors and managers may be expected to at least be perceived by subordinates to possess a higher degree of knowledge by virtue of education or experience. This is not the case in a school, where individual teachers may in fact be more experienced as classroom practitioners than the principal, or may have superior formal educational qualifications.

Blase (1993) defines micropolitics in the following terms:

"Micropolitics refers to the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals in organisations. In large part, political actions result from perceived differences between individuals and groups, coupled with the motivation to use power to influence and/or to protect. Although such actions are consciously motivated, any action, consciously or unconsciously motivated may have political "significance" in a given situation. Both co-operative and conflictive actions and processes are part of the realm of micropolitics." (p.143)
The very powerful research findings of Blase might be considered in the light of the Professional Recognition Program which has been implemented in the Department of School Education, Victoria. Despite the misgivings expressed by teachers in consultation meetings convened to gauge teacher opinion, the principals' assertion that they must be accorded the final decision on appraisal for teacher advancement has been recognised, teachers having no recourse other than to appeal to the Merit Protection Board if they consider that the process has been unfair, and then only on the grounds of procedures employed, rather than the validity of the evaluation methods themselves. It follows then, that there could well be teachers who will experience the negative feelings reported by Blase, and schools which could well be negatively affected by a less than healthy organisational climate. In order to avoid these negative consequences, considerable thought and preparation is required prior to a review process being devised and adopted, to ensure that it addresses the questions of bias and potential favoured treatment of certain individuals in schools.

Review under the Professional Recognition Program is based on a list of Professional Teaching Standards, developed by the Standards Council of the Teaching Profession. The Principal is the reviewer, or may delegate the responsibility to representatives, such as Assistant Principals and in most schools, Level Three teachers. Reviewers meet with each teacher at the beginning of the year in order to clarify the teacher's duties for that year. This will be followed by a further meeting during the year for the formal provision of advice on progress.

"Annual review decisions will be taken by the principal at the end of the school year in the light of each teacher's performance". (Professional Recognition Program for Teachers: Handbook p.8)

There is, however, no stipulation as to the procedure by which data on which the decision is to be based, should be gathered. The mechanics of appraisal are the province of the Principal, who may or may not approach the decision making consultatively. The evaluation processes which are integral to the effectiveness of the Professional Recognition Program indicate that the developers of the plan place great faith - somewhat ingenuously, in view of the findings of Blase, in the impartiality and integrity of the principal. Whilst one can rationally assume that the majority of principals in the service will carry out their responsibilities for the fair, equitable and effective evaluation of teachers scrupulously and with the utmost integrity, equally, as previously stated, one cannot assume that all will do so, and unless there is a legitimate and effective avenue of redress for teachers, there appears to be potential, at least, for abuses to occur. That permission to conduct research was withheld in several schools which were approached, and in one case, withdrawn, the reason given being that it might have proven to be "divisive", suggests that in these schools, the process was not being introduced without some difficulties being encountered.

TEACHER COLLEGIALITY AND APPRAISAL:

Many contributors to the literature refer to the "isolation" of teachers in "egg cell" classrooms as inhibiting their growth as professionals, forcing them to depend on their own resources for the resolution of curricular, instructional and management problems which arise during the planning and conduct of instruction.

Hargreaves (1991) citing the work of other researchers, makes the point that if collegiality is seen as promoting professional growth and internally generated school improvement, it is also widely viewed as a way of securing effective implementation of externally introduced changes, in particular, the implementation of centralised curriculum reform. This has implications for the implementation of the Curriculum and Standards Framework in Victoria,
since the development of school-based courses grounded in the provisions of the Framework depends to a large extent on the co-operative work of faculty groups within the school. Teachers are charged with the responsibility for implementing centrally defined curriculum mandates, which virtually compels them to develop collegial relationships and networks at the school level. Shulman (1989), quoted by Hargreaves states:

“Teacher collegiality and collaboration are not merely important for the improvement of morale and teacher satisfaction...but are absolutely necessary if we wish teaching to be of the highest order.... Collegiality and collaboration are also needed to ensure that teachers benefit from their experiences, and continue to grow during their careers”. (p.47)

Referring to the involvement of teachers in the exercise of leadership at school level, Shulman also comments:

“Schools are asked to become like our best corporations, employing modern methods of management to decentralise authority, to make important decisions at the [point where street-level bureaucrats reside. Leadership is not monopolised by administrators, but is shared with teachers”. (p.48)

Collegiality has two dimensions - sharing between teacher colleagues, and a sharing of leadership between principals and teacher/leaders.

Hargreaves points to a number of “faces” of collegiality - team teaching, collaborative planning, peer coaching, mentor relationships, professional dialogue, collaborative action research, and informal staffroom conversation. He maintains that there is, however, no such thing as “real” or “true” collaboration or collegiality, but only those different forms of collegiality which have different consequences, and serve different purposes. Advocates of collegiality assume that there is a shared culture in school organisations, incorporating values, habits, norms, beliefs and generally “the way things are done”. There may however, be no shared culture, or the differences and disagreements among members of the organisation might outweigh what is held in common.

In the micropolitical perspective, group collegiality, dependent on shared values, may give way to a quest for power and control where differences in an organisation are more apparent than shared views.

Management which is primarily benevolent and skilled can generate a collaborative culture by building consensus, however control-conscious administrators can impose a kind of collegiality by means of the exercise of organisational power. The first type of collegiality is voluntary. The second is contrived, and may indeed violate the rights of the individual, subjecting him/her to group pressure.

Hargreaves distinguishes between “collaborative cultures” and “contrived collegiality” as follows:

In **collaborative cultures**, collaborative working relationships between teachers and their colleagues are:

- **spontaneous** - they emerge primarily from the teachers themselves as a social group. Although they may be facilitated by administrative arrangements, they evolve from, and are sustained by the teaching community itself.
• **voluntary** - they arise not from administrative constraint or compulsion but from a perceived value among teachers that derives from experience, inclination, or non-coercive persuasion that working together is both enjoyable and productive.

• **development orientated** - teachers work together primarily to develop initiatives of their own, or to work on externally supported or mandated initiatives to which they themselves have a commitment. In collaborative cultures, teachers most often establish the tasks and purposes for working together, rather than meet to implement the purposes of others.

• **pervasive across time and space** - working together is not often a scheduled activity (like a regular planning session) that can be administratively fixed as taking place at a designated time, and in a particular place. Scheduled meetings and planning sessions may form part of collaborative cultures, but they do not dominate the arrangements for working together. In collaborative cultures, much of the way teachers work together is almost unnoticed, brief yet frequent informal encounters. Collaborative cultures are in this sense, not clearly or closely regulated. They are constitutive of the very way that the teacher's working life operates at the school.

• **unpredictable**, because in collaborative cultures, teachers have discretion and control over what will be developed, the outcomes of collaboration are often uncertain and not easily predicted. In implementation-orientated systems where most decisions about purpose and program are centralised at the school board, or state level, this unpredictability can be administratively perplexing. In general, therefore, collaborative cultures are incompatible with school systems in which decisions about curriculum and evaluation are highly centralised. The difficulty for administrators seeking to help develop collaborative cultures may, therefore, be a difficulty not so much of human relations, but of political control.

The comparative, combined features of **contrived collegiality** are as follows:

• **administratively regulated**: contrived collegiality does not evolve spontaneously from the initiative of teachers, but is an administrative imposition that requires teachers to meet and work together.

• **compulsory**: contrived collegiality makes working together a matter of compulsion, as in mandatory peer coaching, team teaching, and collaborative planning arrangements. In contrived collegiality, there is little discretion afforded to individuality or solitude. Compulsion may be direct, or it may be indirect in terms of associated promises of promotion and veiled threats of withdrawal or support for teachers' other favoured projects, for example.

• **implementation oriented**: under conditions of contrived collegiality, teachers are required or "persuaded" to work together to implement the mandates of others - most directly those of the principal, or indirectly those of the school board, the state or the nation. Such mandates may take the form of a national curriculum, accelerated learning programs, or co-operative learning strategies. Collegial co-operation is closely tied to administrative co-option.

• **fixed in time and space**: contrived collegiality takes place in particular places at particular times. This is part of its administrative regulation. When, for example, peer coaching sessions, collaborative planning meetings in preparation time, and mentor meetings alone constitute teachers' joint working relationships, they amount to trying to secure co-operation by contrivance.

• **predictable**: contrived collegiality is designed to have relatively high predictability in its outcomes, although this cannot be guaranteed.
It would appear that collegiality, particularly that which exists in a **collaborative culture**, can promote professional growth, and in turn, school improvement. Policies and practices of teacher evaluation might be expected to impact on the development of collegiality within a school staff. It could be predicted that the involvement of peers in summative evaluation would reduce trust and openness in the collaborative relationships, particularly in a situation in which the method of data collection on which the evaluation was to be based had not been clearly indicated to the teachers, as appears to be the case in the evaluation of Level 1 and 2 teachers under the new Professional Recognition Program guidelines in Victorian government schools. This would be exacerbated in schools in which teachers could identify a "political" climate, characterised by "coalition building" on the part of the principal or senior staff, or in which teachers could sense that they were not fully accepted, due to their not being fully integrated into the prevailing culture. The co-existence of an evaluation system, perceived by administrators and teachers as being **effective**, **equitable** and **humane** and a collaborative culture could be postulated. Conversely, an evaluation system perceived to be unfair, inequitable, and affected by the political intrigues of those possessing power, would be unlikely, in view of the foregoing literature, to be accompanied by a voluntary, collaborative culture.

**FOCUS FOR RESEARCH - RESEARCH QUESTIONS.**

An extensive review of the available literature, much of it emanating from the United States, in which evaluation in one form or another has been a fact of life for teachers for some considerable time, gave rise to the following key questions:

1. **Perceived effectiveness:**
   What are the features, identifiable by teachers and administrators, of appraisal programs, which cause the programs to be deemed **"effective"**?

2. **Motivation of teachers to improve performance, and to grow and develop professionally:**
   How do appraisal programs in schools succeed in:
   
   (a) Motivating teachers to improve their performance, and

   (b) Providing assistance for teachers to grow and develop professionally?

3. **Morale, Collegiality, School micropolitics:**
   What effect do appraisal programs exert on:
   
   (a) teacher morale

   (b) the development and maintenance of a voluntary, collaborative collegiality, and

   (c) the relationships between administration (Principal, Assistant/Vice Principal, senior staff) and the teaching staff.
The literature suggested a number of propositions which the research sets out to test. These are listed as they relate to the key questions:

(1) EFFECTIVENESS:

(a) Teachers and administrators will make judgments concerning the effectiveness of an appraisal program, based on their own beliefs and perceptions, rather than on empirical evidence.

(b) That a program which is perceived to be "effective" will be seen to incorporate standards by which an improvement in performance may be assessed. These may be based on the Professional Teaching Standards determined by the Standards Council in Victoria, a "duties based" model along the lines advocated by Scriven (Ingvason and Chadbourne, 1994), or goals jointly agreed by appraiser and appraisee at the outset.

(c) That to be perceived as "effective" by teachers, appraisal must take into account the "context" in which the teacher works. This has been postulated by Darling-Hammond (1990), Natriello(1990), and by Hatry and Greiner (1985) when they advocate a "Performance by Objectives" approach to appraisal, which permits environmental factors - "context" - to be accommodated.

(d) That for an appraisal program for the purpose of evaluation, or in Victorian terms, "review", to be considered "effective" by teachers who are reviewed, the reviewer - Principal or superior, or delegate - must be viewed as being qualified, capable and adequately prepared to make a judgment concerning the teacher's prowess. The literature from the USA suggests that the complexity of the teaching task; the degree of individuality with which individuals approach it; the breadth and scope of the criteria - at least in the DSE's Professional Recognition Program - and the time which will be required to review annually, the performance of all teachers in a given school, may well result in at best, an annual routine, conducted on a superficial level to satisfy bureaucratic decree, or at worst, summary judgments, made substantially on the basis of hearsay "evidence" from the Principal's close associates - a "knife in the back" approach to review or evaluation.

(e) The literature cited identifies two primary purposes for teacher appraisal/evaluation:

- provision of data in order that personnel decisions may be reached concerning promotion, the awarding of salary increments, tenure etc.
- the provision of feedback to teachers regarding their performance, which will become the basis for the professional development, and professional growth of the individual.

That even where appraisal and review processes are separated, the nature of the review process, and the fact that in government schools at least, it is the responsibility of the Principal, may cause review to assume a pre-eminent position in comparison with appraisal for professional growth and development.

(f) That teachers may be more likely to view as "effective" an appraisal/evaluation process in schools which employs more than one data-collection method, so that the profile obtained of the teacher's performance is as complete and representative as possible. This approach to data collection is advocated by McGreal (1991), in the literature cited.

(g) That the quality, as perceived by the teachers, of the feedback they receive in the course of an appraisal/evaluation process, is likely to substantially effect their perceptions of the
effectiveness of the process. Natriello (1990), Duke and Stiggins (1990), Ingvarson and Chadbourne(1994) and others point to the importance of informative feedback, based on the adequate collection of information.

(h) That appraisal for the purpose of professional development has the potential to improve performance only to the extent that the teacher is assisted with time and resources, to follow up on areas targeted by the appraisal for improvement. The assistance provided to the teacher as part of the appraisal program determines whether the program is a genuine professional development audit for the individual teacher, or simply a ritual to be followed.

Natriello, and Duke and Stiggins point to the importance of time and resources being employed to assist teachers to develop professionally, following an appraisal of performance which targets areas in need of improvement.

(2) MOTIVATION, and PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) That if teachers perceive that effort and superior performance are rewarded in some way, either by some tangible means, or by positive feedback from superiors or recognition, they are likely to be motivated to continue superior performance, or work to improve poor or adequate performance. Conversely, where effort or superior performance are perceived to be unrewarded in terms of tangible rewards such as opportunities for promotion, tangible rewards in terms of salary increments or positions of responsibility, or positive feedback or recognition from superiors, they are likely to be negatively motivated.

This is suggested by Vroom's theory of motivation, which postulates that performance and reward relationships, motivate employees to continue to expand effort toward the accomplishment of organisational goals and objectives. Effort and improved or superior performance which is unrewarded is likely to decline as the motivation diminishes or becomes negative.

(b) That "motivators" will differ from one teacher to another. Some will be intrinsically motivated by feedback which indicates improved or superior performance, whilst others may be equally or more effectively motivated by extrinsic rewards - promotion, or salary increment. Darling-Hammond's "views of teaching" (1990) - as labour, a profession and an art - are relevant to this issue, since it may be expected that teachers who view their work as professional, requiring the exercise of judgment and problem-solving skills, or as art, requiring intuition, creativity and improvisation as well as the requisite professional knowledge and skill, may be less dependent on extrinsic or tangible rewards than teachers who hold the view of teaching as labour. "Motivators" may well depend on the teacher's years of experience and the level at which he/she is currently operating, in terms of a career structure, as the views of Schlechty (1987) and Futrell (1987) suggest.

(c) That positive motivation resulting from an appraisal process might be expected to be directly related to the clarity of the statement of expectations, as in Scriven's "duties - based" model of evaluation (1994), or the clarity of the goal setting, as in Hatry and Greiner's "Performance by Objectives" model (1985)

(d) That individual teachers may be expected to react to evaluation or review in quite different ways - one perceiving it as a challenge, another viewing it as a source of stress and anxiety. This is recognised by Natriello (1990), who proposes evaluation models which have clear goals, the employment of a range of data-collecting methods, frequent and informative feedback, and resources provided to assist teachers in improving performance in order to present a less threatening prospect.
(3) MORALE, COLLEGIALITY and SCHOOL MICROPOLITICS.

(a) That where teachers perceive that "rewards", in terms of salary gains or promotional opportunities, are unrelated or only marginally related to performance, and that particular individuals are favoured, morale will be negatively affected.

Mintzberg (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1990, p.363) refers to the playing of "political games" in organisations, one of the "games" being the "sponsorship game", in which those in positions of power foster the interests of those subordinates who give them uncritical commitment and loyalty, and generally ingratiate themselves. Scriven (1994) refers to the existence of the "old boys network". The research conducted by Blase concerning the politics of favouritism in schools, found that principals manipulated opportunities for the acquisition of valuable information, manipulated opportunities for advancement and recognition, and generally favoured certain individuals at the expense of others irrespective of performance. Blase (1993) found that such behaviour on the part of administrators was directly associated with negative effects on motivation, morale, job satisfaction and work effort for preparation and classroom instruction. Maclean (1992) in his Tasmanian study found that teachers perceived that factors other than effectiveness and competence - factors which might be termed "political" - had a significant bearing on promotion.

(b) That where a significant number of individuals experience low morale as a consequence of perceptions of "unfairness" in evaluations or reviews, the resulting lowering of morale may be expected to "flow on" to other members of the staff. Teachers who participated in the studies conducted by Blase, reported that significant perceived levels of favouritism on the part of administrators resulted in a general lowering of morale, an increase in conflict, and the formation of splits and "cliques" among members of staff.

(c) That where peer appraisal or peer-assisted appraisal is negatively critical, or where it doubles as, or serves the review process, collegial communication and trust might be adversely affected. It might be expected that teachers will be reluctant to share ideas, to admit weaknesses, and to engage in frank discussion with a view to seeking a solution for problems, if they perceive that such communication may be to their detriment. Even given a situation where peer appraisal is conducted for professional development purposes only, collegial communication may be adversely affected if agreed confidentiality is not maintained, or there is a fear that it will not be maintained.

(d) Appraisal which has been designed and implemented with the sole purpose of professional development, so that it can only have a positive outcome for teachers, may be expected to improve the working relationship between the Principal/senior staff and teachers. Review on the other hand, particularly if the consequences are negative, or perceived as being potentially negative, might be expected to:

- widen the gap between administration and staff
- reinforce authoritarian/hierarchical relationships
- cause teachers to be guarded or "careful" in their communication, ensuring that their difficulties remain hidden
- create conflict, interpersonal animosities and suspicion.

Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1994) point out that the judgmental nature of review or evaluation may well inhibit the collegiality and openness required to make appraisal in the
formative sense work, and recommend that evaluation be conducted by external professional bodies.

RESEARCH METHOD:

The case study method has been selected. Lang (1993) states that, "The case study, ......is the method of choice for studying interventions or innovations, and education is replete with these". (p.140) "The case study is preferred in examining contemporary events, but when the relevant behaviours cannot be manipulated", according to Yin (1984), who also maintains that the case study method has a distinct advantage when "a "how" or "why" question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control". (p.20) Merriam (1988) defines the case study as "an examination of a specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution or a social group". (p.9) She further states that "case study is a design particularly situated to situations where it is impossible to separate the phenomenon's variables from their context".

The individual school is the unit of analysis, or the "case" for the purpose of the study. The unit constitutes a "bounded system" or "an instance drawn from a class"using the terminology of Adelman, Jenkins and Kemmis (1983), cited by Merriam (1988) (p.45). Since there is enormous potential for schools to differ, by virtue of mission, ethos, clientele, and the personalities which constitute the administration and staff generally, all of which in turn constitute the context in which appraisal takes place, this study has been envisaged as being a multi-site case study, involving four different schools, one of which will be an independent school. The findings are being analysed separately, and will be presented as three separate "portraits" of teacher appraisal, then a cross-case analysis will be attempted, leading to generalisations relating to the research questions outlined above. Yin (1984) states that "multiple case studies have distinct advantages and disadvantages in comparison to single-case designs. The evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust". (p.48) He advocates "replication logic" in the conduct of multiple case studies. The method of data collection and analysis remains the same for all three "cases", therefore.

A "pilot study" was undertaken in order to refine data gathering and analysis methods.

Selection of participants:

In order that a cross-section of opinion within each individual school might be obtained, "purposive sampling" was undertaken, based primarily on years of experience of the teachers who were invited to take part, but also including consideration of particular teaching areas. The sampling process was guided by the administration, or by the staff member responsible for the appraisal process within the school, but not necessarily determined by that person.

Method(s) of data collection:

Data was collected primarily by means of semi-structured interviews, the same basic schedules, based at least initially on the guiding propositions, having been employed in all schools studied. Since the study is the work of one person without secretarial assistance, some notes were taken during the interviews in order to provide a frame of reference for later compilation of an interview log. Interviews were audio-taped, in order that the interviewer had an opportunity to establish and maintain eye contact with the participant, and thereby retain his/her interest in the "conversation". Following the interview, an "interview
"log" as described by Merriam (1988) was written. This constitutes notes on the statements and comments made by the interviewee which the researcher identified as being significant or important. The bulk of each interview was transcribed exactly, only irrelevant comment or social discussion being omitted.

**Triangulation:**

Whilst interviewing was the primary method of data collection employed, effort was made to study **documentation** in each school, although it was recognised that the confidentiality of the appraisal process would preclude the gathering of data by this method. **Observation** was also employed, where permitted. Whilst it was not envisaged that observation of actual appraisal processes would be possible, it was possible to conduct observations of meetings and professional development activities relevant to the appraisal process. The interviewing of administration and teachers - the appraisers and appraised, was calculated to ensure a balance of information received, and the presentation of possibly divergent viewpoints.

**THE SCHOOLS:**

The study was undertaken in three government schools and one independent school.

- A government secondary college in a large regional centre
- A government secondary college in a small country town
- A single campus of a large, multi-campus, secondary college in an outer metropolitan area of Melbourne
- An independent, K-12 college for girls in Melbourne.

The government schools had all implemented a review process mandated by the Department of Education as part of the Professional Recognition Program. The Council of the independent school had instructed the Administration to implement an appraisal process, but had not been prescriptive as to the nature or mechanics of that process. The school had sought the input of consultants, involved the staff as a whole, then a small group of volunteers from the staff which had conducted a pilot process. The staff who had participated in this pilot were interviewed, following its conclusion.

One of the government schools had also involved the staff in consultation from the outset, and had tailored the process to the school's needs, according to recommendations from a staff committee which had been convened for the purpose. That teachers felt some ownership for the school's version of the review process came across strongly in the interviews, and possibly influenced their views to some extent. The other government schools had not consulted to the same extent, although senior staff members - the Leading Teachers, had been involved in the implementation of the process.

Analysis is based on the guiding theoretical propositions, which were in turn based on the review of the literature and insights derived from it. These propositions induced the questions which guided the interviews.

The strategy which is being employed has been described by Yin (1984) (p.107) as a special type of "pattern-matching" - "explanation - building". This involves:

- comparison of the findings of the initial case against the proposition,
• revising the proposition,

• comparing other details of the case against the revision,

• again revising the proposition,

• then comparing this revision to the facts of the other two cases during the final stage of cross-case analysis.

Each case is being analysed separately at first, against the propositions guiding the interview questions, then a cross-case analysis will be attempted, involving where possible, all three cases.

Interview transcripts are being coded using QSR NUD.IST Rev.4. Approximately one third of the transcripts have been coded to date, making possible only a very vague indication of trends in comparison with the research Propositions.

**Observations recorded at the current stage of analysis.**

**Perceived effectiveness:**

Teachers appear to be either neutral toward the process in terms of its effectiveness, or in favour. Very little antagonism has been noted. The predominant view appears to be that the review process is an additional imposition placed on teachers, but not one against there is a great deal of resentment. Perhaps this is a conditioned response to the continual process of change to which teachers have been exposed during the past decade. It is also possible that they responded to the interviews with a degree of reserve and political astuteness.

Several teachers indicated that they were aware of possibilities for performance enhancement inherent in the process, should time and resources be devoted to it within the school, and recommendations for professional development arising from it be followed through.

Some of the reasons given by teachers who viewed the process as being effective are:

- financial bonuses
- learning the opinions of others regarding one's own performance

*(Teacher)*"It's nice having someone say that you're doing things right. It always is - in any job! I don't think that there's enough of that in teaching. All too often, by the time you've worked your way through the group of classes of kids during the day, you end up feeling that you're incompetent, that you haven't taught them anything, and the rest of it. That can be pretty depressing. That's where it's important to have people saying - "We really appreciate that you did this", or "That was really good. You did well here. These kids are showing improvement", or whatever."

*(T)* "There are two types, aren't there - the people who aren't Level 12 .....they can go into the next pay sub-division, can't they, so for them, I guess the purpose is primarily to see whether they qualify for that, but for the others, given that.......for me, whether I passed the appraisal or not, it didn't affect my pay. All it was going to do was make me more aware of myself, and what people thought of me."

- assists the improvement of weak areas of performance
"I think the main aim of it is that you can simply sit down, have a look at the areas you can improve, see what you are doing right - get some encouragement as well as places that you can improve - not only for you - the person reviewing you gets to know you a little bit better, and that's a big help in the school - to simply know more about other teachers. I don't think there's enough of it."

"Effective in what........I guess the system here, in making people aware of their shortcomings, is very effective. I don't know whether there are any other reasons for assessment....bonuses, or whatever.....it certainly is a means of making people aware of what others think of them, and where their weak areas are, and going away and fixing them up......it's certainly effective in that regard."

- discussion of one's performance on a one-to-one basis

"I think realistically its main purpose is to have a check on teachers and make sure that there's some accountability, but I think its real purpose is to give positive feedback to teachers, and realistic feedback, and I think it's helped enormously in developing positive relationships between people in our school. The people that I've worked with on a very personal level - it has made an enormous difference to people's understanding of one another, both the people who feed into their review, and the people who actually do the review with me. I think that only positive relationships come out of those times that we spend together."

- a range of people involved, therefore a valid assessment of performance
- the process is structured and predictable
- useful for the beginning teacher
- effective only if it generates action - responsibility of teacher and reviewer - must be followed up by some action for improvement.

"I think it'd only effective if you use the information that comes out of it. You can do all the work in the world, and be TOLD all the things in the world, but if you don't do something about it, then no- it is not very effective. It's up to the individual, and it's up to the reviewer to make sure that that person is encouraged to take on, or change, or develop whatever it is they need to do, so that the next time one is appraised, they can say - yes I've done this, this and this. This will be the test - the second time when you check to see what you've done, and if there's been an improvement or not."

"I think it's really up to the individual. Some people are very aware of their failings - places they could tighten up in their teaching. They would tend to do it themselves anyway, as they self-assess. Other people just do the chalk and talk and manage to survive until the end of the lesson, and really don't give much thought to it. But again, it's whether you put it into action or not. A guy came last year on a PD day and spoke really interestingly, I thought, on how students learn - that some students learn better with chalk and talk, and some learn better with giving them a picture, and visual stimulation, yet I haven't put that into action, and there are things I could have done from it. That's as big a criticism of this as it is of professional development days - it only works if you take the step afterwards and put it into action. You can sit down afterwards on your second review and say, "Oh yes, I've tried this", and you might have only tried it for ten minutes in a lesson. You could do a con job if you wanted to, even with other people assessing you - your peers hanging reviews on you. Unless they're in a classroom with you - you have to choose very carefully, or they simply are not going to know what you do anyway."
Others who viewed it as being ineffective gave the following reasons:

- lack of relevance to one's role in the school (librarians, student welfare co-ordinators)
- inexperience of reviewer in the role of the teacher being reviewed

(T) "I was really worried I'd be assessed on things that were just in the classroom, and they did assess me as much as they could on the ............ side of things, but it was really fishing in the dark. They could only push questions that they really understood - on what was involved in ............ and until you do the job, you just don't understand it. In the same way, I wouldn't understand exactly what being a deputy principal is about, even though I know they work very hard, and they do these few odd things - I really don't understand the job until I do it. I think they are just as vague about being a ................

• insufficient incentive for teachers on level 12+

(Reviewer)" I think the group of people who are perhaps a little cynical about it - maybe over time their cynicism will change - would be the people who are sitting there with no more increments to achieve, and who perhaps initially saw it as a waste of their personal time, and insignificant for their professional development. I would be optimistic that because we are now in our second year, we're trimming it a little for them, and making it more as a way of designing their professional development for the next year - trying to excite them about something that they will do. Perhaps that cynicism is fading a little, and they can see that - there might not be money in it, but there are other benefits. When they're in their last five or ten years of teaching before they're going to move out the other end - you need something like that to keep you going. Maybe for those people it's come at a good time too - that group of people who are 45+ and who are realistically saying, "I'm not going to get a promotion position". There are people here who've missed out on their L2's and L3's, and realistically, they might never get a position. They need a purpose in keeping excited, and maybe it will provide that, if it stays a positive process. They're the people I worry about in the process."

(R) "It's very difficult as a person in their late 30's or 40's not to be able to look forward to a financial improvement over the next 15 years of your working life. There aren't many professions where you can't look forward to your salary improving over time as you put in more time and effort. I think there would be a lot of benefit if the government could accommodate that in some way into this process, because then I think the REAL benefit of it would flow - the people would move with it. Realistically, there are still no monetary rewards for people who are doing a wonderful job in the classroom. The pats on the back are valuable, but we live in a real world. We have families, and we have commitments, and I think people are entitled to some monetary recognition for extra effort - for maintaining an effort, and getting improved outcomes. You look at accountants, doctors - other professions, and they don't get stuck in their early 30's or early 40's like some teachers are being asked to be happy about being stuck. Financially, it's really difficult for some people."

(T) "It's a tough one, I mean, I can only speak from my opinion, as a person at Level 12......it has no bearing on me. I've reached the top. I've got nowhere else to go, so nothing's going to happen to me if the process doesn't go on, or
if the process goes on. If I were a teacher who was on the bottom level, I'd see it as a really good process. I think that if I were a young man now, I would be accelerating through the levels a lot quicker than I have done in the past.”

- insufficient incentive for teachers still on incremental scale - Principals unwilling to allow teachers to access more than one level at a time for financial reasons. Process viewed as “another hoop to jump through”.

- similar process at all experience levels leads to unfairness in outcomes young teachers not catered for in the process. In the words of one:

  "If you get a good appraisal at the start of your teaching career, you've got nowhere to go. So how do you get the improvement and the professional development out of the appraisal? You don't get an incentive out of the appraisal either. I've got my next appraisal coming up in the next three weeks. What's going to be different about it from last year? I can't see that there's going to be a difference from last year."

  "That's where I worry that a process that could work really well isn't going to, because people are going to see it as being a Mickey Mouse sort of hoop jumping."

When asked whether or not they had consciously changed any aspects of their teaching in response to review advice, few teachers identified aspects of teaching which they had changed. One or two stated that they were making an effort to involve students to a greater extent in the lessons, however most cited aspects such as clarifying their own assessment and reporting procedures, rather than any modifications to actual curriculum delivery or classroom strategy.

(T) "I'm a little bit more conscious, but - what came out of my review wasn't really useful for changing teaching - actually it was me saying, "I want to change my reports a little bit", and the Principal going, "I don't think they need to be. OK. If you want to say that's what you need to improve, we'll talk about it." So it wasn't as constructive as it could have been, but it might have been for other people, so that's hard to know."

(T) "I wouldn't say I've gained a lot, simply because I'm the sort of person who does self-appraise - I do sit down and think - now how could I have done that better. And I will bounce off other people - say, "What do you do in this situation?" I don't think it was an earth-shattering revelation as far as I'm concerned. I consider myself to be a relatively competent teacher and I think that was simply confirmed when I went to the review which was nice....... I think you've got to believe in the ability of your reviewer and any of your peers who have reviewed you to really understand you, and to comment."

(T) "I don't think it's changed it much. It's probably changed some things.....I'm probably more inclined to ask kids what they think about some things, and involve them more, because that was a weakness of mine....I was seen as rather domineering."

Some motivating features of the process were identified as follows:

- attention on one's self during the process
"If you get the chance to sit down and talk about your favourite subject, which in most cases is yourself, then sure, you're going to appreciate it. It's quite a satisfying experience - to get into a Principal's office and the topic of the hour is (Name)..... Everyone's concentrating their attention.....being the egotists that we are, I guess we all appreciate that, and the recommendations are made in affable circumstances. The Principal says, "I think you should do this and that", and you walk away, and you do do it. I found it reasonably motivating."

- professional factors
- financial reward for teachers on the incremental scale
- affirmation/feeling "valued" for one's contribution to the school

(R) "If I look personally at the teachers I've been involved with, I think because it's a chance at last to get some accurate, positive feedback on how we're going in all the levels that we're working in - with kids - with parents - with faculty - with other areas that we're working in - when you get feedback that's positive, you can only be encouraged to maintain your efforts. I think that maybe if we'd started this ten years ago, we might have coped as groups of people better with all the changes that have been imposed on us than we did. I think through all that process of change, we lost sight of maintaining a realistic view of what we were on about - what we were doing. I think at last we're getting it right. It would have been better ten years ago. The five or six years of all those changes were very difficult, because at the same time, we were working harder than we'd ever worked before, and not getting any feedback. At last we're getting some feedback, and I think it has encouraged people to motivate themselves to keep trying and looking for other ways of doing things."

- useful for future job applications
- feeling good about one's work
- feeling good about colleagues' perceptions of one's contribution to the school
- positive feedback concerning performance
- beneficial if it focuses on professional development
- encourages the administration to develop a sensitivity to the needs of teachers
- necessary for the 45+ age group - encourages them to review their methods and attitudes

whilst the following were viewed as being "demotivators":

- fear

(T) "Teachers are more aware of pinpointing weaknesses in other teachers - I don't know if this is related to the review process. Because I came in at the start of the excess problem, I think that has been the cause of it. I think that there's concern among some teachers that the review process will then be used to decide excess, which - we've been told it hasn't, but at the same time - you know - it's evident - maybe the Principal class and the Level Three's will become more aware of each individual teacher, and therefore they can make a better decision. The review process kind of fits in the middle there - a way of being aware."
"It depends on how it's used, again. If you've got an administration who decide that they're going to sit down and really look at everyone's reviews together and collate figures, or anything along those lines, staff could see it perhaps as threatening - to think that they were the little number on the graph - well I know that that one there standing on their own is me! It would depend on what was on the review. That could be very threatening. I would have a pink fit! I don't think that the management here would do that. People were squawking at the time, "does this mean you're going to read my review", and therefore, my job will be on the line, if I'm not doing what fits in with the school policy etc. I don't see it happening here, but I can see it happening in some schools.....or if there were a directive for it to occur - that could be very threatening."

- mistrust of reviewers

"I see the negative side. I have very little trust in the leaders in the school. I think they've got their positions not on the work they've done around the place.....that's what they're supposed to do - to look at what you've done and what you can do, and that's how you get the positions, but I can see some of the leaders around here.....my opinion of them as teachers, and the stuff that they do in their classroom....they've got no qualities at all. I've got no confidence in them at all, which is bad for morale. I don't trust them."

- anxiety that review will affect the likelihood of contract renewal
- nothing tangible to gain from the process
- process has the potential to devastate, if feedback not handled sensitively

"I've heard other people who I think have taken it on board personally.......because teachers by their very nature are very personal people. They take things to heart. They believe what they're doing is right and that's the sort of people they are.......and they work very hard at their job. They put in a lot. When you put in a lot and work very hard, and you make a mistake but don't see it's obvious.......... it can be very hurtful and demoralising, because it's a very "giving" career."

The ones that I've reviewed, I would say that it's done the opposite, (i.e. adversely affected relationships with staff colleagues) because I have found that the peers have been far more positive about the person's performance than the person themselves, and for the person to get that sort of feedback on how their peers are seeing them has been of enormous value to them. It has also allowed them to look at their own perspective, and say, "Maybe my perception of how I'm going is a little harsh", so there's been value there. As a person who's done some reviews as a peer reviewer, I have felt some tension for myself in being honest about a person's performance, and I addressed it with the person, saying that I had been asked to comment on the performance, and I had put it at this level because we have talked about this, and I sense this is how you feel too. I have tried to address it with the person, rather than hoping they did not find out that I'd said something. I think that's the difficult area - you're caught between being what you see as honest, and keeping your neck out of the noose. The process allows for strict confidentiality, so people can be honest. It makes them squirm a bit, but I think there's a lot of value in talking to the person on whom you've commented.

- in initial stages, viewed as "Big Brother watching"
At this stage of analysis, the process appears to have little effect on the morale of teachers, apart from the additional burden on their time. Some viewed it initially as threatening, however the element of threat has diminished with familiarity.

(T) "It might de-motivate people who don’t get a very good review, but at our place, I think you’d have to be doing a shocking job to get a bad review, so then I don’t know if de-motivation is of concern."

Similarly, relationships between reviewers and reviewees appear to change little as a result of the process. One or two teachers cited the development of more positive relationships with their reviewer following involvement in the process, however most appeared to regard the process on a professional footing and stated that their relationship with the reviewer remained unchanged. One person interviewed highlighted the difficulty an administrator might experience in reviewing a colleague of long standing:

(T) "I know a fellow who is going to be reviewing another fellow, and he has enormous respect for this person in some ways, especially his organisational abilities and his out of classroom contribution to the school, but he doesn’t have much of an opinion of the guy as regards his classroom control rapport with the kids, or delivery of his lessons. Now he’s going to be reviewing him, and he really is in a dilemma, because he does not believe at this stage, that he’s got the guts to tell him.....he’s said to me, "How am I going to rate so-and-so, because you and I both know that lots of aspects of his delivery are terrible, but am I going to have to be the one to tell him?" That's a problem, because at this stage, I would say that he's not going to tell him. Last year, we had a fellow who shouldn't have got an increment...in fact, a fellow who's since taken a package, but he reviewed OK. He came through the process, and he shouldn't have. The kids laughed at him to his face, jumped out of windows, launched rockets in his room etc. Any system that can give a favourable review grading to that person - it's got to be flawed."

whilst another expressed anger and disappointment at a report given by a Head of Department which was less than commendatory, and was seen as being negatively biased rather than being based on evidence. Generally, the aspect of reviewer/reviewee relations received favourable comment. The issue of honesty versus friendship was mentioned by one or two reviewers, however the confidentiality of the process appears to work toward lessening the possibility of tension.

The time factor was stressed by both teachers and administrators from all the schools, particularly by the government school participants, since the process has been "added on" to the duties already being performed. The view that the absence of time allocated for the process severely limited its value both to the individual teacher and to the school as a whole, was universally expressed. The independent school had allocated some time to the process, providing some part of the school day in which appraiser and appraisee could meet. It was recognised by both administrators and teachers, however, that a considerable amount of teachers’ own time would nevertheless be required, if the process were to be implemented effectively.

The above observations are drawn from a superficial analysis undertaken whilst the transcripts were being typed, and the coding of only a fraction of the transcripts. Whilst interesting, they provide an indeterminate indication only, of the outcomes of the study at this stage of the analysis.
Summary of observations:

It would appear, at this relatively early stage of data analysis, that teachers tend to either accept the concept of performance review passively, or view it as being a relatively positive process, having the potential to enhance performance, perhaps in the long term, to improve student learning outcomes.

The primary difficulty expressed by both teachers and those who are reviewing them, is the resource-neutral context in which the process has been implemented. It would appear that although the process is viewed as having inherent potential, its beneficial effects are at the very least, being inhibited by the lack of time provided for the implementation of the process. Reviewers who were attempting to realise the potential of the process for the teachers for whom they were responsible, were almost unanimous in their regret that more time was not available for discussion with the teachers, for teachers to collate and present professional portfolios, or for procedures such as mutually agreed observations to take place. This has been supported by the views expressed by the independent school personnel, for whom time was made available, albeit not a great deal, and who were, as a consequence, able to use data such as videotaped classes in the discussions.

The predominantly positive or neutral perspective gained may well have been influenced by the climate prevailing within the schools which agreed to participate in the study. Approval was denied by several schools, in one instance, the reason given was that the study could prove to be "divisive". Had data been collected in these schools, different views could well have been presented.
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