APPRAISAL: A PROCESS FOR CONTROL OR DEVELOPMENT?

**A study of teacher accountability, power and decision-making
with emphasis on the New Zealand context**

by

Sandra Wendy Aikin

**A three paper thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Education:Policy and Research**

Victoria University of Wellington

1994

ABSTRACT

This sociological–historical study aims to contribute to the understanding and analysis of the changing pattern of power and decision–making in education apparent in the development of teacher appraisal policy. The study provides an account of the factors influencing the New Zealand teacher appraisal policy draft which at the time of writing is still to be released. A range of considerations to be taken into account is exposed and the signposts for the development of teacher appraisal policy are made explicit. This is achieved by making the process transparent as well as recognising and evaluating the contribution made by participants.

A key feature of this study is the examination of the 'policy importation' process as the emerging demand for greater teacher accountability in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand has resulted in the formalisation of the assessment of teachers' professional performance through appraisal policies.

This study argues that three perspectives have shaped the debate on teacher appraisal: neo–liberal market; managerial; and professional. It posits that a noticeable shift has been made towards the requirements of managerial accountability and examines the reasons for this.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My very considerable debts to family, friends and colleagues are scattered far and wide. There are too many to acknowledge all in name. But this thesis would never have been completed without their support, encouragement, understanding and patience. It has been a formidable and triumphant experience for us all.

I would, however, like to acknowledge the highly stimulating professional discussions and guidance given to me by my supervisors, Professor Hugh Lauder and Dr John Barrington. Ruth Mansell and Ken Rae gave me the benefit of a frank and full appraisal of my first draft. NZEI Te Riu Roa my employer honoured me with its confidence that I would complete this study. I was given every encouragement, access to all the technology available to the organisation, and plenty of paper. In particular, the library staff of NZEI Te Riu Roa has been stalwart friends who carried out my requests, sometimes at short notice with zest, zeal and amazing tolerance. To Penny Pruden whose friendship and skills motivated me in my lonely task, I express my great appreciation.

I owe a special debt and thanks to those who agreed to be interviewed. Their generous and open co-operation represents to me the best things about professionalism in New Zealand.

Finally, my thanks to my friend Shona Macaskill, whose conversation, direction and humour have had very important effects on my professional and personal development.

CONTENTS

Title page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii

CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background and significance of research	1
1.2	Research investigation	3
1.3	An outline of the thesis	4
1.4	Key features	7
1.5	Terminology	7
1.6	Overseas imperatives for teacher appraisal	8
	<i>United Kingdom</i>	8
	<i>United States of America</i>	10
1.7	Discussion	12
1.8	Notes	13

CHAPTER TWO : ACCOUNTABILITY

2.1	The age of accountability	15
2.2	A teacher's work	17
2.3	Defining accountability	18
2.4	Forms of accountability	20
	<i>Professional</i>	21
	<i>Market</i>	22
	<i>Management</i>	23
2.5	Discussion	25
2.6	Notes	26

CHAPTER THREE : MODELS OF APPRAISAL

3.1	Purposes of teacher evaluation	27
3.2	Summative versus formative models	28
	<i>Common-Law model</i>	30
	<i>Goal setting models</i>	32
	<i>Product models</i>	34
	<i>Clinical supervision models</i>	36
	<i>Composite model</i>	38
	<i>Competency-based model</i>	40
3.3	Discussion	41
3.4	Notes	44

CHAPTER FOUR : POLICY MAKING AND POLICY TRANSFER

4.1	Concept of policy making	45
4.2	Agenda setting	47
4.3	Policy making models	49
	<i>A rational decision making model</i>	49
	<i>An incremental policy model</i>	50
4.4	Policy process	51
4.5	Participants	52
4.6	Policy transfer	53
4.7	Discussion	61
4.8	Notes	63

CHAPTER FIVE : TEACHER ACCOUNTABILITY AND APPRAISAL IN NEW ZEALAND – A CASE STUDY

5.1	Background	65
5.2	Fourth Labour government 1984–1990	67
5.3	Accountability for teaching performance	67
	<i>Inquiry into the quality of teaching</i>	68
5.4	Neo-liberal views	70
	<i>The role of the New Zealand Treasury</i>	70
	<i>Ruth Richardson</i>	71
	<i>Business Roundtable/Education Forum</i>	73
	<i>Administering for Excellence 1988</i>	75
5.5	The management view	76
	<i>State sector amendment act 1989</i>	76
	<i>State Services Commission</i>	77
	<i>Today's Schools</i>	80
5.6	The professional collegial view	81
	<i>Tomorrow's Standards 1990</i>	81
	<i>Teacher registration</i>	81
	<i>Teaching unions in the school sector</i>	82
5.7	Discussion	84
5.8	Notes	86

CHAPTER SIX : RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

6.1	Role of the researcher	88
6.2	Interview guide	89
6.3	Data collection	90
6.4	Those interviewed	90
6.5	Those declining to be interviewed	91
6.6	Data verification	94
6.7	Evaluation of methodology	94
6.8	Analysis and interpretation of interviews	95
6.9	Notes	115

CHAPTER SEVEN : CONCLUSIONS

7.1	Research questions and major themes	116
7.2	Accountability	117
7.3	Control and power relationships	120
7.4	Applying Wolman's questions	122
7.5	Appraisal – formative or summative	127
7.6	In summary	131
7.7	Prognosis	132
7.8	Notes	132

BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
---------------------	------------

APPENDICES

1	State sector amendment act 1989, section 77c	141
2	Sample of letters relating to the interviews	142
3	Ministry of Education consultation on draft guidelines responding to the legislation.	144
4	Comments, concepts or terms referring to overseas programmes – made by the Minister of Education 1989–1992.	151
5	Telephone conversation with the Minister of Education's senior private secretary.	159

CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and significance of research

This thesis is written at a time when national developments in New Zealand involving legislated requirements for consultation with a range of interested parties on assessment of the performance of teachers, has come to a halt. The process had been taking place over a number of years and policy for teacher appraisal had been completed to a final draft stage. Since that time no public or formal part of the teacher appraisal policy draft has been released. During this apparent state of limbo the purpose of this research means that there is still the possibility of some insights and/or findings to influence and inform the next phase. This thesis is a contribution to that debate and has been constructed in a manner that international learning, research, and practice can contribute to the development of the best possible teacher appraisal scheme for New Zealand schools.

The current growth of teacher appraisal schemes worldwide is part of a much wider demand for accountability (OECD 1988). There is a concern that public money spent on teachers' salaries should be well spent. Moreover, the concern has been intensified during recent periods of high unemployment especially from parents who see education as an important means for their children to get jobs and improved standards of living. Good teaching skills are seen as paramount for their children's learning success (Apple 1983, Wragg 1987, Istance 1989).

An analysis of the public's perception that education standards are falling (Irving 1987) has focused on a number of areas of teacher performance, for example, the teaching of science and mathematics. This perception has led to increasing pressure to find ways of identifying and rewarding good teaching performance (OECD 1990:11) and weeding out incompetent teachers. Ironically, the most

notable feature of the present accountability push is that much of the influence is being exercised by people with business management backgrounds, who have themselves no experience of teaching (OECD 1988:1, Walsh 1987:150, Wragg 1987:76).

Teaching is not a unique field in terms of being the focus of exploration as to the possibility of some form of systematic appraisal of performance. The public service generally, including the armed forces and police, and various industries already have some form of appraisal of performance (Wragg 1987:76). According to Graham et al. (1985) some form of assessment of professional potential is included by the majority of commercial companies as part of their appraisal schemes. Generally, however, an organisation *with* appraisal schemes has an hierarchical structure, and delineation of line management and roles are clearly specified¹. This is seen as important as management control, then, can be asserted through control of the work process and product as well as by direct surveillance (Walsh 1987:148).

In contrast, teaching has been regarded by its practitioners as a profession with collegial modes of control rather than those of line management. The different views of teachers' work engendered by these two positions have understandably created considerable debate.

Underpinning this debate is a search for answers to complex but fundamental questions such as: What constitutes teacher effectiveness? What is a teacher's role? Can teaching be considered a profession? What constitutes professional effectiveness rather than market or managerial effectiveness?

1.2 Research investigation

In a climate characterised by professed concern for improved learning and teaching, various factors have led to the introduction of teacher appraisal in many OECD countries. How did teacher appraisal become an item on the **New Zealand** Ministry of Education's agenda? How was the problem recognised and defined to which teacher appraisal was proposed as a policy response? How were alternative solutions generated? What choices were made from the alternatives? Did political events serve as stimulus or as a constraint?

This thesis attempts to answer those questions in order to explore the information about teacher appraisal at international, national and local levels; and to explain the teacher appraisal policy process so that informed judgements can be made.

Like many areas of study within the social sciences, this one is particularly untidy. Whilst imperatives for teacher accountability are relatively new in the New Zealand context, they have been the subject of considerable international debate for some years. Substantial work has been carried out in the area of teacher appraisal in both the United States of America and the United Kingdom, as will be discussed later in this chapter. Therefore, another aim of this thesis is to investigate why the wider call for greater teacher accountability that occurred in the United Kingdom from the mid-1970s, and which was subsequently taken up in New Zealand, has not resulted in the same policy response, here, of an imposed, compulsory 'top-down' teacher appraisal scheme.

Education policy makers in New Zealand **do** borrow from overseas and have done so regularly (Peddie 1991:1). As Wolman (1992:27) convincingly demonstrates, 'policy transferability – the transferring of policy from one political

system for use in another – appears to be a frequent occurrence'. The process of policy transfer between England and New Zealand is argued, and its relationship with the making of policy in the area of teacher appraisal in New Zealand, is considered in the course of this thesis. An examination of this process is used to explain why the policies relating to teacher appraisal in the two countries are different – despite apparent similarities in the political ideologies governing both countries.

1.3 An outline of the thesis

This thesis is organised into seven chapters.

The first part of this chapter has presented an overview of the significance of this investigation and identified the questions around which this thesis is organised. It continues with a profile of the chapters, as well as defining the specific terminology of teacher appraisal as used in this thesis. The chapter also considers the motivation for increased teacher accountability which has been evidenced in the United Kingdom and the United States. The direct and indirect consequences of this motivation for New Zealand teachers will be the subject of a later chapter and will not be focused on at this point.

In chapter two the impact of the relatively recently changed environment for a teacher's work is viewed and the reasons for this are identified. A selected range of meanings of the term 'accountability' and selected forms it has taken are discussed. The chapter focuses upon three different perspectives of accountability, namely: professional, market and managerial. These perspectives are used to illustrate the struggle between teachers' professional autonomy and self control, against a managerial concept of dependence and control. A central tenet of this thesis is that in New Zealand, as in other countries

such as England and Wales, it has been the latter perspective which has dominated the teacher appraisal policy making process. The arguments may be presented in professional educational guise but the intent is management and control.

Chapter three focuses upon summative and formative models of appraisal. The differences of form and purpose of these models has been the crux of debate. The way in which participants in the teacher appraisal policy project have lined up in this debate is illuminating in making explicit the real agendas operating. The models mirror the issues surrounding teacher evaluation and appraisal as they are found in the research of the late 1980s. The approach taken is not an original approach, and neither is it an exhaustive compilation. As Weber (1987:3) states: 'Teacher evaluation is a complex social, psychological and managerial challenge'. This chapter aims to explore this complexity. Major trends in this field are exposed by a review of the common practices of teacher evaluation and appraisal. This review aims to move the discussion from the more theoretical description and explanation to a practical level of prescription and recommendations, i.e. to the overall administrative structure.

In chapter four attention is turned to providing an overview of policy making (i.e. defining the problem, specifying alternatives, making a decision and implementation) as well as to consider selected policy making models. By describing and making explicit elements of the process it becomes possible to evaluate options to influence and participate in the process with effect.

For the purposes of this thesis, Kingdon's (1984) strategy of distinguishing between participants and processes is seen as useful, and it will be explored before an analysis and reflection on Wolman's critical questions of the process of cross national policy transfer. Appraisal is a politically contested activity.

Individuals can and do have a significant part to play. The New Zealand process shows that 'policy transfer' or 'policy importation' has occurred and the form it has taken is one of managerial control.

Wolman (1992:29,43) goes beyond the rational policy making model and argues that 'transferring a policy from one country to another requires that additional steps (or questions) be added'. This argument will be seen to have importance in the New Zealand context.

Chapters five and six take a case study approach to the call for greater teacher accountability and appraisal in New Zealand. The process, as yet incomplete, in New Zealand will be viewed against the backdrop of the pictures painted in the preceding chapters. The theories and concepts described and discussed previously have been used to both inform the analysis of the New Zealand process and to better understand its meaning in the social and educational context which spawned it. Such a case study approach is useful because it enables us to see how policy emerges in a specific context.

Finally, chapter seven summarises that which has been learned about the policy making process from the New Zealand case study examined against the questions raised by Wolman (1992) in his investigation of policy transfer. This approach will make clear the motivating force for teacher appraisal policy developments in New Zealand. It will explain what happened, and how and why the developments occurred in a certain way. Finally, in this chapter the major conclusions of this thesis will be stated and each of the parts of the thesis will be assembled into a whole.

1.4 Key features

This thesis shows that the key features of the New Zealand teacher appraisal policy and process were:

- ◆ Teacher appraisal policy making has been a site of struggle between professional and managerial forms of accountability.
- ◆ Managerial control has been the dominating feature of teacher appraisal policy making and its process.
- ◆ The overseas experience has provided a backdrop and potential blueprint by which New Zealand themes of accountability and appraisal were initiated.
- ◆ Successful policies for teachers cannot be developed in isolation from more general educational policies.
- ◆ Attempts have been made to link the accountability debate with questions of teacher effectiveness and teacher efficiency.
- ◆ The practical uses of evaluation are divided between contrasting purposes, that is, formative and summative.
- ◆ A rational policy making model has not been used in teacher appraisal policy developments.
- ◆ The 'context' has an important role in shaping and defining a problem and in what solutions are offered.
- ◆ The education reforms have provided an opportunity for controlling teachers' professional performance through their employment provisions.

1.5 Terminology

The terminology used in the field of teacher appraisal is confused. At times, the terms 'appraisal', 'evaluation' and 'assessment' appear to have been used interchangeably in the literature on teacher appraisal. Quite different meanings are often ascribed to the same words in a manner which obfuscates the debate rather than clarifies it. The context in which the terms are used also greatly affects their meaning.

For the purposes of this thesis the definitions offered by Her Majesty's Inspectors for the United Kingdom (HMI 1985:7) provide clarity :

- ◆ *evaluation* – a general term used to describe any activity by an institution where the quality of provision is the subject of systematic study;
- ◆ *review* – a retrospective activity implying the collection and re-examination of evidence and information;
- ◆ *appraisal* – emphasising the forming of qualitative judgements about an activity, a person, or an organisation; and
- ◆ *assessment* – implying the use of measurement and/or grading based on known criteria.

1.6 Overseas imperatives for teacher appraisal

The overseas experience is being looked at to provide a background against which the New Zealand developments can be evaluated. The overseas experience also provides a potential blueprint by which New Zealand policy makers can build. Rose (1988:219) responds to the question, 'why comparison in policy analysis?':

The major problems that face one government are often the same as those that face its neighbours ... Although the existence of common or similar problems need not imply that every nation should or will respond in the same way, it does mean that each may draw lessons from the relevant experience of others.

An examination of the changed environment in both the United States and the United Kingdom is illuminating. Criticisms of the problems with state schooling were based on similar premises in New Zealand and a similar solution, that is, more closely controlling and specifying teachers' work was advocated to help bring about desired changes.

United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, it is the widely accepted view that the 'The Great Debate'², initiated by James Callaghan in 1976, was the starting point of the

growing number of challenges to schools and teachers which called for higher standards and greater accountability in education (Reynolds 1987:130, Walsh 1987:150).

The 'trigger' for James Callaghan's speech was the perception that education was no longer relevant for promoting economic growth³. The speech was an attempt to link education more tightly to the economy and to reduce state expenditure on education to the minimum level possible. At the heart of this attempt were questions of teacher effectiveness, teacher efficiency and teacher appraisal.

The first official document in the United Kingdom to signal the likelihood of a specific national programme of teacher appraisal appeared in *Teaching Quality* under the subheading of 'Managing the teaching force':

Concern for quality demands that [where] teachers fail to maintain a satisfactory standard of performance, employers must in the interests of pupils, be ready to use procedures for dismissal. In this context it is relevant to note that while employment protection legislation provides most employees with a right not to be unfairly dismissed, unsatisfactory performance can be sufficient reason for fair dismissal (DES 1983:81).

It was an unfortunate introduction. Attacks on teachers and schools became more frequent and more fierce as the 1980s progressed. Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State for Education and Science (1981–85), carried out a sustained attack on the 'ineffective teacher' overtly linking appraisal with pay⁴. Bash and Coulby (1989:9) contend 'this was a successful populist position as it provided an easy target for parental dissatisfactions'. The long-running pay dispute and strikes of 1986 and 1987 further exposed teachers to criticism by politicians, the media and parents. The strikes were mainly, but not exclusively, about pay⁵. The issue of control of teachers who were seen to be impeding government reforms was clearly part of the government's agenda.

The culmination of the attacks was found in clause 4 of the 1986 Education Act, which legislated for the regular appraisal of teachers. Appraisal, with its overtones of control, appeared at this point not only as a weapon to weed out incompetent teachers and disrupt the existing career structure, but potentially also as a means of getting rid of those who were considered politically or otherwise undesirable. By implication, the whole teaching profession could be seen as idle and ineffective. It encouraged parental and public scrutiny and criticism of the work of teachers. Disruption in schools, for instance, could be blamed on the failure of the 'ineffective teacher' to keep control. Thus distancing central government from blame.

In the United Kingdom, the attacks on education and teachers in particular had echoed developments seen across the Atlantic.

United States of America

Much earlier, in the 1950s, when the American Educational Research Association formed a Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness (Lokan & McKenzie 1989:2), interest in appraisal, evaluation or assessment of teachers and their teaching had been part of the search for knowledge concerning which attributes and methods differentiate good from poor teachers. It also was influenced by the more general body of business and industrial research which was seeking more efficient and effective ways of operating.

By the early 1970s, the focus had moved to encompass notions of the evaluation of teaching and teachers.

In 1983 in the United States of America, as a result of the economic decline, the report of the President's National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*⁶, dramatically heightened

public concern⁷, provoking a wave of reform initiatives that engulfed the education community. *A Nation at Risk* said little about educational administration, but included most of the management and teacher conditions recommendations later found in New Zealand in *Tomorrow's Schools* (Munro 1989:8).

Apple (1988) regards *A Nation at Risk* as the most influential government-sponsored document on the relationship between schooling and the economy in the United States of America at a time of drastic cutbacks in social spending. Apple discusses its major impact on official policy towards education which was 'to reconstruct a crisis around particular themes: international competition, capital accumulation, and a reassertion of toughness and standards'. Apple argues that in the United States of America a new alliance or power bloc⁸ has been formed which combines industry with the political New Right. The aim of this new alliance is 'to provide the educational conditions believed necessary both for increasing profit and capital accumulation and for returning us to a romanticised past of the ideal home, family and school' (1988:283). Apple identifies the power of the alliance carrying through a number of educational policies and proposals:

- ◆ calls for voucher plans and tax credits to make schools like the idealised free-market economy,
- ◆ the movement throughout the country to 'raise standards' and mandate both teacher and student 'competencies' and basic curriculum goals and knowledge, usually by employing management and evaluation techniques originally developed by business and industry,
- ◆ increasingly effective attacks on the school curriculum,
- ◆ the growing pressure to make the perceived needs of business and industry into the primary goals of schooling (1988:283).

Three years later, the Carnegie Taskforce on Teaching as a Profession, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, called for the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The mission of the Board (1989:1) was to establish high and rigorous standards of what teachers should know and be able to do, to license teachers who met those standards, and to advance other educational reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in schools⁹.

1.7 Discussion

Education has been seen as a key element of public policy making and social reform in the postwar period and this is as true of New Zealand as it is for each of the national contexts described above. Education had been expected to fuel economic growth, facilitate equality of opportunity and afford social justice to the deprived. But the deepening economic crisis and changed environment of the 1980s eroded beliefs about the contributions which education can make. Disquiet by parents and politicians combined to produce a severe and pessimistic mood in relation to education. Expenditure cuts, falling school rolls and teacher redeployment or redundancy necessarily bring into sharp focus the principles and procedures for assessing and evaluating teacher competence (OECD 1989).

The governments of both the United States of America and Britain argued that a prerequisite for a prosperous and secure national future was a workforce that commands more than basic skills. An educated citizenry is essential to the sound functioning of a democracy and to economic growth. Adults must be able to communicate complex ideas in a compelling manner, take advantage of the latest advances in science and technology, solve problems neither they nor their teachers have ever seen before, and add real value to the goods and services

they produce (NBPTS 1989:5). These imperatives have been used as a rationale for a growing emphasis upon tighter accountability, a required core curriculum, and a concentration upon basics and suggestions that teacher deficiencies are at the centre of the 'education problem' today. These imperatives have a strong resonance in the New Zealand context.

In essence, education has become integrated into a wider set of ideological commitments whereby the objectives in education are the same as those that guide economic and social welfare goals which:

... include the expansion of the 'free-market', the drastic reduction of government responsibility for social needs, the reinforcement of intensely competitive structures of mobility, the lowering of people's expectations for economic security, and the popularization of a form of Social Darwinist thinking (Apple 1988:283).

It has been against this international backdrop that New Zealand developments in teacher appraisal have occurred. The national context of themes differed but quite clearly the themes were those around which the New Zealand initiatives were centred.

1.8 Notes

- 1 Graham (1985:86, 93) notes that in recent years there has been a shift away from a somewhat autocratic approach, towards more open systems with some elements of self appraisal. See also Mortimore, P & Mortimore J. (1991) for a fuller account of appraisal techniques from the Civil Service, business and commerce in the United Kingdom.
- 2 'The Great Debate' which followed Prime Minister James Callaghan's Ruskin College speech in October 1976 was a response to growing criticism about educational standards in comprehensive and primary schools, young people's attitudes to work, and the Department of Education and Science's informal style of policy making and lack of detailed strategic plans.
- 3 Various studies (Boudon 1973, Jencks et al. 1972) had also cast doubt on the contribution which expanded levels of investment in education could make to the promotion of economic growth. The studies questioned the effectiveness of targeting social groups through expanded educational opportunities.

- 4 At a conference in Sheffield, January 1985, Sir Keith Joseph, then Secretary of State, outlined a programme of action relating to appraisal, teacher management and training, again emphasising his view that teachers' pay should be linked to performance and subject to assessment. DES press notice, 11 January 1985 (cited in Simon 1991:505).
- 5 Another result was the decline of the status of the teaching profession and its increasing removal from the process of educational policy formulation (Bash & Coulby 1989:9).
- 6 The vigorous public debate which attended the American exercise was duplicated in New Zealand four years later. Munro (1989:8) notes that 'the Jefferson quotation at the beginning of *Tomorrow's Schools*' is also found in the introduction to *A Nation at Risk*.
- 7 Within the United States of America poor educational performance of the workforce was blamed for the country's relatively poor economic performance in comparison with that of Japan.
- 8 Gordon (1992) also discusses a 'new hegemonic power bloc within capital'. See chapter five, Business Roundtable/Education Forum.
- 9 The Board's vision of what teachers should know and be was described. In addition the Board presented a set of principles to guide the research and development effort necessary to launch the state-of-the art assessment system that it desired. The Board defined the objectives, form and operation of the assessment so that development work could properly reflect its thinking (NBPTS 1989:53).

CHAPTER TWO : ACCOUNTABILITY

A central theme to any discussion of teacher appraisal is that of accountability. Imperatives for its achievement and the boundaries of this notion are important to identify and analyse in order to clarify the agenda for teacher appraisal.

This chapter begins by briefly locating the call for greater accountability in education within the international setting of public sector restructuring. The implications of the changed environment for a teacher's work are discussed and the concept of accountability is clarified. The chapter focuses on three models of accountability: market, managerial and professional. The different perspectives embodied in these models set the context for different understandings of teacher appraisal. Underpinning each of these models is a notion of what it is to be an effective teacher as well as an assumption about teachers' working conditions. This chapter contends that the major thrust of the accountability debate has been anti-professional and has favoured market and managerial models in line with New Right thinking.

2.1 The age of accountability

Chinnery (1983:3) perceives 'accountability' as an organisational management term which has gained international currency over the years. He gives 'scientific management' and 'human relationship management' as two other examples of such forms. Each of these descriptions provides the title to an age or an era based on a dominant organisational management theme. Chinnery argues that in hindsight this present era could be termed the 'age of accountability', because the management-dominant strategies of organisation, in both the public and private sectors, are based on making some accommodation to the increasingly

powerful controls exerted over the economy by governments and their bureaucracies.

A clear example of this is found in OECD¹ countries. Both the public and the private sectors of western OECD democracies have had to adjust to dramatic changes in the world economy. Economic pressures have provided compelling efforts to restrain or reduce the size of the public sector and to boost its efficiency and effectiveness. To an increasing extent efforts have been made by governments to achieve better value for money. This has meant that countries such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom (in the mid-1970s), and Australia and New Zealand (mid-1980s), have adopted certain strategic policies: they combine selective cutbacks in resources with measures making the most effective use of available staff, with a consequent emphasis on the need to improve individual performance.

The most significant feature of such policies is the emphasis placed on the introduction of new management concepts such as objectives setting, performance measurement, audit and organisational review. Accountability for results achieved and resources used became a key element of such policies. Education policies have been subject to this emphasis.

The unproven claim of effectiveness and efficiency presented by a 'free market' model premised on choice, competition, and contestable services thus became the framework for educational administration and delivery of the curriculum. Education policy is no longer to be developed on the basis of consensus and the involvement of all participants, but mobilised by politicians advocating New Right ideology and managed by officials of the same bias. Ranson and Tomlinson (1986) argue that this changing environment has enormous implications for the

management of those working within the education service:

Its vision and objectives are being questioned and simplified, while the complex, often ambiguous traditional framework of decision-making – with its assumptions about who should be involved, whose values should count and how decisions should be arrived at – is being clarified, concentrated and centralised. In short, the traditional balance of autonomy, power and accountability in education is being redefined (Ranson & Tomlinson 1986:1).

In order to understand what is being changed, and what is at stake for teachers, it is useful to briefly examine teachers' professional conception of their work. The use of the word 'professional' in this sentence is deliberate.

2.2 A teacher's work

What a teacher is employed to do and whether or not it has been done adequately or excellently is a common theme of the accountability debate and teacher evaluation schemes. Ingvarson (1986:143) adds, 'The kind of job teaching is thought to be will profoundly affect the approach to evaluation that is developed'.

The teacher's primary duty is to teach students worthwhile knowledge (some mix of cognitive, affective and psychomotor), depending on the extent of the students' abilities. Often it entails an obligation to perform a number of other tasks such as correcting homework or keeping up-to-date with subject matter. But, the job of a teacher is not just teaching. There are, in addition, many secondary duties that arguably are not required for performance of the primary ones. For example, reporting to parents, supervising students during lunch hours, doing committee work, counselling students. A good many of these, however, are understood by teachers to be part of the job (Scriven 1989:117).

Characteristically of other professions, teachers work in an environment in which many of the obligations of the job are understood rather than spelled out in job descriptions. Coupled with this is the strongly held notion of autonomy of practice, both individually and collectively. A key characteristic of a profession is that its members take responsibility for setting standards of practice, monitoring and adherence to those standards (Ingvarson 1986:142).

As Smyth (1991:224) puts it:

The ultimate irony is that while teachers and schools worldwide are being sold the idea that they should be more autonomous and responsive to local needs, they are also being told in no uncertain terms what their outcomes *must be* and how they *must strive* to meet *national priorities* and enhance *international competitiveness*. Teachers, therefore, are supposedly being given more autonomy at the school level at precisely the same time as the parameters within which they are expected to work and against which they will be evaluated, are being tightened and made more constraining.

2.3 Defining 'accountability'

Ranson et al. (1987:3) maintain that accountability is a multi-layered concept, and that its several layers of meaning need to be unravelled if sense is to be made of the emerging institutional forms of accountability. To be accountable is to be 'held to account' but also 'to give an account'. These elements reveal unique social characteristics encompassed in the accountable relationship of control and also of discourse. Power and purpose are brought together in institutional arrangements of accountability.

Accountability as 'being held to account' implies formal ties between the parties, one of whom is answerable to the other for the quality of action and performance. Being called upon to 'give an account' always involves a clear and special responsibility. Responsibilities have been conferred upon persons for the

performance of roles and functions on the understanding that they are answerable for the performance of their duties.

The duty to 'provide an account' usually demands more than a descriptive response. An account may include a report on the use of resources or the achievement of students but, in most cases, there will be a further expectation 'to account' for performance: that is, to offer a narrative which interprets and explains performance. 'To be held to account' invites the respondent to say why such and such has been accomplished and thus make the recorded data of a report more intelligible and clear.

The interdependent elements of responsibility, answerability, evaluation and potential sanction are articulated particularly well by Dunsire (1978):

Being accountable may mean... no more than having to answer questions about what has happened or is happening with one's jurisdiction ... But most usages require an additional implication: the answer when given, or the account when rendered is to be evaluated by the superior or superior body measured against some standard or expectation, and the differences noted: and then praise or blame are to be meted out and sanctions applied. It is the coupling of information with its evaluation and application of sanctions that gives 'accountability' or 'answerability' or 'responsibility' their full sense in ordinary usage².

To 'hold to account', therefore, focuses upon the dimensions of control in accountability.

The different emphases of accountability may be organised in different ways to reinforce particular sets of values and relations of power (Ranson et al. 1987:6). But until the specific form of accountability is explored, Ranson et al. postulate that 'to be held to account' and 'to give an account' do not embody intrinsic value positions.

2.4 Forms of accountability

Renwick (1986) argues that accountability is an essential structural element, but that forms of accountability which were useful during a phase of democratic centralism were now becoming outmoded and ineffective. These forms Renwick describes as:

Close central direction through control of professional training, officially prescribed syllabuses, the inspection of schools, the power of regulation and financial control, has already given way to forms of control that require the active participation of organisations and interests other than those of officialdom.

Renwick continues by discussing the changed focus of accountability:

The questions of accountability that are now raised are directed increasingly to the nature of the constraints within which schools, colleges, and other educational institutions, and the teachers who teach in them, should carry out their work (Renwick 1976:63).

Darling-Hammond (1988:9) examined the structure and limitations of current systems of accountability in education. She argued that accountability mechanisms available to safeguard the public interest must include at least the following: political accountability, legal accountability, bureaucratic accountability, market accountability, professional accountability. Cuttance (1992:20) provides a similar typology by discussing the work of Becher et al. (1979). Three elements of accountability in school systems are distinguished:

- ◆ moral accountability – answerability to one's clients
- ◆ professional accountability – responsibility to oneself and one's colleagues
- ◆ contractual accountability – accountability to one's employers or political masters³.

For Ranson et al. (1987) there exist two significant forms of accountability in education – professional and market. Briefly, they may be explained as follows.

Professional accountability

The type of accountability developed within the teaching profession itself was intimately related to the notion of teaching as a profession and teachers as professionals (Simpkin 1993:5).

In this model, a professional association controls the entry of individuals who wish to commence practice in a particular area of public service, thus ensuring a minimum prerequisite standard of competence. Once the professional is practising, s/he is expected to maintain standards by following the established 'code of ethics' for the profession. Complaints expressing dissatisfaction with a professional are investigated by a committee of professional peers.

The professional form of accountability is grounded in assumptions about the complexity of the educational task of developing students' capacities over time. It emphasises the scope of educational achievement and a belief in the potential of each young person, whose progress at any one point is recognised as relevant to the relationships and expectations which teachers can create within the classroom. The professional view is that exams constitute an important but narrow indicator of student achievement, and the other dimensions of learning must be taken into account when evaluating standards: the whole cultural, social and creative aspects of school life should be equally assessed. Therefore, a more comprehensive statement about a student's achievement is required.

The teacher's focus on accountability should be to the student rather than to the 'taxpayer' or even the board of trustees. The educational process is complex, with a multiplicity of decisions required, and sensitive dynamics in interpersonal relations. Given the complexities, the professionals argue that the forms accountability should take are best determined internally by teachers or by advisory and inspectorial colleagues, who understand the nature of the task and

can evaluate the extent of students' progress (Darling–Hammond 1986:532, Ranson et al. 1986:90).

Within the professional view of accountability, appraisal becomes a collegial activity promoting student learning through the mutual support members provide for each other. The process of teacher appraisal thus becomes a means whereby teachers can be helped to extend their professional development, expertise and ability to assess student progress (Kyriacou 1987:139). This position, as will be evident in the case study section clearly had strong adherents in the New Zealand context.

Market accountability

In this model a variety of 'suppliers' of a particular public service compete for custom, with the consumer's choice determining which of them survives and flourishes. If unhappy with the service, the consumer simply takes their custom elsewhere. In this sense it is possible to create mechanisms for making schools more accountable to parents – such as voucher systems (Pateman 1981).

Proponents of the market model (Sexton 1990, NZ Treasury 1990) argue that the professional basis of internal review distorts the essential purpose of the accountability sought. Institutions must look outwards to the public beyond their boundaries. Schools should be answerable to their consumers, in this case the parents. The orientation of their account, it is claimed, should be upon *standards* of attainment rather than *process*.

Ranson et al. (1987:6–7) argue that the market schema proposes a limited account of educational achievement (solely in terms of test scores)⁵, while its theory of the conditions for effective schooling (consumer competition and choice) is underdeveloped.

The process of schooling is non-problematic in the market model. There is no recognition of differing levels of resourcing and it is assumed that all involved have an equal starting point. Ultimately, the responsibility for education rests with the parents making rational choices in the market. This posits perfect information – to say nothing of perfect judgement, by perfect unharassed parents!

Supporters of market accountability maintain that greater school autonomy, competition, parental choice and individual contracts are the key to raising standards and improving learning. Under this model teachers would be on individual contract to their employer (board of trustees), who would be free to pay more or less according to the quality of the teacher – and according to such criteria of responsibility and extent of duties as they may determine (Sexton 1990:87). Part of the impetus for teacher appraisal in this accountability model is derived from the belief that the market would provide a mechanism to remove ineffective teachers. Perhaps this position is most clearly seen to be held by the Treasury in the New Zealand setting, that is the position adopted by the Treasury in its briefing papers to the incoming government ((NZ Treasury 1987).

In the foregoing model the market determines quality. This is a key contrast with management accountability where the market *and* a specific formula for accountability determines quality. Dale & Jesson (1992) argue that in a quasi-education market and a centralised state it is management accountability which is the key to quality.

Management accountability

Willis (1992:207) identifies a third model of accountability in the New Zealand context, namely management accountability.

For Willis, the market and management models share the same ideological assumptions: of individual responsibility for outcomes; and the same purpose of accountability mechanisms to provide clear information on achievement of objectives. Management accountability, however, also focuses on the decision-making, and on the application of rules which emphasise the importance of good management practices for improving the quality of teaching and learning (Willis 1992:209).

The intent of a management model is the construction of organisations which have clear lines of decision making, accountability and appropriate incentives to ensure role specification and proper performance. Some recognisable features of this type of organisation include: 'a reliance on quantifiable output measures and performance targets ... the use of fixed-term labour contracts, the development of corporate plans, performance agreements and mission statements ... the introduction of performance-linked remuneration systems ... a general preference for monetary incentives' (Boston 1990)⁶. In this way a management model differs from the market model which sees control being exercised by external demands of the market place.

Management accountability mechanisms see New Zealand teachers as employed by individual boards of trustees at a local level, with principals on limited-term contracts, but with the government continuing to determine their salaries, conditions of service and their qualifications. The government also controls what is taught in school through charters, and through monitoring by the Education Review Office (another government agency) which has an audit role to ensure adherence to the government's requirements.

The use of regular teacher appraisal to satisfy 'management accountability' would be a means by which the principal could identify how well individual

members of staff are meeting their duties (both teaching and administrative) and responding to particular changes and developments within the school (Kyriacou 1987:139). This is the position taken by the State Services Commission when negotiating employment conditions for teachers and was also implicit in the public comments on more general matters made by Dr Lockwood Smith, Minister of Education.

2.5 Discussion

The 'accountability' debate has seen authorities in the United Kingdom imposing a universal system of appraisal on all teachers in the state-maintained sector whereby the information from an appraisal can be used for management purposes. Organised teachers, on the other hand, have taken the view that an appraisal system should be one that would promote improvement in the quality of education: a vehicle for enhancing professional expertise and supporting institutional development. Moreover, such a system should not incorporate forms of accountability which would destroy professional trust.

The notion of professionalism is inevitably bound up with concepts of autonomy and self-control (Walsh 1986:14). In contrast concepts of management, where it is assumed that the individual teacher is formally accountable to the system and school, involve dependence and control. Concepts of management and professionalism, therefore, tend to contradict rather than complement each other, and inevitably there are conflicting pressures resulting from the desire for professional autonomy and the need for managerial control.

In this chapter the concept and the implications of differing perspectives of teacher accountability have been discussed. The conceptual distinctions are a necessary element for sketching out the territory of teacher appraisal policy but in

order to understand the kinds of teacher appraisal policy options available to New Zealand, it is necessary first to locate the types of teacher appraisal models on offer and to identify their adoption by key participants in the teacher appraisal policy development process in this country.

2.6 Notes

- 1 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was established in 1961 as the main forum for monitoring economic trends amongst the free-market member democracies of North America, Western Europe and the Pacific. It is in the OECD that government representatives meet to compare and co-ordinate their policies, both domestic and international.
- 2 Cited in Ranson et al. 1987:7.
- 3 Cited in Cuttance, P. 1992:20.
- 4 Renwick offers a definition of 'professional':

To begin with, there is the meaning to be given to the word professional. In common usage it is an exclusive word. It marks off a group of people from all others on the basis of expertise, authority, and a right to practise. It also signifies a status within occupations and within society. Many of the aspirations and feelings of teachers stem from their perception of teaching as a profession, either as it is or as it might be. And these aspirations and feelings often focus on other, more firmly established professions – medicine and law are the examples most mentioned – as models in comparisons with which the further progress of the teaching profession should be gauged (Renwick 1976:54–55).
- 5 The 1980 Education Act in England was designed on a market accountability model by making it a duty for schools to publish information on examination performance and parents being enabled to express a preference for schools.
- 6 Cited in Simpkin 1993:4.

CHAPTER THREE : MODELS OF APPRAISAL

How a teacher appraisal process will be fitted into the overall administrative structure of New Zealand education is still a matter of debate. In order to make any evaluation it is important to identify specifically the options available and the criteria that each meets. What underpins choices about the allocation of resources, and what is the impact of these choices on student learning and other outcomes, requires a consideration of teacher/school efficiency and effectiveness as well as the economy in general.

In this chapter the debate is moved forward by examining a number of selected teacher evaluation/appraisal models, and alternative approaches which have been developed. The separate problems of the main participants and processes are also analysed. This chapter argues that the conception of accountability employed determines the choice for any teacher appraisal model selected and identifies the reason(s) for that choice.

3.1 Purposes of teacher evaluation

There are multiple purposes for evaluation that can and need to be served. The purposes generally are divided into two major camps: i.e. evaluation for making personnel management decisions; or evaluation for making decisions for enhancing personal professional growth. These are crucial criteria for consideration in judgements about the appropriateness of employing any particular model of teacher appraisal.

In a Rand Corporation study (Wise et al. 1984) of teacher evaluation procedures, school administrators in the United States of America cited four basic purposes for evaluations: personnel decisions involving teacher placement and tenure;

staff development, such as identifying areas for teacher inservice training; school improvement, focusing on upgrading the general level of instruction; and accountability, centred on meeting or exceeding district and state standards. Within these goals, however, there are two conceptually distinct orientations – summative and formative. Experience in the United States has shown that if the two are combined, it is summative assessment which dominates and tends to undermine any useful formative assessment (Kyriacou 1987:143). For example, if a major goal of an evaluation process is to eliminate incompetent teachers, can it also help teachers improve?

3.2 Summative versus formative models

Ingvarson (1986) claims it is common in writings on teacher evaluation to find that a clear distinction is made between evaluation for improvement (formative evaluation) and evaluation for accountability (summative evaluation). He argues that the concept that underpins that distinction assumes a managerial, audit view of accountability. The distinction becomes redundant with a professional conception of teacher evaluation' (Ingvarson 1986:152).

Summative models may be convenient for rating teachers against a fixed scale of standards and then comparing their performances against their colleagues; or ~~ranking teachers according to predetermined merit and eliminating incompetent~~ teachers. Such models appeal to advocates of merit pay and 'master teacher' plans. Formative models concentrate on pin-pointing teachers' weaknesses and strengths for the purpose of making them better teachers. Most formative models include 'feedback', and take many opportunities to assess the teacher's performance spread over an extended period. Support may be provided for teachers, and formative models can be connected with staff development activities.

The two models of appraisal differ in their breadth and depth of coverage. A summative model is more expedient and reaches many more teachers; whereas formative systems expose teachers' plans and styles in considerably more detail. The models also differ in the way they recognise good teaching. Summative models use a standardised approach while formative models are context-specific and more individually focused. In addition they differ in the kinds of evidence they gather.

The major points of difference between summative and formative models are summarised by Weber (1987:8) in table 1.

Table 1

Comparison of summative and formative models

	<i>Formative</i>	<i>Summative</i>
<i>Rating Scales</i>	uses flexible criteria emphasises teaching context	uses standard criteria treats all teaching as comparable
<i>Outcomes</i>	advises teacher on improvement	decides on promotion, tenure, dismissal
<i>Evaluators</i>	to be effective must have teaching background, plus knowledge of each teacher's strategies	must be able to apply standardised criteria to observed data
<i>Time Demands</i>	may require repeated visits, conferences, and analysis of teaching materials	typically requires one or two visits, not every year
<i>Data Sources</i>	relies on observations, teaching materials, students scores, plus information from teachers on intentions and perceptions (self-assessment, peer assessment), climate	relies on impressions, inferences, judgments, opinions of administrators
<i>Motivation for teacher improvement</i>	relies on teachers' desire to improve	relies on fear of failure, need for conformity
<i>Primary purpose</i>	fosters professional development	prefers accountability to taxpayers and boards

Given this fundamental distinction there are several models of appraisal that need to be considered.

Common-law model

Weber (1987) claims all-purpose evaluation systems are adopted in an attempt to meet multiple goals. In making these claims Weber draws upon McGreal's work (1983) which found certain features so common in evaluation systems that McGreal called them 'common-law evaluations'. These systems are formative approaches on the surface, but they were summative in operation, providing only for termination of appointment or tenure evaluations. McGreal estimated that 65% of school districts in the United States used some form of the common-law method.

Common-law systems rely on simple definitions of evaluation and a minimum of processes and procedures that have remained virtually unchanged for years, as this typical opening statement reveals:

General statement

This district believes that each child has unique educational and socio-emotional needs that require quality instruction by all staff members. The district and its professional employees have a responsibility to see that the needs of the students are being met. One way to meet this responsibility is to have a teacher evaluation procedure that is designed to improve the quality of instruction. In order to be most effective, the procedures should involve both teachers and administrators throughout the process.

Procedures

- (1) All nontenured staff will be evaluated by their principal at least three times during the school year. A professional evaluation form must be submitted after each evaluation. The final report must be on file no later than the end of the first week in March.
- (2) All tenured teachers will be evaluated by the principal or his or her designee at least once each school year. A professional evaluation report must be submitted by April 15.
- (3) A conference must be held with the staff member following each evaluation. The completed evaluation report must be reviewed with the staff member during the conference. Suggestions for improving areas marked fair or weak should be made along with plans for any follow-up visits. Both parties should then sign the report.
- (4) Teachers have the option to write comments about any part of the evaluation in the appropriate space (McGreal 1983:9-10).

A high-supervisory/low-teacher involvement in the evaluation process is evident, with the teacher being a relatively passive participant. It is the supervisor who determines when visits will be scheduled, fills out the required forms and conducts the post-evaluative conference. The evaluation is generally seen as synonymous with observation; little or no data other than classroom visits are used, and the evaluation thereby reflects an element of the market accountability notion of inspection.

This sort of evaluation process has great utility. It can be used economically where there are many teachers and few supervisors. Generally the requirements do not demand extensive supervision. The process requires very little training and allows for the application of standard criteria rather than special knowledge of subject areas. Furthermore, McGreal maintains that districts that use the common-law model can appear to meet accountability demands while avoiding the sensitive areas that may be disruptive to staff.

In most common-law systems standardised criteria are accompanied by some sort of scaling device. The supervisor provides high inference judgement on where the teacher stands on each predetermined criterion. This form of instrumentation is one of the clearest and most troublesome characteristics of the common-law model (McGreal 1983:11). It may rate high in utility and relative reliability, but it is not a valid¹ way of judging teaching. Neither does this method require evaluators to know anything about teaching in a particular area. Common-law models reinforce the traditional concepts of evaluation that promote 'watch dog' attitudes focusing on administrative tasks rather than instructional ones.

In general, there are four patterns of common-law teacher appraisal/evaluation systems, with some variation or combination: goal-setting models, product

models, clinical supervision models, and a composite model. The procedures of both goal-setting and product models satisfy the managerial form of accountability, whilst the clinical model reflects a more professional approach. The composite model, taking account of school effectiveness research, has attempted to reconcile both summative and formative purposes. More recently the competency-based model has reinforced the managerial element of accountability.

Goal-setting models

In recent years dissatisfaction with the traditional common-law model has grown. There is an assumption that the clearer the idea a person has of what is to be accomplished, the greater the chances are of success.

Goal-setting models avoid problems of validity by involving the teacher in determining the criteria for evaluation. The teacher actually begins the process by conducting a self evaluation, often focusing on areas in which s/he feels weakest. The teacher then drafts a goal-setting 'contract' after which the teacher and the appraiser (most commonly the principal in the British, Australian and New Zealand appraisal developments) meet to discuss the self-evaluation, contract and steps needed to improve. The appraiser then confers periodically with the teacher to monitor progress towards the contracted goals. The high teacher involvement keeps the criteria meaningful to teachers, while the pre- and post-conferences introduce reliability into the evaluation.

Basic goal-setting assumptions focus on continual growth and improvement. The model acknowledges that at best only a limited number of objectives can be evaluated and that these need to be well-defined. Supervision is an active, continuous dialogue between the supervisor and teacher.

One programme arising from the goal-setting model has been Redfern's (1980)² performance-objectives approach. The heart of the plan is the setting of objectives, forming an action plan and then carrying out and monitoring the results.

The performance-objectives approach is dependent upon how several essential features are arranged. Job duties must be specified, preferably by a detailed list of responsibilities which does not allow too much personal interpretation (which could lead to misunderstandings in the appraisal process). Objectives, then, can reflect some aspect of these detailed responsibilities. Rather than using generally stated objectives, participants should use behavioural objectives to facilitate mutual understanding and ease of documentation. Moreover, a single written form can contain both the performance objective and the action plan; both the teacher and supervisor can then understand what is to be done, the outcome desired and the method of measurement used.

The performance objectives approach places much greater emphasis on instructional improvement, but like other goal-setting models, the established performance objectives come from the list of responsibility criteria (job description), thus preventing the teacher and appraiser from considering unique teacher needs.

A goal-setting model is formative and not suitable for ranking teachers. Much depends upon the contract that the teacher draws up and the evaluator reviews. The contract must specify observable, measurable behaviours or outcomes and must identify the acceptable outcomes. It must further provide a date for accomplishing the goals. Useful goals may be hard to form: they must be realistic and yet challenging, attainable with existing resources and consistent with school, department and district goals.

There are considerable benefits to a goal-setting model. The model focuses attention on the professional growth of each teacher. It encourages a working relationship between teachers and the appraiser (principal or supervisor). Another obvious benefit of this relationship is the clarification of performance expectations, making the criteria unambiguous and personal. The model, however, requires too much paperwork, and forces evaluators to make decisions about teacher performance in areas for which they are not necessarily qualified. Neither is the model realistic in time and availability of inservice resources.

The goal-setting model, although consultative in appearance, displays market-management accountability characteristics, to establish authority over human and financial resources. In many instances it attempts to measure a teacher's output by monitoring performance. 'Management accountability focuses on the application of rules which emphasise the importance of good management practices for improving the quality of learning and teaching' (Willis 1992:209). For example, the principal as chief executive officer, as part of the employment contract, is appraised on agreed targets on an annual basis. This practice has been transported on to the notion of annual appraisal against agreed targets for all teachers, too (appendix 3).

Product models

The most controversial model is one advocated by 'market' enthusiasts which makes use of student achievement results as a method of assessing teacher effectiveness. Product models assume that teachers can best be evaluated by measuring student achievement. If teachers can produce high student achievement, generally in a testing situation, then teacher competency must also be high. Much depends on being able to measure student achievement accurately; therefore, the nature of the tests used in product evaluation models is a primary issue. Generally a time period is designated for the evaluation cycle,

with the pre-test and post-test administered to show any changes in student ability. Norm-referenced tests (measuring the student performance on a curve) may be used, as may criterion-referenced tests (measuring performance according to a preset standard).

Perhaps the simplest and **most** inaccurate method of judging teacher performance is to compare the raw scores of students on standardised achievement tests. Achievement tests do not measure instruction-generated achievement, but measure instead the student's competence, that is the student's cumulative knowledge about a subject acquired through varied experience, probably from more than one teacher, plus knowledge and experiences gained outside the classroom (Darling-Hammond 1984:28).

For an accurate and fair view of student achievement and teacher performance, influences on test scores other than teaching quality have to be accounted for and controlled. Two kinds of method have been proposed: one is a simulation method which sets up classroom teaching situations with controlled content and time for teaching³; the other is a naturalistic method, which uses actual classroom test scores (carefully controlled for non-achievement factors), as well as other classroom materials as evidence of teacher performance.

Noting the problems in using standardised tests and simulation methods, some researchers have proposed multiple-measure approaches, using classroom data to advance product-orientated teacher evaluations. This is a hybrid approach which uses several sources of evidence for student achievement and teacher effectiveness⁴.

The naturalistic approach is the combination of criterion-referenced and norm-referenced testing made possible by creating items from the curriculum of the

school and then standardising performance expectations. Ideally, criterion-referenced tests measure student achievement more accurately than norm-referenced tests.

A caution to this model, however, is that what it measures is too narrow. There is more to teaching and learning than test results. The reliance on testing 'reflects a belief that knowledge can be assessed through the reproduction of discrete observable items' (Willis 1992:210). Quite clearly this approach would be in conflict with the professional model of accountability.

Clinical Supervision Models

The clinical supervision model emphasises the collaborative nature of supervision; indeed it is more a supervisory than an evaluative method. The focus is on teacher motivation and improvement rather than on summative judgements of quality. Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1987) and others at the Harvard School of Education formulated the clinical approach in the 1960s. They held that teachers have a professional body of knowledge that can be adequately evaluated only by equally knowledgeable supervisors (Acheson & Gail 1987:11).

Clinical supervision is meant to suggest the face-to-face relationship between teacher and supervisor and to focus on the teacher's actual behaviour in the classroom. Collegiality, then, is essential to the assumptions behind clinical supervision.

Sergiovanni (1982) notes five assumptions of clinical supervision models. First, teaching is a complex set of activities that requires careful analysis. Most forms of evaluation tend to oversimplify the nature of teaching by starting with predetermined criteria. Clinical supervision, by contrast, derives issues from the teaching situation and takes seriously the teacher's analysis. Second,

supervision is a 'partnership in inquiry' with the supervisor as a more experienced practitioner instead of an aloof expert. Thirdly, the purpose of the clinical supervision is to assist teachers to modify existing patterns of teaching in ways which teachers desire. Thus, supervision responds to teachers' instructional needs rather than administrative needs. Fourthly, the supervisor's job is to help the teacher choose goals, to shed light on teaching issues and to aid in the teacher's progress towards goals. Finally, effective clinical supervision increases the teacher's desire for and skills of self-improvement.

The stages of clinical supervision begin, as do the goal-setting models, with pre-observation conferences. Then comes the observation itself, followed by the supervisor's analysis of the data gained from the observation and a strategy to improve the teacher's performance. A feedback conference involves the teacher and supervisor analysing and interpreting the data. The teacher then decides on alternative approaches for the future, with the concurrence of the supervisor (Acheson & Gail 1987).

Clinical supervision requires the supervisors to be colleagues rather than part-time evaluators. The time constraints, and the lack of knowledge which principals often labour under, may turn their attempt at clinical supervision into mere mechanical steps. It may have the appearance of clinical supervision without the substance.

Some schools, however, are finding that clinical supervision can be effectively implemented using peer appraisers who share responsibilities and may observe each other. Such an approach has been proposed and used under various names: peer supervision, peer coaching, collegial evaluation, collegial supervision. This variation has two salient traits. First, the information obtained by collegial supervision is purely formative and is shared with the principal only if

the teacher who was observed chooses to do so. Second, participation in the process is voluntary and teachers may choose their own partners for co-workers.

Like other models, clinical supervision aims to improve student learning. The clinical supervisor believes that if s/he can improve teacher performance, the teacher in turn will be able to improve the supervised teacher's students and the results will be observable. Acheson & Gail (1987:25) claim that no convincing evidence can be located on student effects associated with clinical supervision, although studies clearly point to a positive relationship.

Composite model

In 1986, as part of the negotiating machinery on teachers' pay and conditions of service in the United Kingdom, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) set up a working group (National Steering Group) to draw up an agreed set of principles and procedures for appraisal. The principles outlined in the ACAS report were an attempt to meet both managerial and improvement purposes based on the following definition of the nature and purpose of appraisal:

The Working Group understands appraisal not as a series of perfunctory periodic events, but as a continuous and systematic process intended to help individual teachers with their professional development and career planning, and to help ensure that the inservice training and deployment of teachers matches the complementary needs of individual teachers and the schools (ACAS 1986:1).

The school teacher appraisal pilot study provided a vehicle for the debate about what type of appraisal system should be introduced. After two years of overseeing a nationally co-ordinated study based on six local education authorities (LEAs), the National Steering Group (NSG) produced a report which gained support throughout the education service. It advised on the process and

conduct of appraisal made up of a series of stages (Hopkins & Bollington 1989:164) and pin-pointed the benefits to teachers and schools. Its main achievement was to propose a national framework for appraisal which would have professional credibility and authority, while at the same time providing forms of political accountability which would be acceptable to LEAs and governing bodies.

The NSG saw appraisal as a way of raising the quality of the workforce and suggested an approach that started with self-evaluation, followed by an initial interview with an appraiser, classroom observation, and a subsequent interview. An appeals process and principles to guide documentation were also recorded.

The regulations on appraisal passed in 1990 made the process compulsory for all teachers. The regulations, however, contained a considerably reduced emphasis upon staff development, with an increased importance for such development being seen as part of the overall school plan. The needs of the individual teacher, which were so central in the NSG report, became much more subservient to those of the school. It is with regard to the management of appraisal, however, that the greatest changes are recorded. The regulations made appraisal a more negative, punitive and menacing tool of control, setting aside the NSG's powerful endorsement of appraisal as a professional activity. Three aspects in particular contribute to such an assessment of the regulations. First, the use of appraisal statements to advise others on decisions about pay, promotion or disciplinary matters; second, the right of the local education authority to consult others without the teacher's consent; and third, the role given to the school governing bodies to implement, operate and evaluate the processes of appraisal taking place within the school.

Competency-based model

The term 'competency-based' training is widely used and recognised in the vocational education sector. There is, however, no unanimous agreement on the definition of the term 'competency' (Robinson 1993:2).

Development of a competency-based approach to training has recently been applied to education at tertiary level in the United Kingdom, Australia⁵ and New Zealand. It is a model on which all training programmes will be developed from nationally recognised unit standards, the building blocks for staircases of increasing skill and career advancement. Such 'building blocks' being determined by the requirements of performance in the workplace. The unit standards may also be portable to new domains. For example, skills of budgeting may be relevant for both a grocery business and a school. The writing of unit standards begins with a needs analysis which is developed from observation of the activities of occupational groups in the 'sub-field' (early childhood education is a sub-field of education).

Much of the criticism of competency-based training arises from the behaviourist paradigm which dominated the early thinking (around the 1950s) on the nature of competence and on the way in which it should be assessed. This behaviourist model focused on an analysis of tasks involved in an occupation, and suggested that assessment of competence should be based on direct observation of the performance of those tasks (Robinson 1993:2). That model from the 1950s, Carr (1993:2) says, is still apparent:

The competency-based model of training aims to teach, in appropriate ways, a list of specific competencies or skills that successful workers actually perform on the job today.

Gonczi (1993:1) identifies three major perspectives on the nature of competence as a concept being employed in the debate in Australia: the task-based or

behaviourist approach; the clarification of generic competencies that are crucial to effective performance; and the integrated approach within which the notion of competence is related.

He argues that competency approaches have the potential to break the long-standing and destructive dichotomy between theory and practice which has characterised educational thinking for thousands of years – including the unfortunate dichotomy between vocational and academic education.

The natural way of conceiving competence, however, that is as a series of tasks, has fatal defects. Likewise, the alternative of conceiving competence as consisting of attributes or generic skills also has marked limitations. Hager (1993:83) argues that the integrated approach offers many advantages while avoiding the major limitations of the other two conceptions. But how well the approach works out in the long term remains to be seen. Hager has one major prerequisite for the model to work, namely, that the 'profession' **owns** the model. This has not been the New Zealand experience.

3.3 Discussion

All of the models described in this chapter were explored and evaluated in the New Zealand policy making project. The implicit acceptance or rejection of models, in full or in part, will be telling in any evaluation of the draft policy of teacher appraisal when it is released.

The practical uses of evaluation are divided between formative and summative purposes. Schools need both formative and summative strategies to serve the needs of teachers, students and the public. The problem is how to provide for both these procedures in the practical setting of already overburdened schools.

In an accountability model, the aim of appraisal is to assess a teacher's performance in order to make decisions about dismissal, promotion or possible merit pay. In a professional development model these purposes are downplayed because it is assumed that the initial period of professional education and training would prove whether or not a person is suited to teaching. Appraisal becomes not a reward and punishment mechanism, but a process which should result in development in both the skills and career prospects of the individual teacher and lead to improvements at school or institutional level. This model is about the improvement of teaching and learning.

The two contrasting models are alternatives. The models cannot be combined successfully, though many schemes, in particular in the United States of America, have attempted to do this. The reason is straightforward. The success of the professional development model depends upon teachers being open, frank and forthright during the process. They must be able to discuss problems and constraints or engage in constructive criticism of aspects of the management of school. If it is to bring about individual and institutional improvement, appraisal must therefore be a two-way process which takes place in an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality (Evans & Tomlinson 1989:15). This flies in the face of low trust models which emphasise summative judgements.

According to the Rand Corporation study on evaluation practices, the most successful systems pay attention to four critical factors in running their evaluation programmes. First, they are committed to the process; they ensure that the appraisers are trained and competent; they emphasise collaboration in the process; they use an evaluation process that integrates general goals with a teacher's specific instructional strategies (Wise & Darling-Hammond 1985:103-113).

Hopkins & Bollington (1989) offer a comparison of the approach taken by ACAS in the United Kingdom with the United States of America experience, which they claim reveals a series of trends in teacher evaluation. These are:

- (1) a tendency to root schemes in criteria of effective teaching or goal setting;
- (2) the influence of clinical supervision;
- (3) an increase in developmental schemes and a move away from summative appraisal; and
- (4) an awareness of the need to secure teacher and local education authority commitment.

What is apparent in the United Kingdom, the United States of America and more recently in New Zealand, however, is that schemes currently adopted are a reflection of the 'management' form of accountability. This is contrary to the position advocated by ACAS (1986) or Hopkins and Bollington (1989).

When looking specifically at assessment, a key mechanism used in Britain is 'paper and pencil' tests and the results are publicly relayed through 'league tables'. Such mechanisms support both the market and management accountability commitment to the view that its fundamental purpose is to provide information to groups outside the system. If student quality is measured solely on examination results, this has implications for decisions made about teachers.

Furthermore, while some principals have adopted a 'democratic approach' through an appraisal process, largely characterised by a voluntary scheme developed through wide discussion and consultations, and with an emphasis on professional development need, others have adopted a more inspectorial approach, with such notions as 'the principal's right to manage' emerging in the justification of the scheme (Kyriacou 1987:141). And as Codd (1990) notes:

What this defines is an organisational culture that is hierarchical, competitive, individualistic and highly task-oriented. It is an instrumental culture in which ends are separated from means and people are valued only for what they produce. If it is imposed upon schools, it is a culture

that tends to be undemocratic, uneducational and wasteful of human initiative and capacity. This is the culture of managerialism⁶.

Having considered different models of teacher appraisal the question is now raised: 'What determines the selection of a particular policy?' The next chapter explores the political dynamics surrounding the development of teacher appraisal policy and examines, in particular, how policy transfer was effected.

3.4 Notes

- 1** Validity refers to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the evaluation in the context of the classroom.
- 2** Cited in Weber (1987:12).
- 3** For a full discussion see Popham–McNeil–Milman (PMM) approach in Popham, W.J. (1971) *Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems*.
- 4** Glass (1974) proposed a loosely structured evaluation system that used trained classroom observers, student evaluations and collateral data. Haertel (1986) expanded the use of collateral data to include teaching aids such as in-class tests or handouts.
- 5** It should be noted that neither the United Kingdom or Australia has attempted to apply the competency-based model to professional work.
- 6** Cited in Gordon & Walker (1992:9).

CHAPTER FOUR : POLICY MAKING AND POLICY TRANSFER

Earlier chapters have argued that the purpose of teacher appraisal policy was to bring about a management form of accountability. This chapter explores the politics and processes of policy making in order to understand: who sets the agenda for the accountability debate, who and how were the alternatives specified, who made the choice and implemented teacher appraisal policy.

The chapter begins by looking at theories about policy making and draws on the work of Kingdon (1984) by examining the agenda setting process of policy making and the process which determines the content alternatives and involves key players. Wolman's (1992) framework considering the relationship between policy transfer and the policy making process is seen as useful in this respect. This chapter argues that interest reflecting government control rather than educational interest was a vital factor in determining policy selection.

4.1 Concept of policy making

The purposes of policy making can be seen to be diverse and include purposes such as: to identify and respond to a public problem; to bring about change; or it may be to formalise what already exists in practice but not in written form. Anderson (1978:19) points out, 'Not everything that happens in society is a political problem. Policy makers have to make a distinction between *problems* and *the way things are*'. Thus, policy can be seen as an act of political intervention. For example, a political decision is made that some 'standard' is not being met, or a 'standard' needs to be defined and established. Anderson continues that the invoking of some standard of judgement introduces a normative element to the centre of any effort to develop a systematic,

comparative study of public policy:

A policy is more than a state, action or activity. It is a conscious contrivance, reflecting human purposiveness, and it is in some sense a moral act. A distinction is made somewhere between things that are good for the public and things that are bad (Anderson 1978:20).

Policy cannot be satisfactorily explained simply as a by-product of certain socio-economic conditions (although as we have seen, this can give rise and direction to policy); or political pressures or solely as the outcome of an accepted political process. People recognise problems, they generate proposals for public policy changes, and they engage in political activities such as election campaigns and pressure group lobbying. Anderson's comments highlight how important it is to know what concerns are brought forward, and by whom, and how issues are debated and assessed if we are to understand the policy process. Intrinsic to the notion of policy making, therefore, is its formulation, promulgation and implementation.

Kingdon (1984:3), in his seminal book *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*, simplifies the concept of policy making to a set of processes¹ which includes at least:

- ◆ the setting of the agenda,
- ◆ the specifying of alternatives from which the choice is to be made,
- ◆ the authoritative choice among those specified alternatives, and
- ◆ the implementation of the decision.

Kingdon cautions that 'success in one process does not necessarily imply success in others'. For example: an item can be prominent on an agenda without subsequently passing into law; neither does enactment of policy necessarily guarantee implementation according to legislative intent.

4.2 Agenda setting

Policy agendas² can be usefully analysed as representing a solution to a particular set of problems. The issue of how problems are constructed and framed is central to policy analysis. Beilharz (1987) describes the situation in the following manner:

Problems are not given but constructed, agendas are not self-evident but are produced as though they were; policy making is an instrumental exercise which necessarily fails to see itself as such. The relevant question then is – What is the problem to which ... has been proposed as the solution?³

The process of agenda setting may be influenced in a number of ways, as will be seen in the New Zealand case study discussed in chapters five and six. An influence may be a crisis or prominent event, or simply the building up of problems pressing in on the system.

Ideas which result in policy making come from a range of sources. The critical factor that places an item on an agenda is not its source, but the climate in government and its sensitivity to the idea⁴. A combination of sources is virtually always responsible for an agenda item coming to prominence. Whole communities are affected simultaneously across the board. Walsh (1987:147) aptly illustrates:

... the pressure for the introduction of performance appraisal for teachers [in the United Kingdom] derived from a number of sources, but the most important is the desire for greater central control of education ...

Mass media clearly affects the public opinion agenda. It can do this by magnifying movements and thereby can accelerate an issue's development and impact. The public's attention to governmental issues tracks closely on media coverage of those issues (Kingdon 1984:61). But instead of educating the public on an issue, the more common approach of the media is an episode of quite

intensive sensational coverage. This has been evidenced by the studies of both Alcorn (1987) and Irving (1987).

Alcorn's study concludes that 'Press reports and especially press headlines serve to create or reinforce people's general attitudes to the worth and achievements of the education system'. The tone of press comment throughout the period of her study suggested that the media believed there was much that was wrong with education in New Zealand: 'Editorials were generally condemning. The papers also suggest, however, that the system could get it right if only teachers followed certain guidelines and were more accountable, though this term is usually left undefined' (1987:28).

Irving (1987:1) also maintained 'that public perception is fostered and shaped by the media which has a strong tendency to focus on negative results and findings ...'. Irving continues that the 'evidence' as it is presented in the media is 'often taken out of context or used selectively to reinforce a particular point of view. ... It establishes a powerful mythology which in the public mind becomes the new reality'.

Another influence might be the gradual accumulation of knowledge and perspectives among the specialists in a given policy area and the generation of policy proposals by such specialists⁵.

Thirdly, political processes affect the agenda. Swings of national mood, capricious public opinion, election results, changes in administration, all may have powerful effects too.

It can be argued, however, that most policy emerges as a result of competing interests. Peddie (1991:5) elaborates on the competing interests which policy makers face:

Governments are also faced in education with a multiplicity of participants and interest groups, each of whom constitute powerful voting lobbies. Parents, employers, educators all have much to say as coherent – and sometimes highly organised – interest groups, but so do many other sectors of the community. Given that such interest groups will have an extremely divergent range of knowledge and experience of the education system this increases the problems of decision making.

The complexity of problems means that, apart from the set of subjects or problems on the agenda, there is always a set of alternatives for government action which is seriously considered by governmental officials and those closely associated with them.

4.3 Policy making models

A rational decision making model

A rational comprehensive model for policy makers to operate under is offered by Kingdon (1984:82). In this model, goals would be defined first and levels of achievement set. Policy makers would canvass many alternatives that might achieve these goals, and they would compare the alternatives, systematically assessing their costs and benefits. They would choose the alternatives that would achieve their goals at the least cost. Kingdon recognises, however, that for a variety of reasons his rational model does not very accurately describe reality. He concludes that often participants are not solving problems at all. Goals have not been specified precisely, and problems have not been identified with care. In fact, policy makers often seem to be committed to a certain proposal, and along the way develop information about problems they are

supposedly solving as a means of justifying their position. Kingdon emphasises:

Events do not proceed neatly in stages, steps or phases ... thus participants do not first identify problems and then seek solutions for them; indeed, advocacy of solutions often precedes the highlighting of problems to which they become attached. Agendas are not first set and then alternatives generated, instead, alternatives must be advocated for a long period before a short-run opportunity presents itself on an agenda (Kingdon 1984:204).

An incremental policy model

Education policy changes in many OECD countries, prior to the education reform movement of the 1980s, tended to be gradual and in small steps. Instead of beginning with consideration of each programme or issue afresh, decision makers would take what they were currently doing as accepted and make small successive changes in that current behaviour. This had the advantage of their not having to consider a vast array of far reaching changes, or redefining goals. The small adjustments were entirely manageable and generally did not require considerable resources added to the base budget.

In 1983 the OECD examiners of the New Zealand system commented that:

Insofar as it is possible to generalise about the style of educational policy making of a whole society, that of New Zealand remains consensual and incremental ... (OECD 1983:10)

and

Frequent review and the making of small adjustments perhaps been responsible for the lack of major structural change in New Zealand's educational system (OECD 1983:18).

Kingdon does not find an incremental model as satisfactory for describing agenda change, although he concedes that an incremental approach might still characterise the generation of alternatives⁶. The agenda might be quite volatile, but the alternatives policy makers consider, and the actual proposals they are prepared to enact, might represent much less dramatic changes.

Both these models, however, can be quite clearly seen to be applicable to the teacher appraisal policy making process as is developed in chapter five.

4.4 Policy process

Kingdon characterises the policy process as consisting of three major streams: problems, politics and policies.

First, various problems come to be recognised by people in and around government who set the agenda, such as the State Services Commission. Second, there is a policy community of specialists (bureaucrats, academics, interest groups, treasury officials) who each 'float' their ideas in the policy communities, for example, the New Zealand Treasury (1987) briefing papers, Sexton (1990), NZEI (1992). Third, there is a political stream composed of things like swings of national mood, vagaries of public opinion or interest pressure group campaigns as was seen by the demands, made through the mass media, for greater accountability in the education system in the late 1980s.

The three process streams are largely independent of one another, and each develops according to its own dynamics and rules. But, Kingdon (1984:82) argues, at some critical junctures the three streams are joined and the greatest policy changes grow out of that joining of problems, policy proposals and politics. This was true of teacher appraisal policy.

Each of the three processes – problem recognition, generation of policy proposals, and political events – can serve as an impetus or as a constraint. Various mechanisms such as indicators, events and feedbacks bring problems to the government's attention. As an impetus, items are promoted to higher agenda prominence. As a constraint, items are prevented from rising on the agenda.

Some items may not rise on the agenda because of the financial cost, the lack of acceptance by the public, the opposition of powerful interests, or simply because they are less pressing than other competing items.

But for a matter to be seen as a problem, people must become convinced that something should be done to change it. Kingdon provides insight about how a problem is recognised:

People in and around government make that translation by evaluating conditions in the light of their values, by comparisons between people of between ... other countries, and by classifying conditions into one category or another (1984:119).

4.5 Participants

Kingdon (1984:20) distinguishes between participants and processes. In principle, each of the active participants can be involved in each of the important processes – problem recognition, policy generation and politics. He believes that it is elected officials and their appointees, rather than career bureaucrats or non-governmental people, who are the most important in shaping the agenda. This does not always appear to be the case in New Zealand, however. The present Minister of Education, for example, has not shown in the Ministry's teacher appraisal policy project, the interest or level of interference evidenced from him in the national curriculum developments. He appears to have quite deliberately distanced himself from the policy.

The political leaders, bureaucrats and various forces outside the government (including the media, interest groups, researchers and the general public) can all be sources of agenda items. They also have a role in suggesting alternatives for action. Currently being debated by New Zealand academics are alternative models for improving teacher effectiveness. Some argue for a 'reflective' teacher

model and others a 'teacher development' model. In both instances the perspectives have developed through an incremental process of gradual accumulation of knowledge and experience.

So agendas may be set through the mobilisation of interest groups by leaders, or the issues may reach the agenda through a diffusion of ideas amongst the professional educators or bureaucrats. Or changes in the agenda may result from a change in party control brought about by elections.

4.6 Policy transfer

Wolman (1992) examines and analyses the actual process of policy transfer and considers the relationship between policy transfer and the policy making process. As Waltman (1980)⁷ observes, 'Governments are, in this respect, like any other human organization ... national governments, behaving like business firms, schools, hospitals, labour unions, and so forth, frequently copy the policies of other nations'. Schneider and Ingram (1988:62) agree: 'policy design' often is copied, borrowed, or pinched from similar policies in other locales'.

Learning about a country's policy is also frequently cited as one of the main rationales for comparative public policy research. Peddie (1991:4) concurs and adds:

We [New Zealand] have borrowed from overseas in the past, and continue to do so in the present. We have made mistakes in our borrowing, yet powerful forces outside the professional education sector continue to hold up models from overseas as examples of what we 'should' be doing.

Wolman contends that relatively little is known about the policy transfer process:

We know almost nothing about the process by which such policy transfer occurs or indeed, whether interaction even occurs, and if so through what means. We also know little about the role policy information from

abroad plays, either in a systematic or an idiosyncratic fashion, in the broader policy process and under what kinds of circumstances policy transfer is likely to occur (1992:29).

More frequently when policy transfer is considered, it is part of the literature on a wider review of policy diffusion and concern with the role which imitation plays in the diffusion process (Wolman 1992:28)⁸.

Wolman (1992:29) posits seven questions to assist investigation of the process of policy transfer. They provide a useful framework to examine the role of policy transfer in New Zealand education policy making process and teacher appraisal policy in particular. The framework permits questions to be asked as to the role information from other countries might play in the appraisal policy process (particularly in the policy stream) and under what sets of circumstances policy transfer from overseas actually occurs.

How do policy makers learn about policy in other countries?

Wolman discusses both the formal and informal processes of learning about other nations' policies. He elaborates:

Policy makers learn about the policies of other countries through trips abroad by individual ministers and civil servants (sometimes for general reconnaissance purposes and sometimes organised around a specific problem or policy), more formal fact finding missions, usually by groups of civil servants, reports from civil servants who participate in formal exchange programmes involving a stay of substantial duration in another country, formal and informal contacts with foreign visitors, and advice and information from academics, think tanks, consultants, and journalists, both through personal contact and through reading their reports, articles and books. (1992:30)

Although there are formal mechanisms through which learning about policies of other countries is supposed to occur, teacher appraisal in New Zealand is not characterised by a systematic search for policy transfer possibilities. The Minister of Education's only visit to Britain in 1991 was fleeting. His 'investigations were wide ranging and on the whole he discussed the

implementation of education policies, looking at where things went wrong and what to avoid' (see appendix 5). Opportunities have been taken to meet with British visitors in New Zealand, but the agenda priority has been on the financial arrangements of bulk grants to schools or 'assessment of learning'. There is no evidence that the Minister had intended looking formally at the assessment of teachers, and/or teacher appraisal schemes, from speeches and action following the Minister's visit to Britain (see appendix 4), or his meetings with overseas politicians, academics and consultants.

Formal and informal contacts with foreign visitors at a ministerial level and by Ministry of Education officials will no doubt have occurred, but the consequences of those contacts has not materialised into particular efforts or expressions of interest by officials.

Information gathered from and participation in international organisations such as the OECD by Ministry officials has, at this stage, focused primarily on national curriculum developments.

Reports based on visits or fact-finding missions are often highly descriptive and cursory, relying more on verbal communication than on written material. Visiting ministers, state officials and fact-finding groups are generally exposed much more to the views of those wishing programmes to succeed. These 'visitors' tend to be shown 'show-case' examples rather than average situations. To illustrate briefly: whilst in Opposition, New Zealand Education Minister Lockwood Smith 'did a great deal of reading and formed his opinion that the first three years of a child's life was the most vital'. When Lockwood Smith was in the United States of America on other business, he took an opportunity to see a Missouri policy, 'Parents as First Teachers', in action. From that one visit, two American advocates of the programme were invited to come to speak to New Zealand early

childhood groups. 'Parents as First Teachers' Missouri-style became New Zealand policy (see appendix 5).

Such examples confirm Wolman's view that the information acquired through contacts with consultants, journalists, academics, and visitors often tends to be highly impressionistic and unsystematic.

In summary, Wolman contends that, 'the result of these various means of gathering information about foreign policies might be characterised as a pre-eminent form of policy making by anecdote rather than by analysis'.

Macaskill and McDonald (see chapter six) offer a convincing alternative view on the role of the consultant. They discuss the pervasive role of multi-national economic consultants who move from country to country in a type of global web networking. These people deal with particular questions world wide. The consultants' presence is evident within countries undertaking education and economic reform. The ideas, concepts, economic theories of those multi-national consultants have the ability to set the agenda in one country in light of another's.

Where do ideas for policy transfer come from?

Policy transfer through borrowing can occur based on similar patterns of information, geographic proximity or linguistic and cultural similarities. Wolman sees as of greater importance the ideological similarity between the national governments of the two countries.

Reich's (1991) notion of a 'global web networking of problem identification and solving'⁹ has credence. There is a feeling that New Zealand suffers from similar problems to Britain and that we can learn from that experience. This is due to

many reasons; some of the major ones are our shared colonial past, a similar language, and cultural similarities.

Currently both Britain and New Zealand have national governments who adhere to New Right ideologies. The ethos is to favour privatisation by the removal of the state from its responsibility in areas of social policy public interest.

How do ideas for policy transfer enter the domestic policy process?

Policy transfer does not occur in a vacuum, but as part of the broader policy development process. It thus takes place in the context of discussion of existing problems, general ideas about dealing with them, and specific proposed solutions. There is an obvious rationale in looking particularly to countries which are perceived to share similar problems.

It is clear that New Zealand has looked to Britain for ideas and policies to solve its education issues. Peddie (1991) has argued convincingly that New Zealand ideas for policy transfer have come disproportionately from Britain and, in general, most interviewees in chapter six agree. McDonald, in her interview, pointed out that 'Britain in its turn looks to the United States of America for its ideas'.

The general framework for education with which the New Zealand National Government came to office in 1990 was one which emphasised devolution, choice, individual competence and effective management practices. Concepts all evident in the United Kingdom and the United States which were seen as desirable by New Zealand governments. The New Zealand education reforms continued to develop those concepts. Rae (1993b:9) illustrates:

With a new government elected at the end of 1990 and appointment of Dr Lockwood Smith as Minister, the watchwords have become – achievement, choice, enterprise and national competitive advantage.

How is the policy under consideration for transfer evaluated?

Kingdon's rational model of policy making suggests that policy makers considering the transfer of a programme to their country should first evaluate the policy's effect in the original country. Furthermore, they should make this assessment particularly with respect to the problem that they wish the policy to address in their country, recognising that the policy may have pursued different objectives in the original country.

Just as the rational model of policy making may not have been used in the originating country, it is not surprising that a rational model or an alternative to it may not be pursued in the process of policy transfer. Wolman highlights this:

Policies are sought out which conform to a (frequently just emerging) conception of appropriate policy approach or ideology and assessment is then focussed on the way in which such programmes are put together and operate. Evaluation of effects is limited to the immediately observable (1992:36).

Ideas for policy transfer have been evident through successive ministerial and working parties such as, the Marshall report (1978), the Curriculum Review (1987), Project ABLE (1989) which have made highly significant calls for teacher effectiveness and teacher responsibility for student learning if not directly the mode for obtaining it. The Scott (1986) report in particular identified the need for accountability mechanisms.

How is the suitability for the policy transfer assessed?

To be successful, a policy transfer must be capable of being adopted through the political system and, once adopted, must be effective. This means the policy must successfully address the problem it is expected to solve. Finally it must be capable of survival, that is, it must continue to exist and to operate effectively.

Contextual questions are raised as to whether the recipient country is suitable as a host for policy which has operated in the different setting. Przeworski (1970:6) discusses factors relevant to potential policy difference among countries. He concludes, 'A selected set of social variables are rarely autonomous; there are always other factors that can influence any observed relationship'. Among important aspects of a policy's environment Wolman (1992:38) includes 'its institutional and structural setting, the national political culture, public opinion, relationship to other policies, and the country's level of economic development, wealth and economic structure'.

Although there had been much rhetoric about teacher competency, there had been no 'trigger' to bring a demand for an immediate policy response. In fact, the political environment was not receptive to change: reforms undertaken by the government in the labour market, for instance, with the introduction of the Employment Contracts Act and public health sector were proving highly contentious.

Theories underpinning resistance to a policy bring competing accounts of a problem and can change or defer a policy. The good standing of nurses in the public perception, and their highly uncharacteristic stand on conditions of service and pay, had created legitimisation difficulties for the government. The government also found that teachers were highly organised, and their successful opposition to government education policy on the bulk funding of teachers' salaries had united and channelled a public outrage. Other initiatives at the tertiary level, and in the area of national curriculum and assessment, had not met with acceptance. The media carried stories of how people's lives were being detrimentally affected by the changes. An appraisal policy in line with managerial accountability as expressed in Britain would only create further public antagonism.

Clearly, policy settings may differ considerably across countries. Although policy makers appear readily to recognise that there are important differences in policy settings across countries, they have more difficulty in understanding the nature of these differences and assessing their importance for policy transfer.

What kind of policy transfer occurs?

Policy transfer is usually thought of as the borrowing of a specific, fairly detailed, policy or programme from another country. Wolman's research shows in many cases a specific policy idea may be borrowed, but the specific design or structure through which it occurs in the original country may not be. Such is the case with the concept of New Zealand taking on the recent British model of a national curriculum framework with levels of learning specified as objectives and accompanied by formal assessment procedures (see appendix 4). Wolman concludes, 'Policy borrowing should thus be seen as encompassing a broad continuum from general concepts, to policy tools, to highly specific programme design'(1992:41).

What kinds of processes characterise the policy transfer process?

The rational policy analysis model is well known: define the problem, identify causes, set forth goals and objectives, consider constraints, list alternatives, posit evaluation criteria, evaluate alternatives by the chosen evaluation criteria, choose preferred solution. But Wolman asserts transferring a policy from one country to another requires three additional steps to be added to the standard rational model. These steps he frames as questions :

- 1 Are the problems to which the policy is to be addressed in the recipient country similar to those to which it was addressed in the originating country?
- 2 To what extent was the policy 'successful' in the originating country?
- 3 Are there any aspects of a policy's setting in the originating country which are critical to its success there, but which are not

present, or are present in a different form, in the recipient country? (Wolman 1992:42)

4.7 Discussion

A policy, then, is likely to be successful when a problem is recognised, a solution is available, the political climate makes the time right for change, and the constraints do not inhibit action.

Policy transfer is not an isolated endeavour, but an integral part of the policy process. Policy ideas from other countries are generated from the community of specialists who have an interest in, and a commitment to a particular policy area. Policy makers, especially in a context such as the OECD, are aware of development in their particular international community. They also want to do what is currently being done by others, especially by those countries perceived as 'leaders'. Clearly, there is an advantage for those who promote ideas from other countries. The policies can be seen in place and working.

The New Zealand Ministry of Education's stated aims in its international policy are to 'keep apprised of current cross-national thinking, developments, and issues in education'; to view and ensure New Zealand policy decisions are within an international framework of findings and standards; to use 'the information, expertise and experiences of education in other countries'; and to take the opportunity to be part of an international network across the full range of educational activities and development¹⁰.

The important role that language plays is a key element in the investigation of public policy making. Kingdon (1984:126) argues that attention must be paid to the language of political discourse, that is, the way in which public actions are argued about, explained and justified. Wolman (1992:34) too, believes that the

way policy makers learn about other countries' policies occurs with particular ease when it is facilitated by a common language and by the high flow of visitors and informal contacts between the two countries.

At the broader level of concepts, however, Wolman believes these may originate from more visible participants as a result of travel, personal contact, or flow of ideas through the media.

The interaction of politicians and economic participants is not wholly straightforward; that is, it does not happen in simple, direct ways. Rather, the interaction is through the mediation of their institutions. Politicians and economic interests work through mechanisms set up to aggregate preferences, make decisions, and provide modalities of enforcement. These mechanisms themselves influence the character of interaction, hence the outcome – and the civil servants and others who have control over these mechanisms themselves have influence over the results.

The adoption of policies from other countries is more likely to occur when those policies are seen to address problems perceived in the home country, and to coincide with dominant or emerging ideas about the appropriate shape of policy, particularly if the ideas are associated with the governing party, coalition or important faction. This is endorsed by Grace (1991:26) who claims 'the New Right agencies in New Zealand were ideologically resourced from Britain and the United States of America'.

This chapter has highlighted the importance of the context of any problem which is on the policy agenda. It is the 'political climate' that shapes the problem and defines it as such. If the conditions also appear similar to another country and a 'ready made' answer is available, then it is likely that policy importation will occur.

The following chapters turn to focus on the New Zealand experience of teacher accountability and appraisal policy making which illustrates the manner which the foregoing theories can be seen to be useful in explaining the actual process in this country.

4.8 Notes

- 1 Policy making may also be regarded simply as the product of the state; or explained through relationships with certain institutional and environmental characteristics; or it may be explained, in Marxist terms, as a product of social structure or class conflict. For a fuller discussion see Anderson 1978:34.
- 2 Kingdon (1984:4) postulates that we should distinguish between the governmental agenda (i.e. the list of subjects that are getting attention) and the decision agenda (i.e. the list of subjects within the governmental agenda that are up for active decision). He sees the two as affected by somewhat different processes.
- 3 Cited in Porter 1987:389.
- 4 Kingdon argues (1984:77) that the origin of an idea, concern or proposal cannot be specified. Even if it could be, it would be difficult to determine whether an event at an earlier point in time was more important than an event at a later point.
- 5 Academics' arguments, innovation by educational practitioners, new technology, may have a major influence in the formation of education policy.
- 6 For a full discussion of 'incrementalism' see Kingdon 1984:83.
- 7 Cited in Wolman 1992:1.
- 8 Diffusion studies examine the way in which policies spread across time and space, and typically attempt to describe and account for the way in which countries adopt similar policies. Similar policies can result from common processes occurring within nations, which may lead them independently to adopt similar policies. 'Policy transfer', however, describes a process when a conscious imitation of the policies of other nations is made.
- 9 Harvard economist Robert Reich (1991) in *The work of nations* describes the international economy as 'the global web' but a crucial feature is the disappearance of the national economy and new forms of enterprise organisations emerge.

10 At a formal level New Zealand, for example, actively participates in:

- ◆ the global activities of the OECD and in particular those that arise from the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) which is the project arm of the policy setting Education Committee;
- ◆ the International Association for the Evaluation of Education (IEA) which is a co-operative network for cross national educational research;
- ◆ the United Nations Educational, Secretariat and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) including the regional co-operative APEID in which 25 of the Asia/Pacific member States of UNESCO participate; and
- ◆ international teacher exchanges with the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, Germany and Japan (New Zealand Ministry of Education International activities, as at 1 June 1993).

At a less formal level: academic exchange of ideas; a variety of travel scholarship opportunities such as Fulbright and Nuffield; travel, friendship and international subject associations – all result in classroom teachers having some understanding about other nations' education systems and particular programmes.

CHAPTER FIVE : TEACHER ACCOUNTABILITY AND APPRAISAL IN NEW ZEALAND – A CASE STUDY

This chapter has two aims: first, it details the policy discussion on teacher accountability and appraisal in New Zealand; and second, it places that policy discussion within the context of the education reforms by considering to what extent the struggle over the reforms shaped or coloured the agenda for teacher appraisal and to what extent teacher appraisal was simply left off the agenda. This chapter argues that three forces of accountability have shaped the debate on teacher appraisal: neo-liberal market, managerialism, and professionalism – with the most noticeable shift made towards the requirements of managerial accountability.

5.1 Background

As part of its political commitment to the creation of a just and more equitable society, the first Labour Government (1935–1949) placed education at the centre of its plans for social, political and economic transformation. Prime Minister Peter Fraser (1939) expressed official thinking about education:

The government's objective, broadly expressed, is that every person whatever his level of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in town or country, has a right, as a citizen, to a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted and to the fullest extent of his powers. So far is this from being a mere pious platitude that the full acceptance of the principle will involve the reorientation of the education system¹.

Post-war, despite changes in government, that principle was maintained. During the 1950s and 1960s, efforts were made to train more teachers to deliver that philosophy to all New Zealand children.

The underpinning doctrine of the Commission on Education in New Zealand (Currie Report 1962) was that increased state expenditure on education would provide greater opportunities for social mobility. Education was believed to effect social equality and lead to greater economic productivity.

In the 1970s, as in other parts of the world, the view that education is a force for social progress was subject to scrutiny and criticism. Not only was there a growing right-wing advocacy of market power, but also influential theorists such as Bourdieu (1971) and Illich (1972) saw schooling as an agent of social and economic **control** and were calling earlier beliefs into question². There was in New Zealand increasing public concern about deficiencies within the education system, combined with calls for greater community participation and parental involvement in education. Alongside these concerns, teachers themselves were calling for professional support and development.

Public concern about education, therefore, was not a phenomenon peculiar to the late eighties. When conflict arose earlier, however, it was about isolated aspects of education which, to a large extent, were able to be resolved by compromise. This type of response fitted well with the structure and philosophy of schools in which change was based on incrementalism and consensus. The 1983 OECD *Review of National Policies for Education* stressed the value placed on consensus and a long-standing commitment to consultation in the processes of choice and decision-making and, more particularly, in the management of institutions at local level (OECD 1983:22). New ideologies, though, were beginning to emerge, and would gain momentum with the election of a new government.

5.2 Fourth Labour Government 1984–1990

Labour's new education settlement for primary and secondary schooling was based upon five principles of restructuring: namely, parent and community empowerment; efficient school-site management; strong accountability; contestable provision and the local determination (within national frameworks) of conditions of employment for principals and teachers (Picot 1988: chapter four). Those principles emerged through a series of reports³, but it was clear 'that the masterplan for education had been in preparation for some time before then and that a blueprint had been prepared by two control departments, the Treasury and the State Services Commission' (McDonald 1993:12)⁴.

The development of the Labour Government's policy has been dealt with in detail elsewhere (see, for example, Boston et al. 1991, Codd et al. 1990, Grace 1991, Holland & Boston 1990, Lauder & Wylie 1990). This chapter concentrates on the theme of teacher accountability.

5.3 Accountability for teaching performance

Simpkin (1993:2) points out that accountability for teachers rests on two important but distinct means, via disciplinary regulations and through competence procedures. This distinction was acknowledged and reinforced by the Scott Committee (1986:6.4.1). 'Disciplinary procedures related to the *conduct* or misbehaviour of teachers' which was a semi-judicial process. Simpkin argues that the procedures prior to 1989 recognised the professional autonomy of teachers and 'did not fit with the managerial agenda ... where self-seeking behavioural assumptions must be dealt with via summary dismissal, punitive (short-term contracts) or monetary incentives'.

Accountability relating to competence was based on the assumption that:

... once selected for teacher training, a teacher had a commitment to a vocation and a reciprocal commitment by government to recognise their vocational and professional autonomy. An incompetent teacher was recognised by the profession as undesirable and a negative reflection on other teachers and should thus be removed by only after every effort had been made to restore competence (Simpkin 1993:3).

Teaching performance in New Zealand in the 1980s was first placed directly under the spotlight through the government's new Education and Science Select Committee chaired by Noel Scott, MP (later Associate Minister of Education). Teaching activity was to be debated politically rather than within the education family.

Inquiry into the Quality of Teaching, (the Scott report) 1986

The committee's terms of reference for its *Inquiry into the Quality of Teaching* were to examine education policy and its administration⁵. The report stated:

The public has a personal as well as fiscal investment in the effectiveness of education. Their children must, by law, be educated. The great majority of those children attend state schools. Because the future life chances of school students depend very largely on the effectiveness of the schooling which they receive, the public has a right to demand the best education possible for their children. Members of Parliament, as public representatives, are duty bound to see that the public interest is protected (the Scott report:2.1.3).

The work of the select committee was initiated by public debate on teacher performance which linked with and contributed to the underlying agenda of accountability. 'The quality of teaching is a priority area of inquiry', the report stated, and continued, '... during electorate work and contact with constituents, many expressions of public concern have been made to committee members. There is widespread recognition that some teachers are unsatisfactory. They damage the children they teach, and parents have expressed their strong concern' (the Scott report 1986:2.2.1).

Further, in its discussion of professionalism and accountability, the committee saw accountability as essential to protect the rights of students and argued that 'there should be processes for their [teachers] ongoing evaluation and review of performance' (the Scott report 1986:chapter 6).

The media, predictably, highlighted the more controversial measures. Central was teacher accountability, particularly the possibility of direct measurable controls, and of more effective dismissal procedures for unsatisfactory teachers. Headlines such as 'No Jobs for Tired Time-Servers' and 'Hopeless Hang On' did not provide for reasoned public debate⁶.

The government welcomed the committee's report, and made connections between the need 'to ensure quality education in all New Zealand schools' (with the individual learner as the major focus of education), and 'teachers as pivotal to the quality of teaching practices'. Therefore, to assure the highest quality teaching for all learners, there was 'the requirement of teachers to be accountable for their professional performance'⁷.

As with earlier reports and specifically the Curriculum Review (1987), the Scott report acknowledged the need for curriculum reform, community participation, equitable provision of resources, equity of outcomes for individual learners, and continuing teacher development. An emphasis more specific to the recommendations of the Scott report and which distinguished it from the earlier ones, however, was that placed on the requirement for greater teacher accountability.

Maintaining the accountability of the profession had become a priority. The Inquiry had signalled that the loss of measures such as grading, or the failure to implement the proposals for the registration of teachers contained in the Marshall

Report⁸, caused some concern. The Education Amendment Bill (No. 4), introduced into Parliament on 25 November 1986, had proposed a structure for the registration and discipline of teachers as envisaged in the Marshall Report as early as 1978 – but it had not been enacted.

In order to move from a general understanding of the context in which issues relating to teacher accountability were debated, it is useful to reconsider Kingdon's ploy of distinguishing participants who are influential in setting the agenda. By considering the role of the New Zealand Treasury, Ruth Richardson and the Business Roundtable the implications for teachers become obvious.

5.4 Neo-liberal views

The role of the New Zealand Treasury

The Treasury's *Brief to the Incoming Government* volume 2 (1987) produced 'one of the most complete and sophisticated statements of a neo-liberal perspective on education' (Dale 1993:5).

The Treasury's analysis identifies three issues which are said to underlie recent public concerns about education. The first is the issue of *choice* which is juxtaposed against 'state direction'. The second is the issue of *equity* which is linked to funding and what is called the 'middle-class capture effect'. The third issue is *efficiency* which is linked to 'levels of performance' (Codd et al. 1990a:25).

Treasury argued that the education system as a whole was inadequate (McDonald 1993:15), offering the lack of achievement in schools as proof (NZ Treasury 1987:16) despite evidence to the contrary (Elley 1991).

Treasury treated education as a 'commodity' and 'private good' rather than a 'public good' which benefited individuals and identifiable interest groups.

Teachers were cast as an interest group which stood in opposition both to the national education well-being and the interests of students:

A key criticism of the education system was that it was run in the interests of the producers rather than the consumers, and that advice from professional groups like teachers was inevitably self-interested and could therefore be disregarded (Dale 1993:7).

Furthermore, Treasury claimed there were 'substantial inequities and inefficiencies in current state intervention in education' and that if the costs of specific state intervention in education were reduced, the benefits would increase (NZ Treasury 1987:293).

Treasury's assertions set the scene for overseas policies on restructuring of the public sector, of which education was a part, to take place. It attempted to create a view that teachers had to be kept on a tight rein. Professional self regulation such as teacher appraisal would be ruled out as teachers could not be trusted. The Treasury's rhetoric echoed notions of professional control of teachers that the *Inquiry* first raised and encouraged legislation seeking to manage assessment of teacher performance (see appendix 1).

Ruth Richardson, Opposition Spokesperson on Education

Ruth Richardson, Opposition spokesperson on Education and member of the Inquiry, had signalled, as early as 1987, her support for many of the arguments articulated by the New Zealand Treasury in its 1984 briefing paper. The education manifesto of the National Party issued by Ruth Richardson in opposition, entitled *A Nation at Risk*,⁹ 'implied serious deficiencies in the New Zealand education system, and set out principles for the reconstruction of education policy', a changed role for the state, more accountability, more 'consumer choice, and improved management systems' (Grace 1991:31). Under

National's proposals the state would remain the principal **funder** of education, but not necessarily the principal **provider**.

On her return from a visit to England and prior to the 1987 national election, Ruth Richardson argued strongly¹⁰ that the current education system was a 'denial of democracy' and lacked 'real accountability':

Any system that leaves parents, pupils and public alike, powerless is a denial of democracy. The old adage – no taxation without representation – bears repeating. The public and parents fund the education system yet are denied an effective say in how that money should be spent. In place of public and parent power, we find a patronising system. The arrogant claim that the politicians, the bureaucrats and the education pressure groups know best. ... The ultimate accountability lies in having to perform to users' requirements; knowing that good performance will thrive, and that poor performers will have to smarten their act or go out of business¹¹.

Richardson called for accountability mechanisms to be installed at four levels:

Public – the public need an accurate idea of overall performance in important areas of curriculum; is our performance in literacy and numeracy, for example, improving or declining? New Zealand lacks such an objective system.

Pupils – pupils need reliable and reputable measures of individual student achievement. That can only be guaranteed by objective and external assessments.

Professionals – teachers need some proper measure of their professional qualities. If those qualities are found to be absent, there must be a system in which the public can have confidence for removing those teachers from the ranks.

Parents – parents need to be in a position to make well-informed judgments about schools and their effectiveness in promoting learning in individual pupils. Where parents don't share the stated objectives, or consider that a school has failed to perform, they need to be able to vote with their feet and take their custom to a school that will reflect their preference¹².

And, between those two pronouncements, in a press statement responding to the Minister of Education's initiative of boosting staff numbers:

The consumers of the education system need to be assured that there are structures to ensure that they won't have to face incompetent teachers.

The best spur to quality in education is to give consumers choice. Only when users can influence the direction of education will we achieve the accountability and the quality that many professionals and parents now call for in education¹³.

A key agency involved in the construction of an education crisis in the mid-1980s was the Business Roundtable.

The Business Roundtable/The Education Forum

According to Gordon (1992:2,9) 'The new hegemonic power bloc within capital was broadly the finance sector' and in particular 'those multinational corporations whose wealth was derived from property and finance'. These groups combined to form the New Zealand Business Roundtable. 'The free market offered these groups an opportunity of unlimited accumulation of wealth'¹⁴. Kingdon (1984:54) also noted the critical importance of 'resources' available to a group that give it an initial advantage (or disadvantage) in affecting agendas and alternatives. In the case of the Business Roundtable its resources make it a powerful lobby group able to influence the government's agenda.

One of the Business Roundtable's strategies was to commission overseas consultants to influence the agenda for education.

Stuart Sexton, who was part of a London right-wing think-tank and closely associated with the extreme right of the British Conservative Party¹⁵, was commissioned to produce the Roundtable's first report: *New Zealand Schools and current reforms* (Sexton 1990). Sexton's brief visit to New Zealand exposed the Roundtable's real agenda for education – which was about setting up market conditions so that the private sector could move into and profit from the delivery of education services.

Sexton was influential in setting the government's agenda along market model as in the issue of funding schools through bulk grant. His report dealt with the education system and made no comment on teacher appraisal as in the market model, as teachers would be judged by the effectiveness of the school's ability to retain students. No further process was required to support or identify teacher strengths or weaknesses.

Business Roundtable chief executive Roger Kerr established the Education Forum as a power elite able to comment on education issues and make recommendations to government. The Forum espoused strong support for the right-wing ideologies held by some politicians within government. The Forum's credibility to speak on education issues rested on its membership. Many members were well-known principals¹⁶. Most of them were considered to hold elitist ideas regarding education. Graye Shattky, then national president of the School Trustees Association, gave added authority¹⁷.

Better Teachers for Better Learning (Education Forum 1992a) was the second report commissioned by the Roundtable and launched by the Forum. The report's author, Australian consultant David Tribeck, focused on teachers' pay and conditions. It strongly advocated the immediate implementation of salaries bulk funding, and recommended voucher-based funding to 'allow direct competition between public and private schools'¹⁸. The report called for market accountability, declaring the most direct way to improve schools derived from 'management discretion on teacher pay [linked to teacher appraisal] through school responsiveness and parent choice' (Rae 1992b:5).

The crucial element of the report's recommendations linked salary rewards to performance. Appraisal would be the mechanism to determine that performance. Teaching organisations were outraged at the assertions made within the report

and within a subsequent Forum publication, *Better Teachers and Employment Contracts* (Education Forum 1992b), which was released just prior to the 1992 bargaining round on teachers' salaries and conditions of service. The timing illustrated the vested interest of Forum members in commissioning the reports.

In summary, the basic assumptions underlying the neo-liberal marketisation of education were: the education system has been performing badly and is in urgent need of reform; schools can be managed more efficiently if major management decisions, including decisions about teachers' pay and work conditions, are made at the local level; parental choice and competition is necessary to promote higher educational standards; and state expenditure should be cut (Lauder 1991:9).

It was in the climate of such debates on accountability that Brian Picot, a prominent businessman, was asked to prepare his report on New Zealand's educational administration.

Administering for Excellence (the Picot report) 1988

The report from the Task Force to Review Education Administration became the basis for government policy on educational administration. The policy, *Tomorrow's Schools*, (1988) encapsulated many of the neo-liberal market arguments. It recommended the disestablishment of education boards and devolvement of educational administration from central government to local school boards of trustees. A principal feature of the reform was that institutions were to be accountable for the government funds spent on education, and for meeting the objectives set out in their charters. They were to be monitored in this by a nationally established independent body, a Review and Audit agency (renamed the Education Review Office in 1989). The agency was responsible for carrying out regular reviews of every institution (*Tomorrow's Schools* 1988:1).

The Picot report echoed the neo-liberal assertion that professionals militated against a flexible, effective and efficient education system (Picot 1988:3.2.4). Picot proposed a structure in which there was positive incentive to improve teacher performance. It was intended that appraisal would help teachers examine the nature and purpose of their work (Picot 1988:7.3.8).

5.5 The management view

The administrative reforms were accompanied by an attempt to change the power structure underlying teacher working conditions which is discussed in some detail in this section. Lauder (1991:11) identifies this attempt in the following way:

... the attempted introduction of a new management culture in which the key to effective education was located in 'management' ... this involved the introduction of manager/employee relationships which divided the managers from workers and increased the power and patronage of management over workers.

In addition, Picot's introduction of appraisal provided a management tool for personnel decisions with the State Sector Amendment Act 1989 as a key policy reinforcing managerial control on teacher appraisal.

State Sector Amendment Act 1989

The State Sector Amendment Act 1989 extended the principles of management and accountability by effecting changes related to personnel and industrial issues associated with the implementation of *Tomorrow's Schools*. These provisions applied directly to teachers' conditions of employment and the delivery of education. The State Services Commission (SSC) had a key co-ordinating role within the public service (Simpkin 1993:1) and was promoted as the appropriate agency to negotiate on 'disputes of interest' on behalf of the employer. The Amendment Act prevented teaching organisations from negotiating with

personnel from the Department of Education, most of whom were former teachers. Instead, teachers' salaries and conditions were set in an aggressive, bargaining climate in which professional standards of teaching were no longer taken as unquestioned. In addition, the SSC attempted to shift the ground away from collegial models of working, including the professional model of appraisal, to a top-down, market-management approach.

The State Sector Amendment Act 1989 also provided for codes of conduct (section 77b), and individual boards of trustees were given powers to prescribe their own standards of integrity or conduct under clause 4. And through the inclusion of section 77c (appendix 1) the education service became the only sector to have employee competency measures imposed. The newly created Ministry of Education had the power to 'prescribe matters to be taken into account by employers in assessing the performance of teachers', but it had to be with the agreement of the SSC. The clause also empowered boards of trustees to set their own policies on performance, provided they were consistent with national requirements.

State Services Commission

At the centre of the SSC's briefing to the incoming National Government in 1990 was a perceived need for 'greater accountability and efficiency in the state education service', whilst the key targets for improvement in the Treasury briefing, by contrast, were 'responsiveness, choice and competition' (Dale & Jesson 1992:10).

Both Treasury and the SSC played major roles in shaping the government's education policies. Both had officers present at the Picot taskforce meetings and were represented on the implementation groups that were to turn the Picot

proposals into practice. The positions taken by both organisations in 'setting the agenda' show rational decision making to be an illusion.

Wilson's (1992) thesis¹⁹ claims that the SSC and Treasury interests and positions were not identical and that SSC was far more influential than Treasury with the Picot committee. Building on Wilson's thesis, the analysis of Dale and Jesson (1992) is that the central purpose of the SSC's intervention in education was to mainstream the service and make it conform with the broader reforms of public administration, and to deny education any special treatment.

Rae (1993b:21) saw the role of the SSC as one of implementing a 'range of accountabilities' which were to be carried through by boards of trustees. In particular, contracts and annual appraisal procedures became prerequisites for the fixing of principals' salaries within ranges of rates. There was an assumption that these procedures for linking pay with performance measures would, in turn, apply to teachers. With the concluding of the 1992 collective employment contracts, board certification of competence became a prerequisite for a primary teacher's progression up the basic scale. The meeting of a schedule of criteria was similarly required of secondary teachers (Rae 1993b:21).

The introduction of the Employment Contracts Act 1991 carried the reforms further²⁰. Employers and employees became free to negotiate over whether to have individual or collective contracts. Coupled with extreme New Right monetarist attacks on teachers' work, pay, status and professionalism, the power and influence exerted by teacher unions in the traditional manner was diminished.

In the market-management led reforms the current employment contract negotiations had led to a tight codification of those working conditions and

attempts to reward individual 'excellence in teaching'. The main accountability link between boards and the principal has become the performance agreement. The process of assessing teachers' performance relies on the setting of standards, and measuring and monitoring of performance against those standards. In England, the School Teachers' Review Body had already identified appraisal as the main way to evaluate performance (Merrick & Rafferty 1992:8).

The attempt to introduce performance-related pay schemes in education reflects the private sector culture of incentives and individual accountability. The logic of performance-related pay is based on the simple premise that individuals who believe their pay to be directly related to their performance will work harder and achieve more than others.

The assessment of performance is the pivotal element in any performance related pay scheme (Annesley 1992:142). The two main approaches have been to assess a teacher against the work carried out, or by student achievement (generally through examination results).

There are practical problems, and amongst them is the difficulty of defining good performance and measuring the value added by an individual teacher's efforts.

Annesley (1992:43) details those difficulties:

A whole range of school and non-school variables, such as school climate, previous instructional treatment, home environment, social class and ability, affect student achievement.

Hartley and Broadfoot (1988) see the inability to isolate a teacher's part in the learning process and to eliminate subjectivity in the assessment process as two compelling reasons why teacher effectiveness cannot be systematically evaluated.

Annesley (1992:144) also discusses the need for substantial and ongoing funding if performance related pay is to be introduced.

Added to which, evidence does not show any strong association between teachers' motivation, skill or commitment and the existence of financial incentives (McNamara 1992, Merrick & Rafferty 1992, OECD 1988). Those considerations were uppermost in the next report prepared for the government.

Today's schools: A Review of the Education Reform Implementation Process (the Lough report) 1990

Six months after the education reforms were introduced, the Lough Committee²¹ was set up to review how the policy was operating in practice and what changes needed to be made. Dale & Jesson (1992:18) argue:

Six months hardly seems to be sufficient time for the reforms to be institutionalised to a stage that would permit the kind of evaluation called for in the terms of reference, especially since many details of the reforms were not completed by 1st October, 1989. For instance, many school charters were not signed, there were numerous disputes about funding levels and there was considerable ignorance about how the system was to work following the galvanic changes it had undergone, such as the removal of all tiers of administration between schools and central ministry.

Clearly the Lough committee illustrated a different mind-set about teachers' role in schools.

The committee met in private and did not invite public submissions. It continued, as Rae (1992a:6) points out, 'in the traditions of desired rationality of administration of education, with significant recommendations on the clarification of roles of school managers, the principals and trustees'. It commented on the principal's role and responsibilities as the chief executive officer of the school – but the teachers were invisible.

The change the Lough committee sought was in the direction of far greater emphasis on the managerial aspects of professional leadership and that these modifications be carried out in the 'name of public accountability, very narrowly defined' (Dale 1993:6).

Sullivan (1992:155) adds to the discussion:

Today's Schools (1990) not only uses the language of managerialism but also applies its principles to schools. The result is a dehumanised account of optimum effectiveness in a context of 'key performance indicators' and personnel management.

Not everybody, though, regarded the use of teacher appraisal to monitor performance as being outside the professional scope of teachers themselves. Such a distinction was made in *Tomorrow's Standards*.

5.6 The professional collegial view

'Tomorrow's Standards'. Assessment for Better Learning (Project ABLE) 1990

The ministerial working party's terms of reference included advice to government on the possible effects of assessment and reporting procedures for teachers (Project ABLE 1990:5). The working party recognised a conflict between the award provisions and legislation. It was careful to distinguish between the formal **assessment** of teachers as a function of personnel management, and **appraisal** as a process of professional development. Teacher appraisal was seen as ongoing peer monitoring of classroom performance within a school's professional development programme and as the responsibility of the school management (Project ABLE 1990:2, 61).

Teacher registration

The cornerstone of any profession is its ability to self-regulate. Teaching unions were influential in persuading the Labour Government to establish a Teacher

Registration Board under the Education Act 1989. The Board would set minimum standards of quality for teachers, and provided an advice and guidance programme which recognised the collegial and professional basis for teaching. Among the Board's powers and duties was the ability to decide whether or not a teacher was competent against set criteria. The criteria within the legislation, however, were not specific and they allowed the Board to interpret and to take a professional view in setting its policy.

The establishment of a Teacher Registration Board was exactly in opposition to the market view, which would regulate standards by the dismissal of teachers who did not conform to the employing authority's individual preferences.

Teaching unions in the school sector

Prior to the early-1980s, both the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) and, to a lesser extent, the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (NZPPTA), the teaching unions covering the school sector, worked within a model that stressed a partnership between teachers and state. Historically, the professional and industrial expectations of teachers were characterised by goodwill and trust.

The role prescribed for teaching unions by the Labour Government from 1987, and carried through by the National Government on taking office in 1990, was seen to be significantly different from that traditional 'partnership' approach. What in the 1980s had been uneasy co-operation and formal involvement now became labelled 'provider capture', under which rubric teachers were accused, amongst other things, of subverting the original intentions of policies when they were implemented in schools. Teachers were to be excluded from processes of educational policy making at all levels.

Teachers, however, did not prove to be passive followers. Together with some academics and spokespersons for boards of trustees, teaching unions argued successfully against their exclusion.

Teachers saw appraisal as part of their professional accountability, the concept of which had been redefined and built up over time. In spite of that, however, the contradictory flow of events is demonstrated by the way in which the NZEI was assumed to consent to primary principals' appraisal process being linked to performance for salary purposes, although it remains one of its tenets that those should not be linked.

As part of the struggle for professional autonomy, the changing pattern of power and decision-making sometimes forces a situation on the parties involved. In an effort to make progress in negotiations and to stave off market-management impositions of individual contracts for principals, NZEI was impelled to accept as a management tool, a performance agreement mechanism allowing the non-teaching professional employer (board of trustees) to determine whether or not a principal is carrying out his/her function efficiently. NZEI negotiated the professionally-based appraisal criteria for salary purposes. The result has confused the NZEI's attempt to maintain appraisal for developmental purposes in its other activities.

There is no doubt this is the thin end of the wedge: the SSC would prefer to see all staff on individual contracts – in which case an appraisal process would not be needed at all.

Despite the government's attempts to isolate and fracture the influence of teacher unions when the new pattern of devolved control and new accountabilities was established, organised teachers continued to influence

decision-making. By their considerable involvement in their union, their ability to respond at the school level, along with participation in a series of public protests, teachers have demonstrated that they are still organised, and will still insist that their direct experience in the classroom must be one of the guiding factors in future developments.

5.7 Discussion

Various reasons (Codd et al. 1990a, Dale 1993, Grace, 1991) are given as to why the government embarked on an extensive legislative reform affecting education. One is that state expenditure could be more controlled in the form of bulk grants, while the responsibility for the way funds are spent is devolved at the local level. Dissatisfaction and frustration with education, therefore, would be diverted from central government (Codd et al. 1990a:21). As well as maintaining its existing power relationship, the government's intention was also to have its way on industrial/political issues which fundamentally affected the environment in which teachers worked by making them accountable through the principal (their chief executive officer) as were other state agencies.

The general effect has been to empower education employers (board of trustees), by removing the intensely legislated framework by which employment relationships throughout the education sector had been constrained. Teacher accountability has, as a result, become a matter to be dealt with at individual workplaces by appraisal procedures developed by individual boards within the rubric of matters prescribed by the secretary with agreement by the SSC (appendix 1).

The collapse of agreed values – the legitimisation crisis – put teachers on the spot. Pateman (1981) conjectures that with a crisis of professionalism it is not

surprising 'to find teachers actively suggesting new forms of accountability which are effectively proposals for more effective and responsive forms of intra-professional accountability than have hitherto been used'. He maintains that in this context it is easy to appreciate proposals drawn up internally by each school showing targets, curriculum, teaching methods, resources:

Traditional forms of intra-professional accountability have ceased to satisfy, and critics will not be satisfied with more rigorous versions of the old mechanisms (Pateman 1981:25).

In order for any group to achieve its purposes through schools, it is necessary for the group to achieve control of and within schools. This has proved remarkably difficult:

... not because of any balancing out of interest groups but because, as it has developed, the education system has come to mediate, in deliberate and in unintended ways, the aspirations, policies, interventions, pressure and so on, of any and all groups (Dale 1989:59).

Examination of the issue of the performance of teachers in the wider context of education reform does not illustrate a rational comprehensive approach to problem solving, nor is there a conception that policy has proceeded in an orderly process with a full set of alternatives compared systematically for their substantive and political costs and benefits. What the case study does indicate is that a problem was recognised and the political climate made it right for change.

The opportunity for controlling teachers' professional performance through employment provisions was seized by government agencies. They no longer wished to see control exercised on the basis of professional, educational outcomes.

5.8 Notes

- 1 C.E. Beeby in his introduction to Renwick, W. (1986) *Moving Targets*, pxxii.
- 2 See chapter one for a fuller discussion of the wider context of change.
- 3 The Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools was set up in November 1984 (the Curriculum Review); a Select Committee Inquiry on the Quality of Teaching (the Scott Report) in 1986; a Taskforce to consider Educational Administration (the Picot Report) in 1988; a ministerial committee to review and recommend proposals for assessment (Project ABLE) in 1989; and a Review of the Education Reform Implementation Process (the Lough Report) in 1990.
- 4 Openshaw, Lee & Lee (1993:271) argue that most critics cite the 1987 Treasury document as having constituted a major source of inspiration for policies adopted by the re-elected Labour Government.
- 5 The terms of reference of the *Inquiry into the Quality of Teaching* (1986) included examination of accountability procedures for teachers at the early childhood, primary and secondary levels. The committee declared its interest to see:
 - ◆ whether clear standards exist (or can be established) by which the quality of teaching is to be measured (e.g. pupil performance measures related to teaching practice; teacher performance measures, etc.);
 - ◆ how such standards and their implementation procedures are decided; the assessment or judgement involved and their implementation;
 - ◆ the possible setting of codes of professional and personal performance for teachers.
- 6 Headlines cited in Noel Scott's press statement of 17 February 1987.
- 7 Government response to the Report of the Education and Science Select Committee: Report on the Inquiry into the Quality of Teaching March 1987, presented to the House of Representatives in accordance with Standing Order 352.
- 8 The Report of the Committee on the Registration and Discipline of Teachers (Marshall Report) Wellington 1978
- 9 June 1987. *A nation at risk* was the title used for the United States report of 1984.
- 10 Alcorn (1987:4) argues that Richardson used language with a distinctly military flavour throughout as she talked of strategies, outflanking the government, capturing the high ground, and that the military metaphors were picked up by the media.
- 11 Ruth Richardson, speech to Women's division of Federated Farmers 47th inter-provincial conference, 11 Feb 1987.

- 12 Ruth Richardson, meeting of the Wanganui and Districts School Committees Association, 25 Feb 1987.
- 13 Ruth Richardson, Wellington, 12 February 1987.
- 14 Jessop, G., Bonnet, B., Bromley, S. (1990) 'Farewell to Thatcherism? Neo-liberalism and new times' cited in Gordon, L. (1992).
- 15 Sexton was the Director of the Education Unit, Institute of Economic Affairs, London. The Education Unit is said to 'research, formulate and publish education policy'. Sexton's previous experience was as the 'special adviser' to the British Secretary of State, Sir Keith Joseph.
- 16 The founding members of the Education Forum were: **Alison Gernhoefer** (Principal, Westlake Girls' High School), **John Graham** (Principal, Auckland Grammar School), **John Hinchcliffe** (Director Auckland Institute of Technology), **Owen Jennings** (President, Federated Farmers), **Roger Kerr** (Executive Director, NZBRT), **Brother Pat Lynch** (Principal, De la salle College), **Steve Marshall** (Director General, New Zealand Employers' Federation), **Alan Shadwell** (President, Manufacturers' Federation), **Graye Shattky** (President, School Trustees Association), **Hiwi Tauroa** (Race Relations Conciliator), **John Taylor** (Headmaster, King's College Auckland), **Neil Waters** (Vice Chancellor, Massey University).
- 17 Although when Graye Shattky's role on the Forum was questioned by boards of trustees, he indicated that his presence on the Forum was in a personal capacity.
- 18 NZBRT (1991:4) cited in Gordon (1992:10).
- 19 Wilson, K. (1992) 'The Picot Report and Legitimation of Education Policy' cited in Dale & Jesson (1992).
- 20 Dale (1992:14) depicts these moves as another example of the 'mainstreaming' of education to be more in accord with public sector administration rather than maintaining any 'special qualities'.
- 20 The Labour Relations Act (1987) had moved NZPPTA and NZEI, the professional and industrial organisations, into a trade union ambit. Unlike other professional groups, their members' conditions were codified under national awards.
- 21 The committee comprised: Noel Lough (chair, former Secretary of Treasury), Donald Cowie (Southpac Corporation), Paul Carpinter (SSC), David Greig (Treasury), Maris O'Rourke (CEO, Ministry of Education).

CHAPTER SIX : RESEARCH DESIGN and METHODOLOGY

The aim of this chapter is to present a small scale study of the attitudes and experiences of some key players in relation to teacher assessment and appraisal in New Zealand. This chapter is linked to chapter five as the interviewees are in one way or another associated with the positions articulated in the previous chapter. The interview questions are placed in the context of: the interviewees' current view of appraisal, and how important is it to place teacher appraisal on the agenda.

6.1 Role of the researcher

Oakley (1981) suggests that traditional criteria for interviews can be summarised as: first, that the interviewing situation is a one-way process in which the interviewer elicits and receives, but does not give information; second, interviewers are advised by textbooks to adopt a narrow attitude and view towards those being interviewed as merely means of obtaining data; and third, that interviews are seen as having no personal meaning in terms of social interaction. I, however, did not adopt those criteria. I tried instead to establish a common bond with those I interviewed and responded to any questions about the research as fully as was required.

Currently teacher accountability and appraisal schemes are particularly sensitive issues, as strategies for control over teachers' conditions of work and salaries through negotiated employment provisions are being planned for in a hostile environment. As one Ministry of Education official said in a telephoned response to my request for an interview, 'You are opening a can of worms'!

With all whom I approached to be interviewed, I clarified my role as a researcher and made it distinct from my role in paid employment as a union official with

responsibility for appraisal for developmental purposes. This was assisted by my conducting of the interviews when I was on leave from my position. My paid employment meant that the interviews, observation, and even the selection of documents for study were likely to be influenced by a particular perspective or by my personal bias. I tried to overcome that bias by cross-checking findings from one interview with those of another and checking interviews against documents, and vice versa.

6.2 Interview guide

The interview questions were loosely structured. This was to let each person respond in her/his own unique way and provided interviewees with the opportunity to raise other concerns they might have. It also allowed the person responding to set the pace and choose the direction of the interview. I believed this would allow the issues and themes to emerge freely. The questions were:

- ◆ What is your involvement with, or interest in, teacher appraisal?
- ◆ What are some of the important purposes of teacher appraisal in the current education climate and debate? Which purpose is most important to you?
- ◆ Accountability is an important issue. What do you see as the origins for the recent focus on teacher accountability?
- ◆ How, and in which ways, do you think that calls for teacher accountability have changed over time?

- ◆ To what extent do the features of teacher assessment and appraisal reflect international trends? To what extent are the features unique to New Zealand?
- ◆ What other comments would you like to make?

6.3 Data collection

My field work took place during September–October 1993.

The retrospective nature of the interviews posed some problems. Of the seven organisations originally involved under the legislation, five had personnel changes which meant that the person interviewed might not have represented their organisation at the policy project meetings held by the Ministry of Education¹. The Ministry of Education itself had three different project leaders during the course of the three years². In another case, the person interviewed had recently retired and his views could no longer currently represent the organisation on whose behalf he had spoken at the policy project meetings. The opinions expressed by the interviewees, therefore, cannot be necessarily assumed as reflecting the current position of the organisations they represented³.

6.4 Those interviewed

I conducted eight interviews with people close to the decision–making process. My choice was guided by the three possible approaches to teacher appraisal: market, management and professional (as discussed in chapter two).

All interviewees except two were their organisation's representative on the Ministry's policy project. Of the two interviewees not involved in the policy

project, one was influential within her organisation on issues concerning teachers' pay and conditions and could be seen to represent the views of that organisation which was represented on the project. The other interviewee had been a member of the Marshall (1978) committee on the registration and discipline of teachers. I believed that she may have some useful insights on 'accountability'.

The length of the interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 90 minutes. All the interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed.

Those who agreed to be interviewed were:

Peter Barlow, Director of the Teacher Registration Board;
George Francis, Director of Special Projects, Education Review Office (recently retired);
Shona Macaskill, Manager of Qualifications Evaluation Services, NZQA (then Senior Policy Analyst, Learning and Assessment Division, Ministry of Education);
Geraldine McDonald, Assistant Director, NZCER (recently retired);
Ray Newport, Senior Adviser Human Resources, STA;
Carol Parker, NZEI Immediate Past President, (now Secretary NZEI Central Regional Office);
Marijke Robinson, Senior Adviser, Government Operations Branch, SSC;
Ken Wilson, Advisory Officer, NZPPTA.

6.5 Those declining to be interviewed

Those that declined to be interviewed gave the following reasons:

The *Minister of Education* was unable to be interviewed due to his 'heavy work schedule'.

Officers of the Ministry of Education declined an interview. Elizabeth Eppel, Senior Manager (Education Management Policy), refused wider comment and focused purely on the issue of position. She indicated that the Ministry had no

position on teacher accountability or appraisal as – 'No government agency takes action unilaterally'.

She continued in the following vein – 'It is the Minister who determines the position. The State Sector Act 1989 under section 77c provided for the Ministry to prescribe matters that are to be taken into account by employers in assessing the performance of teachers. The Ministry has gone down the path to putting in place such a document. In consulting with all the bodies named through the legislation there has been agreement of the process. The Ministry was now in the process of talking about the document with the SSC'.

Eppel elaborated that the Ministry and the SSC needed to reach a consensus. There was no power for either group to act on its own, which meant that any changes the SSC might wish to make would also have to meet with the Ministry's approval.

Mary Garlick, who first held responsibility for the Ministry of Education's policy project, did not believe she could contribute to the research. She was now in paid employment outside of the Ministry of Education and considered herself distant from issues pertaining to teacher accountability and appraisal. She referred me to her Master of Public Policy research paper, 'Teacher appraisal within New Zealand reform of education administration', lodged in Victoria University library 1991.

Robert Barton, Senior Adviser of the Government Operations Branch of the SSC, advised that he would 'rather not meet' to discuss the questions set out in my interview guide. He was 'too busy'. When, however, asked to nominate a 'less busy time' or another person within the SSC who would be willing to discuss the

issues, Barton responded that he was 'really not interested in talking about the issues'.

Barton expanded that the 'sorts of issues the interview would raise were dealt with across the negotiating table' and that was the 'proper place for the discussion'. He continued, 'To some extent the issues have been reflected in contract changes for the past three years in the area of performance agreements and competency and discipline'.

In the case of both Eppel and Barton, I concluded the telephone call by summarising the points made during our conversations to ensure that I had recorded them correctly.

The reasons for the unwillingness of both Eppel and Barton to be interviewed, or allow other members to be interviewed on behalf of their organisations are difficult to determine. They can be speculated only. One explanation could be that their organisation's position on teacher appraisal lacks coherence and consistency, and is unable to stand up to scrutiny. It may also indicate a lack of confidence by those officials to defend their organisations' position. This is a worrisome interpretation when it is considered that their organisations direct relationship with the political will of elected officials mean the Ministry of Education and the State Services Commission, hold positions of power over teachers' conditions of employment and their salaries.

During the telephone conversation, Barton had affirmed that he was speaking on behalf of the SSC. By locating appraisal solely within personnel issues Barton articulated, unconsciously perhaps, that in his view the position held by the SSC on this matter as strictly managerial.

6.6 Data verification

Part of the contract that is made with people whose knowledge and perceptions contribute to a case study must be provision of the opportunity for those people to ensure that their comments have been accurately recorded.

A copy of the transcription was forwarded to the participant with an invitation to verify the comments and identify any remarks that s/he might wish to be quoted on.

6.7 Evaluation of methodology

The use of qualitative studies of this kind is well established in the education sector (Ozga 1987, Ramsay et al. 1990, Robinson 1993). A rich resource of material can be obtained through this kind of approach as those interviewed have an opportunity through reflection to make sense of what they are doing.

A common cause of concern about this type of work is the small sample number used, in this case eight people. It is important to remember that the goal of this case study is to allow the reader to access the way in which decision-makers make sense of change in the area of teacher accountability, assessment and appraisal. By its very nature this information is highly personal and contextual.

This study is important then, not because it can be assumed that this is how all decision-makers in this area are thinking but because it gives us a glimpse into some of the possible ways of working out educational issues relating to teacher accountability, assessment and appraisal. It provides a basis on which to think about and compare how these issues are being dealt with in other places.

The major problem of the methodology from a practical point of view was the volume of data gathered.

6.8 Analysis and interpretation of interviews

Having gathered the data I have linked the interviewees comments under each section in order to present an overall impression of their comments to the questions framed by the interview guide. This approach will highlight where there was accord and differing views. Nisbet and Watt's (1984:76) observations on a case study approach became particularly pertinent with this approach and need to be kept in mind. 'The results from any unstructured comment are not easily generalisable except by intuitive judgement that 'this case' is similar to 'that case'.

Whilst I have been selective in my quotes I believe my selection reports fairly on the on the range of questions, and the interviewees themselves summarise the questions raised.

What are some of the important purposes of teacher appraisal in the current education climate and debate ? Which purpose is most important to you ?

All the listed interviewees, except Robinson, stressed the vital importance of appraisal for professional development purposes. The notion of professional accountability was clear.

Teachers as a profession regard self-improvement as very desirable, and often initiate steps to improve the quality of their teaching. For teachers to do their job better, it is necessary to appraise their present standing, where they want to go, and what mechanisms can be utilised to empower improvement and to ensure continuing development and positive long term change on a day-to-day level.

Appraisal, therefore is seen as beneficial to the quest for self-improvement, providing the teacher being developed is an integral part of the development programme and that s/he is absolutely committed to all the factors that go into the appraisal process. Francis notes that the teacher has to see some benefits coming out of it and, to a large extent, see any disadvantages minimised. Barlow also stresses the need for teacher appraisal to retain the element of general goal setting, i.e. personal career development.

Wilson, however, signalled the pressures of other viewpoints. He felt that teachers have lost the sense of their role under the constant criticism of the last 10 years; and that they can only reassert themselves by re-professionalising themselves and reconstructing the concept of a teacher; and that the use of appraisal is absolutely crucial in this pedagogical debate.

McDonald agrees that it is absolutely vital for teachers to establish themselves as a profession but does not think this has happened yet, for three reasons:

- ◆ the size and variety of the workforce;
- ◆ the primary/secondary split which has led to different forms of training, different unions, etc., but exists only for historical rather than logical reasons;
- ◆ primary teaching is a women's profession and, while women are equally capable of acting professionally, the structural constraints of the ways in which they are employed in teaching – i.e. part-time, relieving positions – may have a bearing on the extent to which they are willing to be appraised and to pay any associated costs, e.g. registration fee ... 'it erodes the opportunity for committed professionalism'.

It is generally recognised that another purpose of appraisal is to ensure teacher effectiveness.

One side of the accountability debate, Macaskill says, has political purpose and political motivation and this, in turn, is connected with the wider public debate about getting value for money.

Robinson, talking from the SSC viewpoint, makes clear the characteristic autocratic managerial view where the behavioural emphasis remains dominant. She refers to 'performance assessment' [this term was used in the Act, see appendix 1], rather than appraisal, and its reliance on the setting up of measures and standards and the monitoring of performance in a competitive environment. The set of reporting systems used report not just on the performance of the individual but also on the performance of the organisation.

Appraisal of the individual teacher by senior staff is seen to have two strands. One is the support aspect, where teachers are helped to get better at their jobs by providing feedback and by identifying and providing professional development. Barlow cautions that the emphasis here should be on praise, and that appraisal can be advantageous to the teacher if the system forces senior staff to actually recognise and to appreciate what junior staff are achieving. McDonald points out that being a principal does not guarantee you are going to be absolutely okay at appraising; not only is appraising a highly skilled job, but also different values or personal feelings can get in the way of judging the work of some of the teachers. Parker emphasises the need to gain more than just one person's input or viewpoint in appraisal; she highlights the 'whole picture' aspect.

The other strand mentioned by interviewees was the disciplinary/competency aspect of appraisal. A view that emphasises school principals as managers rather than instructional leaders. Robinson maintains that she cannot understand the present antipathy to teachers being graded or measured;

however, others recognised teachers' concern that the primary purpose of the appraisal process should not be dismissal of incompetent teachers.

Newport recognises that disciplinary or competency matters may arise as a consequence of, or as an adjunct to, the appraisal process but sees disciplinary procedures as a separate process. Francis also sees disciplinary procedures as having to be both very clear and separate from appraisal. He mentions difficulties in very small schools with reference to privacy and protection for the teacher against whom a complaint has been made, and suggests that the principal, as professional developer of the teacher, may have to be excluded from the disciplinary arena.

The notion of teachers being responsible for self-regulation is foremost for McDonald. She points out that 'individual teachers could ask to be appraised by some outside body ... from time to time the Teacher Registration Board has complaints about teachers, and in order to get them in action somebody has to look at the teacher and somebody has to produce some kind of evidence, then principals have to write in and state the grounds for dissatisfaction. So it is already, at that level, working through principals'.

With its contradictions and tensions the path of the development of a teacher appraisal policy or process is not viewed as running smoothly.

Macaskill sees communication differences as one of the barriers to further development. 'The professional advocates and political accountability advocates are talking past each other' about separate things. This is exacerbated by both parties using the same language for quite different concepts.

Francis does not feel the teacher appraisal agenda has run well (except perhaps in individual schools). He sees part of the problem stemming from different agendas of the SSC [managerial] and the Treasury [neo-liberal market]. Wilson comments that since 1988 the only debate has been the use of appraisal as a control mechanism over the work of teachers in order to:

- ◆ support a managerial structure and culture; and
- ◆ supply the logic for bulk funding.

Robinson implicitly accepts the development of appraisal for management purposes. Her concern is not with the principle but with the detail. She acknowledges that it is not easy to find objective performance criteria, but maintains that does not mean you do not have to try.

Accountability is an important issue. What do you see as the origins of the recent focus on teacher accountability?

Macaskill does not see the notion of accountability as anything new. Accountability in essence has always been a part of the teacher's agenda, the community's agenda and the official agenda. The principal has always been seen as responsible for what happens in the school and the teacher for what happens in the classroom. New Zealand communities have always had an interest in the local school and teachers have always had a form of accountability as, for example, in the practice of reporting to parents. Indeed, colleges of education train teachers to have this notion of accountability.

But this notion of accountability in practice was not the 'pure' professional model if Barlow is correct. He makes the point that this notion of accountability tended to operate, in the 1960s, within the very narrow hierarchical structure of the school. Newport agrees and expands that this earlier accountability of principal and staff was rather 'hit and miss' and that some schools were closed shops.

All the interviewees see the major thrust for accountability as coming in the mid-1980s, when the call for schools to be more effective rang out. Barlow hints that the call was mistaken. He feels that even back in the 1970s, the schools were 'up with the play'. He saw the early response by some schools to calls of accountability probably equal to what was being done in the private sector.

McDonald feels that nothing is ever adopted for single reasons: 'things have to fit within a particular context ... there is a tight little circle of ideas that accumulate round particular proposals, and you cannot knock them out by saying one of your arguments is wrong; it has to be tackled as a whole, usually it waits for a paradigm shift'. McDonald goes on, 'there is always an ideological component'. She agrees with Dale that the ideology arises in a capitalist country on the basis of social and economic conditions in the first instance but, 'it is not sufficient to have that kind of support for something. You need to be able to explain it, in terms of some concept'.

Macaskill points out the contradictions in the Scott report (1986). She argues that it had more of a professional bias to it than a political or economic one, because it did acknowledge the teacher as an important component in the learning process. The mechanisms 'to identify, encourage, reward and insist upon successful teaching qualities', however, are market-management orientated. Macaskill also mentions the emergence of statements regarding 'value for money' during that time.

Francis certainly agrees, and sees 'commercial right-wing materialistic views' as pushing the government back then. He sets the purpose of the public sector reforms within the move towards privatisation. The private sector or the business world was looked to as a model for accountability. Parker adds, 'the call for

teacher accountability was closely integrated with the government's desire for individual contracts, wage-cutting and diminishing the collectivity of teachers'.

Wilson sees the origins for the recent focus as the wish by the state in New Zealand to 'shrink' itself and to construct a provision of social services on a public-choice model and thus to dismantle the welfare state.

Robinson, on the other hand, puts reforms in education in the context of the State Sector Act (1988) which was, she says, basically an acknowledgement of the fact that the state sector was unresponsive. The basic thrust of the Act was to ensure senior managers would be held accountable and that the public service could compete for top quality managers by offering competitive rewards (financial or otherwise). In Robinson's view, the principle of accountability is being able to report back to employers.

Newport concurs. In the *Tomorrow Schools* (1989) environment, the responsibility shifted to the local community and to boards, with principals becoming chief executives or day-to-day managers. With that sort of relationship, he says, 'as a point of principle rather than economics, the board has a right, particularly if it is accountable back to the community, to know that the principal is moving the school in the desired direction and that s/he is responsible in terms of ensuring all the teachers are heading in that same direction'.

Parker, Macaskill, Francis, Wilson and Barlow all expressed **grave misgivings over the call for accountability**. Macaskill considers the recent focus on teacher accountability had become someone else's debate, that is, 'it isn't communities and teachers talking to themselves and between themselves'. And, 'that the mechanism of accountability can be used by people with an

agenda other than an educational one'. Francis comments that the agenda that underpinned what the government was doing in the reforms was the notion that people, not only in education but elsewhere, should be accountable for the expenditure of public money. This he sees as a very serious problem.

Francis continues 'We simply got caught up in an environment which did not recognise the professional nature of teaching because it was not teacher-driven or even ex-teacher driven ... The hallmark of the teaching profession has been a great deal of co-operation and the collegial approach: people are involved in the self-improvement process, they talk to each other, attend courses together, learn from each other's practice, observe each other, look for solutions to problems amongst their colleagues. This collegial element was regarded with deep suspicion by the powers-that-be in the 1980s, even though there is absolutely no evidence to support the theory that if you make people competitive, you improve the performance overall and certainly improve the performance of the very best'.

Barlow believes today's teacher feels accountable to all the parents and to his/her colleagues, and providing value for money. 'Not only do you have to be efficient, but you have to be able to show you are doing the job in a way that is saving money!'

All the interviewees acknowledge the need for professional accountability, but Parker adds that to be accountable professionally, teachers must have the skills and resources.

Barlow sees accountability as a ballooning part of the job, partly because of the social requirements, he comments that teachers are quite wise in saying that

they have got to focus on what they are trying to do and be accountable in that area.

How, and in which ways, do you think that calls for teacher accountability have changed over time ?

A range of calls was identified, some existing at the same time, some changing over time. These included:

... *'Issue' calls* stemming from dissatisfaction, or research, or educational experience, e.g. Maori education, better use of money;

... *Calls from parents* (pre 1988–89), generally to do with teacher competence, discipline, report writing and the inability of parents to approach some schools (Wilson, Newport);

... *Calls arising from the Picot report and reforms*, and resulting bad press when attention was focused on accountability at the school level and community level. The old perception of teachers as 'untouchable and protected' disappeared. Newport says 'Accountability really did open doors and removed some of that protection'.

McDonald comments that 'originally teachers were not, in fact, accountable to any large degree to parents. They were accountable often to inspectors because that was the way the reward system worked. That has gone. Picot introduced, instead of a simplified accountability model, a very diffuse model and one which many schools have been unable to deal with ... Picot said that schools, the teachers in other words, were accountable to the tax payer, the general public, to Treasury, to parents, politicians, to communities' especially Maori. She adds an

illuminating comment: 'The only thing I could not find [in the Picot report] was accountability to pupils. It may be there but I could not find it'.

... *Board of Trustees calls* (post 1988–89). Parker notes that this really comes back to parents again, and that governments use this opportunity to say that teachers must be accountable. Francis sees the shift to board control as especially significant in primary schools. There was a belief that teachers would be more effectively controlled if they were controlled locally rather than through the bureaucratic processes that had been developed.

... *Government calls*. Francis comments on a reluctance in government to hand out money unless they can control the process (see Devolution below). They need assurance first that the money will be used for the purpose given, and second that they are not overfunding. There was also a certain belief that people who had, in the government's view, long holidays, short days and good pay, deserved to be scrutinised.

... *Variously named calls usually linked to a source*. i.e. Treasury model, business model, SSC style, New Right agenda, Business Roundtable, Education Forum style calls.

Francis thinks that the ministers involved in discussions in 1989 were trying to improve the education system, but most of the discussions he took part in were about funding schools and linking pay to performance. Robinson confirms this, saying 'automatic increments are archaic remnants'.

Wilson: 'Since 1988, the call for teacher accountability has been consistent and focused on the public choice model'.

Macaskill comments at length. 'The change over time has got to do with a new political ideology, a business model being applied to education ... I believe for public control and power reasons ... they have to do with achieving other ends as well as educational ends'. She goes on to list some of the aims of the present call which she did not necessarily support:

- ◆ 'let's make sure that teachers are doing what we pay them to do **and we** will decide what they should be doing'
- ◆ 'teachers as a power force need to be broken and need to be subjugated and controlled'
- ◆ 'teachers cost us a lot of money, how do we bring them into line industrially?' (i.e. SSC approach)
- ◆ 'some have to do with looking at central government financing and with the transfer of accountabilities' to the local level.

This last call is about devolution.

Robinson says that 'the whole idea of devolution was based on the premise that decisions would be more efficient if they were made by people who were directly affected by them, and who had the information necessary for decisions to enhance educational performance, for instance ... Devolution is always accompanied by the decision to really still have central standards'.

Wilson and Macaskill see that devolution can also be seen to have a much more sinister side.

Macaskill says, 'There is a strong feeling within the educational community that the central government is quite wittingly and cynically transferring the responsibility as far away from itself as possible ... the rationale is not pure or inherently altruistic or empowering people at all ... Responsibilities are passed on

to schools or local communities despite or with little regard to their abilities to fulfil those responsibilities ... In a sense then they are distancing themselves from possible danger'.

In the context of devolution decentralisation discussions people are asking carefully what is it that has been devolved? ... If you do not devolve the essential resources to make that effective, then questions are raised about how cynical that process is'. Macaskill sees an increasing centralised control as a result of accountabilities and responsibilities being devolved, but not resources. 'The gap between the decision-making and the resources that can make that decision-making happen – that gap has increased and allows neither accountability or responsibility to be properly taken on board by communities. She also thinks that the Government has started to realise that and is starting to pull some accountabilities back in, or attempting (in part at least) to meet some of those resourcing needs for those accountabilities to be real. 'But because they are still in that centralised control position, it really puts major question-marks there about how much control can be allocated.

... *The teachers' call* should not be overlooked.

Parker does not think the teachers' call for teacher accountability has changed, but has just become more sophisticated. She summarises: 'A long time ago we would look in schools and say the school or kids were having difficulty ... it was probably the families or the school or the kids ... Then in Picot's time (1988), it was the schools, they had to change. Since then Government agencies have been formed into committees, e.g. the Lough committee (1990) talked about principals and systems being accountable and principals being accountable for systems as well. Now, through the Employment Contracts Act and individual contracts and individual responsibility, accountability is being divisive by focusing on individual teachers'.

Francis also notes that one of the big shifts in teachers' conditions was the movement from determinations to awards, and now to employment contracts.

Macaskill makes an interesting distinction between 'accountability **for**' and 'accountability **to**' maintaining there is an implicit power differential in the latter. Teachers are increasingly 'accountable to communities, to parents, to businesses, to everyone ...' without specifying what it is teachers are accountable for. She says, 'As a teacher I am accountable to the parents of my class, but I want to specify, and I want to be party to the specifying, what I am accountable for. What we are actually accountable to others for is what we have power to do, (i.e. the training, the skills, the expertise, the opportunity and the expectation that you can meet the responsibility). I can be accountable professionally **to** my profession, and **to** the kids and **to** the principal, and **to** those engaged in the learning process. I can be responsible **for** that learning process and I can be responsible to the Board **for** ensuring that I take that seriously'.

To what extent do the features of teacher assessment and appraisal reflect international trends ? To what extent are the features unique to New Zealand ?

The general view was that New Zealand reflected international trends, a major influence being England. Macaskill notes that an agenda in England led to the genesis of debate and to the movement in New Zealand. McDonald sees the move for teacher accountability and for educational accountability in general as originating in the United States, and then working on the domino theory for the rest of the world, with each country making a few adaptations. She also points out that while the South Pacific draws on both the United States and United Kingdom, the United Kingdom does not acknowledge that it gets things from America, and similarly the United States does not have any truck with what happens in Britain, which is not an opinion leader for the United States.

Robinson says that the early 1980s saw reform all over the world. 'There was this paradigm in the world ... looking at efficiency and effectiveness ... because resources became scarce and people recognised that all these massive state monuments did not do anything much'.

Wilson feels that 'all western welfare capitalist states faced a fiscal crisis and an associated legitimisation crisis, in addition to a trend towards globalisation and a coincidence with right-wing ascendancy. This led to a reassessment of the cost of education and value for money in education'. McDonald certainly concurs that this was the case for America, which is deeply committed to being the most economically powerful country. 'The key document was *A Nation At Risk* which arose from the United States trade problems, the conservative Government and appalling conditions in urban education. *A Nation At Risk* was actually used in New Zealand by Ruth Richardson as a campaign slogan with no reference to what was actually happening in New Zealand'.

Parker comments that calls for accountability and appraisal in the state sector were extremely strong from England and America, and that New Zealand has tried to apply the apparently softer English model but may find it is just as virulent as the American one.

Both Macaskill and McDonald talk about the imported consultants, working for multinational firms, who act more like propagandists. McDonald questions 'the appropriateness and political objectivity of these firms whose agenda and identity are the same (in fact part of their existence is dependent on them creating the agenda); they adopt a business model and produce a formula which simply supports and confirms the views of the customer'.

Looking at differences, Robinson feels that New Zealand took the bull [reforms] by the horns and pursued the policy harder than anyone else; Macaskill comments that New Zealand is in a situation where, due to the absence of a range of barriers which exist in many of the countries where things such as teacher appraisal have developed, the country is able to put new educational ideas into practice free of such barriers. 'A home grown appraisal system, whether it uses principles taken from overseas or not, is always going to be a different ball-game from overseas'. Barlow says, 'we manage to put a stamp on everything'. McDonald feels that the two-party system is a factor here; each one tries to outsmart the other and the fact that Lockwood Smith, then in opposition, had got on to assessment was enough to get David Lange into action.

These were some of the features frequently mentioned with reference to the uniqueness of New Zealand ...

- ◆ small schools with a majority of teaching principals
- ◆ small number of students in private schools
- ◆ distribution of population and homogeneity with only minor regional variations
- ◆ the collaborative nature of New Zealand inhabitants, this encouraged the collegial support in schools; Francis points out that the OECD report highlighted this, and that starting out from a very large consultative base and therefore moving from that system into a local control system may be easier for us
- ◆ peer/buddy appraisal system with self-assessment as the starting-point, i.e. appraisal for development
- ◆ strong history of consultation about issues; problems got solved because people knew each other

- ◆ sharing of good models, eg teaching supervision, development through anecdote
- ◆ never any fear of New Zealand parents in the primary system
- ◆ room for charismatic teaching styles
- ◆ notion of reflection and accountability seen to exist already in New Zealand, whereas it did not in Britain
- ◆ New Zealand teachers have for many years always had a professional development cycle; anything introduced had to be imposed on top of that or accommodate it.

Francis summarises: 'We ought to be producing something that is uniquely New Zealand. We ought not to be saying to people anywhere else in the world, why don't you do it our way?' What we should be saying to them is we would like to see what you are doing so we can learn from it, and we would like you to come here to see what we are doing so you can learn from it. But let's continue to develop in ways which are most appropriate for our environment, our culture, our size, our climate'.

What other comments would you like to make ?

Macaskill looks to potential movements and what might develop in the future. 'Nothing is context free. At the same time as the teacher appraisal development, 'reflective teacher model' movements were happening, the flavour of teacher appraisal is softened. In order for the pure New Right model for teacher appraisal to take place, a lot of money will have to be poured in, as we found in England. This makes it difficult for a government to pursue this agenda in its pure form; neither is it socially or politically sustainable in the New Zealand climate.

'How do you define a good teacher?' asks Macaskill, 'you can tick off the NZQA-style competencies and still not have a good job being done in the holistic sense; the nature and quality of relationship determine whether the teaching learning process is successful. It's something indefinable and complex ... but we are learning more about it all the time and can influence it positively'.

Parker agrees that the labour laws and the Employment Contracts Act have not affected schools and teachers as much as this particular government would have wanted. She feels one of the big failures of the *Tomorrow Schools* initiative is that the work done on delineating the difference between a teaching principal's role in the classroom and his/her role in management. Neither have agreed national guidelines on appraisal been released, despite the Ministry of Education verbally committing themselves to this task at policy project meetings. This has led to other, non-teaching, principals setting up their own schemes.

'There has been no extra money or resources for staffing time, thus consultation between and among teachers on improving their teaching is another pressure; any appraisal is done using teacher development money or in an ad hoc fashion and many principals have had no training'. Parker feels that the current 'system' of appraisal is quite deleterious to the teachers' well-being and creates a feeling of fear, especially since the ability to grant or withhold salary increments was given to boards and principals in the last contract round.

Parker argues that a cohesive professional response is required: 'What we need is a clear call from all of those in the teaching profession for an appraisal system that is fair, resourced and can be put into place; it does not have to be the same for every school but it needs to have the same basis, i.e. it should start with self-appraisal, continue with peer appraisal which should include a management part

[class management, time management]; there should be no surprises and it should be clearly based on appraising for development'.

Barlow agrees that 'people have to form themselves into peer groups or clusters where they can actually set targets and frankly discuss their situation ... I think that is the way it has to go in teaching'. 'There is still quite a lot of work to do,' Barlow says, 'to convince the profession that the raising of standards can easily be done from within, by their members without any more work than they probably do at the moment'.

Francis is optimistic about the future. He says that though the ERO is quite adamant that it is not into appraisal of teachers but rather of schools, nevertheless some sort of appraisal system **will** operate. He feels that a very positive benefit arising from the reforms will be better awareness of student knowledge and learning. As all schools will have to work out what they are trying to achieve, there will be a greater emphasis on optimum use of resources and on those systems which record progress. There will be a fundamental shift from an 'on the spot' view of how effective the teaching or learning has been, to charting and publicising progress. The more realistic people become about what resources they have in terms of time, energy and commitment, the better.

This goes back to a developmental model, says Francis. He thinks that at the local level there may be a much greater preparedness to spend money on teacher development because, after all, the notion of training is an integral part of the business world. He is not sure how the funding of this will work, but thinks that the tendency will be for the government to put money in and allow the local people to decide how it is to be spent.

He comments further that schools will never be adequately funded, so money for teacher development will have to compete with money for everything else; but teachers need to be encouraged to regard money spent on their own development as being a worthwhile spending of money.

Francis sums up, 'Overall I think we are moving towards a regime which teachers can be more confident about – certainly the ingredients that go into appraisal and it may be done, if you take my scenario, in a way in which they are party to the appraisal process and learn from that to move on. The notion of what you do with the incompetent teacher is fairly quickly teased out, because they are in a different category, to the great majority of people'.

Wilson is far less optimistic. He states the union position quite forcibly. 'The secondary teachers' union has always said that merit pay does not work but that teachers ought to be accountable for their effectiveness. We have no difficulty with that provided we have agreed criteria which apply nationally and that there is no link to pay ... that ran headlong into the School Trustees Association and the SSC and the Ministry of Education view that under a system which ran on the basis of public choice, there would be no national system. Therefore, it would be in the province of the boards to set and determine what the local criteria would be. We would never accept that'.

Wilson also says that the SSC was 'quite mischievous and quite false' and told a 'bare-faced lie' when it advised the Ministry of Education, in the 1989 or 1990 negotiating round, that Section 77c (Appendix 1) was necessary in order to get a settlement. Section 77c was a provision inserted by the SSC in order to circumvent any negotiated outcome at the table, and was to give effect to their view that a board may make up their own appraisal scheme and institute them.

So, on the face of it, the Ministry of Education was in charge, but the Commission had total control. 'My understanding is that the Commission is now exercising that control and frustrating the promulgation of useful negotiated guidelines', says Wilson.

He highlights the NZPPTA has a policy of 'shared decision making' as a professional model for teaching. The aim of this being to enable schools to determine for themselves problem-solving models which are inclusive and robust enough to deal with all issues by themselves and to shut out external agencies. This strategy is used as a means of undermining the government legislative mechanisms and rendering them impotent. Wilson concludes, 'So the longer the Ministry dithers and the SSC pays, the better chance we have of setting all this aside and making some actual educational progress'.

Robinson speaks for the opposing side. 'I think that a lot of the boards have been so frightened by the unions that they don't want to antagonise the unions too much and are not quite willing to take up the role that they really need to have ... sometimes you just have to say, well, this is our decision ... I don't think that the Boards are quite comfortable with that yet'. Robinson also feels that principals should not be full members of the board, rather the employee of the board and principal adviser on curriculum matters.

Newport claims further that, while boards realise that principal appraisal can be a useful thing both for them and the principal, it must be done properly. 'A performance agreement to my mind is absolutely no use at all if, at the end of the period of time, you cannot reasonably determine, what has happened'. Objectives therefore must be quite specific, understood, unambiguous and measurable. They also need to be realistic and consistent with the direction we

want to move in, with the emphasis on quality not quantity. Newport sees teacher appraisal as becoming more and more important.

6.9 Notes

- 1 There were five policy project meetings. The first three were convened by Mary Garlick in 1990 (19 Oct, 8 Nov, 29 Nov). (A meeting set by Garlick for 20 Dec 1990 was cancelled.) A further two meetings in 1991 convened by Shona Macaskill followed (12 Aug, 28 Aug). Other consultation and discussion took place between the Ministry and individual organisations.
- 2 Mary Garlick, of the Ministry of Education's then Management Organisation Policy division, held the initial responsibility for the project. During Garlick's time the organisations presented their positions and the purposes of appraisal were debated. Garlick's departure from the Ministry led to Shona Macaskill, of the then Learning and Assessment division, being appointed to lead the project. Macaskill continued the consultation at a group and individual level. She produced draft guidelines (see appendix 3) which gained the general approval of all the parties involved, notwithstanding each organisation's further suggestions. It was assumed that the SSC's participation at meetings would lead to the approval of the draft guidelines as required by the legislation. The task of Murray Jaspers, of Management Organisation Policy, was to progress the document towards publication. The SSC, at this stage, indicated informally that it was unable to agree to the draft and the publication date for the end of 1992 appears to have been postponed indefinitely.
- 3 The number of changes in personnel in only three years is likely to have had an impact on the institutional memory of the intent of the legislation.

CHAPTER SEVEN : CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Research questions and major themes

This study set out to examine the following questions:

How did teacher appraisal become an item on the New Zealand Ministry of Education's agenda? How was the problem, to which teacher appraisal was proposed as a policy response, recognised and defined? How were the alternatives generated? What choices were made from the alternatives? Did political events serve as a stimulus or as a constraint?

This chapter makes explicit the responses to the research questions and re-examines the key themes that were identified throughout this thesis. The chapter concludes by promoting a future direction for teacher appraisal policy.

One major theme traced the call for greater teacher accountability in the United Kingdom which resulted in a centrally imposed teacher appraisal scheme. A similar call, using the same strategies, the same language and the same tactics, was seen in New Zealand. The State Sector Amendment Act (1989) section 77c was passed, and requirements for appraisal were made through the New Zealand Government's white paper, *Tomorrow's Schools*, and through personnel provisions in schools' charters. All have given strong indications of the New Zealand Government's intentions. In the absence of full implementation of fully worked out policy, however, schools have continued to deal (or not deal) with appraisal requirements in an ad hoc manner ranging from laissez faire to autocratic, managerial approaches.

Another theme considered was the process of policy transfer. Countries do borrow policies from other countries. New Zealand is no exception. The Minister of Education is an 'admirer' of educational developments in the United Kingdom, and policies on issues perceived to be similar in both countries have been 'imported' into New Zealand. So what has prevented policy transfer of the British appraisal scheme from taking place? At any event, how frequently and under what conditions *can* policy be transferred from one country to another? This thesis has tried to explain the process and answer those questions by tracking the progression of the concept of teacher appraisal in England and New Zealand.

Finally, it has been shown that the education reforms must be seen within the wider restructuring process. In addition this thesis that successful policies for teachers cannot be developed in isolation from more general educational policies (OECD 1990:9). Neither can those policies be separated from teachers' conditions of work.

7.2 Accountability

At the heart of teacher appraisal is the issue of accountability. The call for accountability in the past focused on '**accountability for**', supporting the notion of teachers being 'accountable for' – children's learning, their own professional updating, responsibilities within the school. The debate has shifted the location of accountability. Teachers are now '**accountable to**'. They are increasingly accountable to communities, to parents, to business – without specifying what it is that the teacher is 'responsible for'¹.

Teacher appraisal in New Zealand can be regarded as a response to the need to bring a greater degree of accountability and efficiency into public services, particularly in the use of limited resources. Concern for improved quality has

been linked to calls for systematic performance appraisal designed to bring about a better relationship between pay, responsibilities, and especially teaching performance in the classroom (DES 1985:55). As Walsh (1987:154) succinctly summarises:

It is in the context of a weakening of the labour market position of teachers and growing central control over, and concern for, the curriculum and standards that appraisal must be understood. The debate about teacher appraisal is a debate about accountability, quality, competence and professional autonomy. It follows from a desire to change the nature of educational work, and the employment relation through specifying conditions of service.

Neo-liberal market accountability argues that economic regulation by government in education produces inefficiencies. Education should be regulated by the marketplace through the natural forces of competition only. Marketplace competition could regulate rates and services provided. This would save costs. Teacher appraisal statements, if used at all, would provide the information for 'consumers' to make their decisions about the quality of teaching within a school. They would also ensure that teaching became 'individualised' and make it possible to carry out other management functions such as rewarding outstanding teachers and/or providing evidence on incompetent teachers.

The argument has been modified by the view of managerial accountability although elements have remained similar. In an educational system to measure the efficiency of resource allocation, a prior specification of performance or output objectives must be set. Individual schools have the responsibility for setting objectives, therefore, the assessment of efficiency has to be correspondingly individualised. The processes also require objective and standardised information about individual teacher performance and an agreement as to what constitutes that performance in order to achieve argued aims and outcomes.

This individual nature of the focus fits the market-orientated ethic of central government and extends the market situation for transactions between parents and schools:

... market educational reforms can be understood as trans-national, if not global, is a part of the solution to a common set of economic circumstances, including falling rate of profit, the growth in multi-national corporations, increasing national debt, rising unemployment, high levels of inflation and spiralling welfare costs, to name just a few (Gordon 1992:1).

Teachers accept accountability in principle (Scriven 1989:92) but feel that ideally all that goes on in schools should be left to the professional judgement of teachers, informed by generally accepted notions of 'good practice'.

Darling-Hammond (1986:537) sees that 'The rationale for legislation and management controls ... ultimately lessens the involvement of teachers in a broad spectrum of important teaching decisions'. The basic reason, though, for increasingly top-down and highly prescriptive approaches is that policy makers do not trust teachers to make responsible, educationally appropriate judgements. Teaching is not viewed as uniformly capable, and policy makers are suspicious about the adequacy of teacher supervision. They fear that supervision does not take place, or that judgements made by supervisors are inaccurate.

There is a tension between individual teacher discretion and organisational control. Arguably the only way out of the accountability dilemma for teachers, and the only way into a broader role for teachers in individual and collective decision-making, is to ensure continuing competence in the teaching force,

thereby reducing the need for bureaucratic controls designed to prevent incompetence. Peer review and peer control or monitoring collaboration are central tenets of professionalism. It is argued that a balance between professional autonomy and public accountability must always be struck.

7.3 Control and power relationships

Teacher appraisal is an example of the paradox the government finds itself in. Its desire to seek popular approval for its policies (devolution) placed power locally in the hands of boards of trustees, as employers, for assessing the performance of teachers: Control of teachers' performance, however, was established centrally through legislation. The Ministry of Education with the concurrence of SSC prescribe what matters needed to be taken into account by boards. It is the SSC which negotiates appraisal, evaluation, assessment of performance through the employment contracts.

Gordon (1992:12) argues that the government expected boards of trustees to take up its role of control and uphold its aims:

From the neo-liberal perspective, boards of trustees have two central roles. In relation to the state they are the 'agent' receiving and disbursing funds and negotiating and implementing policies according to national goals and the school charter. In relation to teachers and the school community, boards are, respectively, 'employers' and 'representatives'.

In New Zealand a notable feature of the reform process has been the tendency for boards to side with teachers against elements of the top-down reforms. Boards have not seen themselves as agents of the government. Gordon maintains that trustees have 'shown a distinct reluctance' to act fully as employers of teachers. It appears that trustees have a 'more informal and positive relationship' with the principal and teachers than was intended:

... in each of these roles boards of trustees have not acted as expected. They have contested state actions in relation to school charters, the funding system for schools and attempts to privatise peripheral services (Gordon 1992:13).

Trustees have the responsibility for teacher appraisal within the personnel provisions of the charter, but in practice most have left the activity very much within the principal's professional role.

When the ends of education cease to be consensual and differences can no longer peaceably co-exist, and given that the government accepts a responsibility to intervene in education, it is faced with a multiplicity of participants and interest groups, each of whom constitutes a powerful voting lobby:

Parents, employers and educators all have much to say as coherent – and sometimes highly organised – interest groups, but so do many other sectors of the community. Given that such interest groups will have an extremely divergent range of knowledge and experience of the education system, this increases the problems of decision-making (Peddie 1991:5).

There are always people who challenge existing structures (Ramsay et al. 1990:434) and practices. The role of the teaching unions has been to open up a process which had formally and politically been closed to legitimate participants (Gordon 1992:13). Where traditional democratic rights, such as the right of participation, have been denied to people by a closed political process, the desire to exercise those rights still exists and, given the proper facilitation, can still be fulfilled. Education unions have had an important role as conduits and facilitators in that process.

Teaching unions in New Zealand may have been more successful than in the United Kingdom in influencing the education reforms because their activity has not simply been as 'blocking agents' protecting the interests and benefits of their members. Much broader social policy issues have been understood and argued by them in the public arena, both at the national and local levels.

In organising their resistance, New Zealand teaching unions have promoted their members' interests through their professional voice, which has led to a close alliance with parents at the local level. 'This difference means that teaching unions have had the ability to organise democratically against what are seen to be inherently anti-democratic reforms both in their nature and in the process of implementation' (Gordon & Walker 1992:2). Both the NZEI and NZPPTA, however, have been forced to compromise their professional guardianship through their defence of teaching conditions.

7.4 Applying Wolman's questions

Wolman (1992:42) suggests that following a standard rational policy analysis model², a further three questions should be asked when transferring a policy from one country to another. In an earlier chapter it was argued that a standard rational policy model was not generally applied. The case with teacher appraisal, both in the United Kingdom and New Zealand, supports that argument. Furthermore, despite similarities between the United Kingdom and New Zealand for calls for greater teacher accountability, and despite looking to the United Kingdom for ready-made solutions to New Zealand's educational problems, similar policy on teacher appraisal has not resulted.

Wolman's questions are still useful, however, to examine the process and determine what conditions are necessary for transfer of teacher appraisal policy to have occurred.

Are the problems to which the policy is to be addressed in the recipient country similar to those to which it was addressed in the originating country?

It appears that there are marked similarities on how the issues have been defined in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand. In both countries educational reform and policies have been driven by three objectives: to raise

national standards, to make efficiency savings in educational spending (increased value for the same or less money) and to create a genuine market model in education (parental choice).

Specifically, the governments in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand are committed to developing a skilled labour force to meet the challenges of international competition, as well as the reinforcement of certain ideological values which promote individualism (such as merit pay schemes) rather than collectivity (national pay scales and guidelines).

In both the United Kingdom and New Zealand the importance of schooling to serve the labour needs of the nation clearly emerged in the accountability debate. In New Zealand recognition of the link between education and the nation's economic prosperity has permitted the implementation of radical labour market policies. Teacher appraisal policy could be used to provide information for rewards and sanctions and thus be consistent with the government's prevailing ideology.

Assessment of teachers in New Zealand did not, however, receive the same agenda priority as in the United Kingdom. Part of this difference may have been, as Gordon (1992:2) discusses, trends that occurred in Britain over the 1980s, such as the scapegoating of teachers as the cause of social and economic failure. Such trends were largely absent in New Zealand where the 'accountability' debate and 'reform process' arrived very suddenly and with little prior warning or preparation³. In New Zealand the education reforms did not mean immediate cutbacks in teaching staff or reduction in Vote Education. Political resistance by a variety of groups united in their opposition to elements of the reforms that had the potential to undermine the quality of teaching and learning in schools may, therefore, have been much stronger in New Zealand, as

the government was perceived to be responding to a crisis of confidence rather than to internal or externally recognised failures.

Also, there is an enduring problem of uniqueness. To determine whether a problem or policy is similar from one country to another it is necessary to overlook a great many of the special features that make a country or a policy decision unique. Every action is part of a particular context, but since every context is different it is difficult to find comparable measurements across time or between countries and to be sure that we are really comparing like with like.

To what extent was the policy 'successful' in the originating country?

Ideas from abroad and those who promote them may have an advantage because they can be seen to be in place and working. This was not the case with teacher appraisal, which was a new policy initiative in the United Kingdom with its first phase of implementation still incomplete.

It is not clear whether overseas research evidence was sought by New Zealand specifically on the issue of teacher appraisal. There does not appear to have been any systematic attempt to assess or monitor the effectiveness of the British teacher appraisal policy by the New Zealand Ministry of Education, New Zealand Treasury or by the SSC. Neither have New Zealand researchers evaluated the British developments. Nor had there been, within New Zealand, serious mention of any problems with the effectiveness of the British policy, although the question of the considerable cost will have been an issue.

Wolman's research found frequent comment that, 'it was the attitude behind the policy that was wished to be imported'. Wolman (1992:38) contests:

The problem, of course, is that it may be the pre-existing attitudes which account for the policy's existence in the United States and that simply

importing the policy structure and design will not necessarily result in similar attitudes. The implicit assumption is that institutional change can bring about attitudinal change.

This raises the question, 'to what extent was it the government's intention to bring about an attitudinal change?' Clearly, the governments of both the United Kingdom and New Zealand were strongly influenced by New Right ideology. The social policy reforms reflected their intention to reconstruct the socio-political and economic context into which policies are implemented. The 'free market' ideology aligns itself with some popular common-sense beliefs that there is too much government interference in the lives of individuals.

The discourse on the education reforms in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand has had similar themes and criticism (Evans & Davies 1990:60)⁴. Grace (1990:73) sees the use of language as an integral part of the political and ideological strategy of the New Right⁵.

The discourse has been framed in economic terms – in the language of production, rationalisation and standardisation (Apple 1986:27) and amalgamated with the language of managerialism. The language has been couched in authoritative terms yet without reference to any evidence to support the claims being made. The intention of the language is to devalue ideas and commitments of professionals, as can be seen by labelling them as 'vested interest' groups, or 'self-seeking' agents.

Are there any aspects of a policy's setting in the originating country which are critical to its success there, but which are not present, or are present in a different form, in the recipient country?

The question of whether the various aspects of the British teacher appraisal policy are suitable for New Zealand is a critical one. The interviewees appeared quite clear that New Zealand's education system did have unique features and that any policy would need to be adapted.

One such feature is that New Zealand, unlike the United Kingdom, has a history of teachers setting educational objectives on an annual basis and evaluating them as part of the professional development cycle. Whereas in the United Kingdom, teacher appraisal policy was relatively new and any appraisal policy imported into New Zealand would, therefore, need to be 'grafted' on to existing practices and apparently do rather more reporting to parents.

A further difference, due to the 'class structure' – such a strong feature of United Kingdom history – is that the British appraisal policy is hierarchical with a clear 'line management' approach. New Zealand's history, its smaller population and smaller size of school⁶ have demanded a more collaborative, egalitarian approach.

Until the advent of the 1980s education reforms, policy makers in New Zealand had a tradition of acting in a collaborative way with education groups, including teacher unions – 'decisions were made, as far as possible, by consensus, after widespread consultation'. Capper & Munro (1990:151) state:

New Zealand has been highly idiosyncratic by world standards in the extent to which teacher unions have been involved in policy development and implementation in professional matters.

There is an argument for saying that, as New Zealand is unique, we should seek local solutions for local problems. There may be overseas parallels to the important issues now facing our bicultural society, but nowhere else is there a situation of exact parallel to that of Maori and Pakeha (Peddie 1990:1). Unlike the criticism in the United Kingdom that there was 'too much equity', in New Zealand the criticism was that the education system was failing Maori learners. In New Zealand there was also growing cultural recognition that Maori values and protocol offered a more egalitarian approach to learning.

Budgets act as a constraint. Overall, perhaps the most critical consideration for the New Zealand Government has been one of cost.

The British Government spent 20 million sterling on setting up a school teacher appraisal pilot study which involved six local education authorities. The National Steering Group's (NSG 1989:23) summary of costs of operating appraisal in the long term was estimated at 40.5 million sterling. The British Government's response was to budget only a further 17 million sterling. Proportionately, however, these amounts were in excess of the funds available from New Zealand's Vote Education for an appraisal policy. In addition as the New Zealand Government was already engaged in an ambitious costly social policy reform programme which was meeting with considerable public criticism and resistance.

Part of the response to Wolman's final question therefore, must be that in New Zealand the necessary funding proportionate to that available in the United Kingdom was not forthcoming; too many other matters were competing for government's attention and an appraisal policy was not seen as a priority.

In times of severe budget constraint programmes that come to the fore must be inexpensive or paid for out of compensatory savings. Those factors have all influenced recent development of teacher appraisal in New Zealand.

7.5 Appraisal – formative or summative?

Teacher appraisal is caught up in a set of contradictions and conflicts. It is not a straightforward idea. On the one hand, every professional national group has to believe in the practice of appraisal because, from a professional point of view, appraisal can be a really important means for developing a profession. In the

process of appraisal, the 'professionals' become critically aware of their practice. They become aware of their strengths and weaknesses and learn from this knowledge. In the professional mode, therefore, 'appraisal' is a productive and developmental activity.

On the other hand, problems arise with the other modes in which 'appraisal' can operate, and the controversial question is raised concerning the use that will be made of the appraisal information. Teachers, both in the United Kingdom and New Zealand are suspicious of the 'arrival' of appraisal. They doubt that the fundamental intention of introducing it is to improve professional performance and believe that the government's promotion of appraisal has other purposes. In other words, the political and the ideological context in which appraisal has been delivered raises doubts about the purpose.

The doubts stem from two bases. First, at the time when appraisal is being introduced, teachers are already facing attacks which they perceived as ideological (Grace 1990) on their professional competence and commitment. For teachers, therefore, any appraisal scheme is likely to be received as an act of potentially hostile surveillance. Thus, first of all, the wider conditions very much affect how people respond to the introduction of an appraisal scheme.

Second, many teachers continue to be sceptical about appraisal, as they fear that the process and information are going to be used primarily for introducing various forms of merit pay, or firmly linked into promotion, or even used for disciplinary and competency matters. If appraisal is very tightly linked to summative purposes the professional potential of appraisal for development and the collegial task of teaching will be destroyed.

The appraisal process and information are also able to be linked by teachers to the development of management techniques in schools. Schools have been required to set out clearly their aims and objectives, with the assumption that these can be measured and will thus provide clear information on school effectiveness and efficiency. This approach is resisted by teachers.

Basically then, there is a dilemma. There is a struggle between the 'professional development mode' of thinking about appraisal, and what can be called a 'controlling mode' of using teacher appraisal. Ultimately teacher appraisal can be said to focus on the issue of power: i.e. control of professional development and the education processes by the profession or government control or all aspects of the educative process.

From the first steps, employers in the United Kingdom saw appraisal as a controlling mechanism as part of reorganising the pay structure. The same effect in New Zealand has already been achieved through the power and control being invested in employment legislation (Employment Contracts Act) and negotiation conducted and exercised by a central state agency. Teachers' work has been specified in detailed contract conditions.

Appraisal for educative purposes has not been acceptable to the SSC who want managerial discretion for boards. Appraisal for salary purposes has been driven by the SSC.

The result has been an extension of the use of an truncated appraisal process for summative purposes. Whereas appraisal was used for professional purposes such as between entry grade to professional grade, the employment contracts now mean that classroom teachers are only able to move to the final steps on their salary scale by a form of appraisal. Similarly, the New Zealand principals'

contract, a performance agreement, uses an appraisal process for summative purposes.

Appraisal need not, however, be purely negative and controlling. Participative appraisal can enhance the recognition of the wholeness of the teaching and learning experience.

Walsh (1987:165) suggests that appraisal may have a role to play in the partnership-based development of education, as part of the process which involves teachers as well as parents and students in the educational process. In that sense it might form part of a reciprocal form of accountability, rather than a hierarchical, managerial accountability.

Walsh argues that appraisal used this way would have many positive benefits.

Participative appraisal could also help overcome the sort of isolation, uncertainty and loneliness that characterises a great deal of teaching. In that it could be a part of the learning process in the school. It could be used not to identify the successes and failures of the individual teacher, but the constraints that operated on the school as a learning community. Appraisal might also be part of the process of developing a language in which one could account for education, making possible more rational dialogue on its nature and development. Participative appraisal could contribute to a reassessment of the purpose of education (Walsh 1987:165).

Perhaps the clearest benefit of teacher appraisal is the potential contribution it can make to foster a better flow of communication and support between teachers, and offer inservice and professional development in a positive way to all teachers on a regular basis.

An individualistic emphasis in the professional management discourse, however, makes it more likely that any attempt at assessment of teachers will involve accountability as well as development. It also means that, in practice, assessment of performance and reward are likely to be related.

Systems for managing the relationships between individuals and organisations need not be inherently antagonistic to teachers' claims to professional status. Indeed, when we focus on what professionals do, there is every reason to believe that teaching is potentially among the most difficult, demanding and highly skilled professions. The organisations that represent teachers, and those which employ them, should be potential vehicles for promoting the professional standards, collegiality, accountability and sense of responsibility which are positive aspects of appraisal.

7.6 In summary

This thesis has argued that when looking at any proposed teacher appraisal policy the proposed policy must be set in the wider context of what other policy changes or initiatives are occurring, e.g. public sector reform. The New Zealand teacher appraisal policy development process demonstrates the importance of this requirement.

For proposals to survive and policy to develop, they must meet several criteria. Their degree of fit with dominant values and the current national mood is critical. Mass public opinion can affect their likelihood of success. If the time is not right for change, further action is likely to be prohibited. This may be the case in New Zealand at present.

Governments are faced with complex problems in a complex system. The analysis of any overseas policy involves the same set of complexities in a different setting. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that policy making in education sometimes falters when adopting ideas from abroad. Appraisal as the fully fledged scheme has not been adopted in England and Wales. Appraisal in

New Zealand has been in truncated form, making for special situations encountered during industrial relations negotiations.

7.7 Prognosis

Given the foregoing it is argued that there are three likely scenarios for teacher appraisal policy in New Zealand. First, the draft policy may never re-emerge in its current form. Next, teacher appraisal policy may emerge in another form to satisfy requirements of managerial accountability. In this situation I believe that teachers and board of trustees' resistance will be at a level to foil the summative purposes. Finally, the optimistic view is that all those involved with policy making have been given a breathing space to participate in informed debate. From this debate, appraisal policy which leads to improved teacher and learning in schools has an opportunity to complement other professional improvement movements. Such a professional model would be a genuine attempt to give expression to the motivation of all New Zealand teachers.

7.8 Notes

- 1 Macaskill in interview.
- 2 See Chapter three, 3.3 Policy making models.
- 3 The highly political reforms could be seen as the Labour Government's response to the opposition's well-developed education manifesto which had been well publicised through the media and the high profile Opposition speaker on education, Ruth Richardson.
- 4 Evans, J. & Davies, B. (1990) 'Power to the People? The great Education Reform Act and Tomorrow's Schools: a critical and comparative perspective' in Lauder & Wylie (1990)
- 5 The New Right seeks to target teachers for many of the claimed problems of the system: the underachievement of Maori, the underachievement of girls in certain areas, the unskilled labour force which prevents New Zealand from maintaining a competitive economic advantage. See also appendix 4: nos 9-11, 15.
- 6 60% of New Zealand primary schools have fewer than six teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, K.A. & Gail, M.D. (1987) *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: preservice and inservice applications*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service. (1986) *Teachers' dispute ACAS independent panel: report of the appraisal/training working group*. London: ACAS.

Alcorn, N. (1987) 'Education and the fourth estate'. Paper presented at the AARE/NZARE conference, Christchurch, December.

Anderson C. (1978) 'The logic of public problems: evaluation in comparative policy research' in Ashford, D.E. ed. *Comparing public policies. New concepts and methods*. London: Sage

Annesley, B. (1992) 'Performance-related pay for teachers' in Manson, H. ed. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education 2*. Wellington: NZCER.

Apple, M. (1983) 'Controlling the work of teachers'. *Delta*, 32.

Apple, M. (1986) *Teachers and texts. A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1988) 'Economics and inequality in schools'. *Theory into Practice*, 27, 4, 282-287.

Bash, L. & Coulby, D. (1989) *The education reform act. Competition and control*. London: Cassell.

Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallot, J. Walsh, P. (1991) eds. *Reshaping the state. New Zealand's bureaucratic revolution*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Boudon, R. (1973) *Education, opportunity and social inequality: changing prospects in western society*. New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, P. (1971) 'Cultural reproduction and social reproduction' in Brown, R. ed. *Knowledge, education and social control*. London: Tavistock.

Capper, P. & Munro, R. (1990) 'Professionals or workers?: changing teachers' conditions of service' in Middleton, S., Codd, J. & Jones, A. eds. *New Zealand education policy today. Critical perspectives*.

Carr, M. (1993) 'Competency or teacher change: reconciling two different models of education in writing unit standards for early childhood education programmes above level 4'. Background paper 2 for discussion by early childhood organisations. University of Waikato, June.

Chinnery, P. (1983) 'Educational accountability in a changing community'. Address given at the 3rd NZEAS conference 'Accountability in a changing community'. Auckland Teachers College.

Codd, J., Gordon, L. & Harker, R. (1990a) 'Education and the role of the state: devolution and control post Picot' in Lauder, H. & Wylie, C. eds. *Towards successful schooling*. London: Falmer Press.

Codd, J., Harker, R. & Nash, R. eds. (1990b) *Political issues in New Zealand Education*. 2nd edition. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Dunmore Press.

Cogan, M.L. (1973) *Clinical supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) 'A garbage can model of organisational choice'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, 1-25.

Currie Committee. (1962) Commission on education in New Zealand. Wellington.

Cuttance, P. (1992) 'Quality assurance and quality management in education systems'. Draft. Forthcoming in Evers, C.W. & Chapman, J.D. eds. *Education Administration: An Australian perspective*. Allen & Unwin.

Dale, R. (1989) *The state and education policy*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Dale, R. (1992) 'The state and education'. Winter lecture. University of Auckland. 21 Jul.

Dale, R. & Jesson, J. (1992) 'Mainstreaming education: the role of the State Services Commission' in Manson, H. ed. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 2. Wellington: NZCER

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984) 'Taking the measure of excellence. The case against basing teacher evaluation on student test scores'. *American Educator*, Fall, 26-29, 46.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986) 'A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession'. *The elementary school journal*, 86, 4, March.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988) 'Accountability and teacher professionalism'. *American Educator*. Winter.

Department of Education. (1978) Report of the committee on the registration and discipline of teachers (the Marshall report). Wellington: Government Printer

Department of Education. (1987) Report of the committee to review the curriculum for schools. (The Curriculum Review.) Wellington: Government Printer.

Department of Education and Science. (1983) *Teaching quality*. London: HMSO.

Education and Science Select Committee. (1986) Report on the inquiry into the quality of teaching. (The Scott report) Wellington, N.Z.: Government Printer.

Education Forum. (1992a) *Better teachers for better learning*. Wellington: Education Forum.

Education Forum. (1992b) *Better teachers and employment contracts*. A review of reactions to *Better teachers for better learning* and an interim assessment of the 1992 teacher employment contract negotiations. Auckland: Education Forum.

Elley, W.B. (1991) *How well do New Zealand students achievement by international standards?* The Elley report. A report commissioned by the Canterbury region of the post-primary teachers association. Christchurch: University of Canterbury.

Evans, A. & Tomlinson, J. eds. (1989) *Teacher appraisal. A nation wide approach*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Garlick, M. (1991) 'Teacher appraisal within New Zealand reform of education administration'. Master of Public Policy research paper. Wellington: VUW.

Glass, G. (1974) 'Teacher effectiveness' in Walberg, H.J. ed. *Evaluating educational performance: a sourcebook of methods, instruments and examples*. California:McCutchan.

Goldhammer, R. (1978) *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers*.

Gonczi, A. (1983) 'An integrated competence approach to professional education'. Paper to Tertiary Education Sector, NZQA. Wellington. April.

Gordon, L. (1992) 'Educational reform in New Zealand: contesting the role of the teacher'. *International studies in sociology of education*, 2, 1, 23–42.

Gordon, L. & Walker, (1992) 'State formation, educational reform and the role of teachers in Australia and New Zealand'. Presented at the joint NZARE/AARE conference. Geelong. November.

Grace, G. (1990) 'Labour and education: the crisis and settlements of education policy' in Holland and Boston 1990.

Grace, G. (1991) 'Welfare Labourism versus the New Right: the struggle in New Zealand's education policy'. *International studies in sociology of education*, 1, 25–42.

Graham, D., Cornthwaite, T.R., Andrews, A.G., Green, A.K., Horsfield, W. & Sanders, M.E. (1985) *Those having torches....teacher appraisal:a study*. Suffolk Education Department.

Haertel, E. (1986) 'The valid use of student performance measures for teacher evaluation'. *Educational Evaluation and Policy analysis*.

Hager, P. (1993) 'How convincing are the arguments against competency standards?' Paper to Tertiary Education Sector, NZQA. Wellington. April.

Hartley, L. & Broadfoot, P. (1986) 'Assessing teacher performance'. *Journal of Education Policy*. 3, 1, 39–50

H.M.I. (1985) *Quality in schools: evaluation and appraisal*. London:HMSO.

Holland M, & Boston J. eds. (1990) *The fourth Labour government politics and policy in NZ. Rhetoric of privatisation and deregulation*. Auckland:OUP

Hopkins, D. & Bollington, R. (1989) 'Teacher appraisal for professional development:a review of research'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 19, 2, 163–182.

Illich, I. (1972) *De-schooling society*. Harmondsworth Middlesex:Penguin.

Ingvarson, L. (1986) 'Linking appraisal and professional development: a challenge for the teaching profession' in Lokan, J. & McKenzie, P. eds. *Teacher appraisal:issues and approaches*. Victoria, Australia:ACER

Irving, J. (1987) 'Public perceptions of education'. Paper presented at the First joint AARE/NZARE Conference, 3–6 December. Christchurch:University of Canterbury.

Istance, D. (1989) 'Schools and quality. An international report.' (Draft form) Paris:OECD.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bone, M.J., Cohen, D.K., Gintis, H., Heyns, B. & Michelson, S. (1972) *Inequality: a reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York:Basic Books.

Kingdon, J.W. (1984) *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*. Boston, USA:Little Brown & Co.

Kyriacou, C. (1987) 'Teacher appraisal in the classroom:can it be done successfully?' *School Organisation*, 7, 2, 139–144.

Lauder, H. (1991) *Tomorrow's education, tomorrow's economy*. The Lauder report. A report commissioned by the Education Sector Standing Committee of the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions. Wellington:VUW.

Lauder, H. & Wylie, C. eds. (1990) *Towards successful schooling*. London:Falmer Press.

Lawn, M. & Grace, G. eds. (1987) *Teachers: the culture and politics of work*. London:Falmer Press.

Lokan, J. & McKenzie, P. eds. (1989) *Teacher appraisal:issues and approaches*. Victoria, Australia:ACER

McDonald, G. (1993) 'New Zealand: research and government policy'. *Evaluation and research in education*. 7, 1.

McGreal, T.L. (1982) 'Effective teacher evaluation systems'. *Educational Leadership* 39, 4, 303–05

McGreal, T. L. (1983) *Successful teacher evaluation*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McNamara, D. (1992) 'Three times unlucky'. *Times Educational Supplement*, June 5. p19.

Manson, H. ed. (1993) *New Zealand annual review of education*. 2:1992. Wellington:VUW, Department of Education.

Merrick, N. & Rafferty, F. (1992) 'High rewards for excellence'. *Times Education Supplement*. Oct 30, p8.

Middleton, S., Codd, J. & Jones, A. eds. (1990) *New Zealand education policy today. Critical perspectives*. Wellington:Allen & Unwin.

Mortimore, P. & Mortimore, J. (1991) 'Teacher appraisal: back to the future'. *School organisation*, 11, 2.

Munro, R. (1989) 'The Munro Report'. Research into the personnel provisions of *Tomorrow's Schools*. NZPPTA. February.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1989) *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession*. Detroit:NBPTS.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983) *A national at risk: the imperative for educational reform*. Washington:US Department of Education.

National Steering Group. (1989) *School teacher appraisal: a national framework*. Report of the National Steering Group on the School Teacher Appraisal Pilot Study. London:HMSO.

New Zealand Educational Institute. (1992) *Better teachers for better learning? – or someone hasn't done their homework ...* An analysis of the Education Forum's March 1992 report. An occasional paper. Wellington:NZEI.

New Zealand Treasury. (1987) *Government management. Brief to incoming government.* Vol II. Education Issues. Wellington.

New Zealand Treasury. (1990) *Briefing to the incoming government.* Wellington.

Nisbet, J. & Watt, J. (1984) 'Case Study' in Bell, J., Bush, T., Fox, A., & Goodey, J., Goulding, S. eds. *Conducting small-scale investigations in educational management.*

Oakley, A. (1981) 'Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms' in Roberts, H. ed. *Doing feminist research.* London:Routledge.

OECD. (1983) *Review of national policies for education:New Zealand.* Paris:OCED.

OECD. (1988) 'Public management studies. Recent trends in performance appraisal and performance-related pay schemes in the public sector'. Paris:OECD.

OECD. (1989) *Education and the economy in a changing society.* Paris:OECD.

OECD. (1990) *The teacher today: tasks, conditions, policies.* Paris:OECD

Office of the Minister of Education. (1988) *Tomorrow's schools. The reform of education administration in New Zealand.* Wellington:Government Printer.

Office of the Minister of Education. (1990) *Today's schools; a review of the education reform implementation process.* (The Lough report). Wellington:Government Printer.

Openshaw, Lee & Lee (1993) 'The 1990s and beyond: Tomorrow's Schools and educational research' in *Challenging the myths.* Dunmore.

Ozga, J. (1987) 'Studying education policy through the lives of policy-makers: an attempt to close the macro-micro gap' in Walker, S. & Barton, L. eds. *Changing policies, changing teachers. New directions for schooling?* Milton Keynes:Open University Press, 138–150.

Pateman, T. (1981) 'Accountability, values and schooling' in Dale, R., Esland, G., Fergusson, R. & MacDonald, M. eds. *Education and the state. Politics, patriarchy and practice.* vol II. Sussex:Falmer Press.

Peddie, R. (1991) 'Comparative studies in education:lessons for New Zealand'. A paper given at seminar on Education Models from Overseas. Wellington:New Zealand Planning Council.

Picot, B. (1988) *Administering for excellence: report of the taskforce to review education administration.* (The Picot report). Wellington:Government Printer.

Popham, W.J. (1971) *Designing teacher evaluation systems.* Los Angeles:instructional Objectives Exchange.

Porter, Rizvi, Knight, Lingard (1987) 'Competencies for a clever country:building a house of cards? Unicorn

Project ABLE committee. (1989) *Tomorrow's standards*. The report of the ministerial working party on Assessment for Better Learning. Wellington:Government Printer.

Przeworski, A. & Teune, H. (1970) *The logic of comparative social inquiry*. Sydney:John Wiley & sons.

Rae, K. (1992a) 'Te Wero – Tomorrow's Schools' in the third year: the challenge for educational administrators in New Zealand'. A paper prepared for the 7th CCEA regional conference in Hong Kong, University of Hong Kong, 17–21 August.

Rae, K. (1992b) 'Better teachers for better learning'. Unpublished paper.

Rae, K. (1993a) 'Education market, family or network'. Unpublished paper.

Rae, K. (1993b) 'Te hutinga o te harakeke – the plucking of the flaxbush. Five impacts on New Zealand schools in 1993 from ongoing restructuring of the administration and management of education'. A paper prepared for the ACEA conference on the theme of 'Devolution, Democracy, Equity', held at Adelaide, Sep 26–30.

Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hawk, K., Kaai, T., Marriott, R. & Poskitt, J. (1990) 'There's no going back. collaborative decision-making in education'. Final report:Curriculum review reserch in schools project. Hamilton:University of Waikato, Education Department.

Ranson, S., Gray, J., Jesson, D. & Jones, B. (1986) 'Exams in context: values and power in educational accountability' in Nuttall, D. ed. *Assessing educational achievement*. London:Falmer Press.

Ranson, S., Taylor, B. & Brighouse, T. eds. (1986) *The revolution in education and training*. Great Britain:Luton.

Ranson, S. & Tomlinson, J. eds. (1986) *The changing government of education*. Sydney:Allen & Unwin.

Ranson, S., Hannon, V. & Gray, J. (1987) 'Citizens or consumers? Policies for school accountability' in Walker, S. & Barton, L. eds. *Changing policies, changing teachers*. London:Open university press.

Reich, R. (1991) *The work of nations*.

Renwick, W.L. (1986) *Moving targets. Six essays on educational policy*. Wellington:NZCER.

Reynolds, D. (1987). 'Teacher appraisal and development: a review of the key issues'. *School organisation*, 7, 2, 129–137.

Robinson, P. (1993) 'Teachers facing change'. A small scale study of teachers working with competency-based training. Adelaide:NCVER.

Rose, R. (1988) 'Comparative policy analysis:the program approach' in Dogan, M. ed. *Comparing pluralist democracies*. Boulder Col:Westview, 219–41.

Salter, B. & Tapper, T. (1985) *Power and policy in education:the case of independent schooling*. London:Falmer Press.

Schneider, A. & Ingram, H. (1988) 'Systematically pinching ideas:a comparative approach to policy design. *Journal of Public Policy*, 8, 1, 61–80.

Scriven, M. (1989) 'The state of the art in teacher evaluation' in Lokan, J. & McKenzie, P eds. *Teacher appraisal issues and approaches*. Victoria, Australia:ACER.

Sergiovanni, T. ed. (1982) *Supervision of teaching*. Virginia:Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sexton, S. (1990) *New Zealand schools and current reforms*. Wellington:New Zealand Business Round Table.

Simon, B. (1991) *Education and the social order 1940–1990*. New York:St Martin's Press.

Simpkin, G. (1993) 'The negotiation of *Tomorrow's schools* in the secondary sector, 1989: issues of accountability: managerialism vs professionalism. Unpublished paper.

Smyth, J. (1991) 'Professional development and the restructuring of teachers' work: the case of teacher collegiality'. *Unicorn*, 17, 4, November, 224–236.

Sullivan, K. (1992) 'The myth of partnership:educational reform and teacher disempowerment' in *New Zealand Annual Review of Education 2*. Wellington:NZCER.

Taskforce to review education administration. (1988) *Administering for excellence*. (Picot report) Wellington, N.Z: Government Printer.

Walsh, K. (1986) 'Managing contraction' in Ranson, S. & Tomlinson, J. eds. *The changing government of education*. Sydney:Allen & Unwin. pp124–131.

Walsh, K. (1987) 'The politics of teacher appraisal' in Lawn, M. & Grace, G. eds. *Teachers:The culture and politics of work*. Lewes:Falmer Press.

Weber, J.R. (1987) *Teacher evaluation as a strategy for improving instruction*. Oregon:ERIC clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Willis, D. (1992) 'Educational assessment and accountability: a New Zealand case study.' 7, 2, 205–221.

Wise, A.E. & Darling–Hammond, L. (1985) 'Teacher evaluation and teacher professionalism' *Educational leadership*. 42, 4, 28–33.

Wise, A.E., Darling–Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W., Bernstein, H. (1984) *Teacher evaluation:a study of effective practices*. USA:Rand Corporation.

Wolman, H. (1992) 'Understanding cross national policy transfers:the case of Britain and the US' *Governance:An international journal of policy and administration*. 5, 1, 27–55. Research committee on the structure and organisation of Government of the International Political Science Association.

Wragg, E.C. (1987) *Teacher appraisal:a practical guide*. London:Macmillan Education.

New Zealand Legislation

1987	Labour Relations Act
1988	Labour Relations Amendment Act
1989	Labour Relations Amendment Act
1988	State Sector Act
1989	State Sector Amendment Act
1989	State Sector Amendment no.2 Act
1964	Education Act
1989	Education Amendment Act
1990	Education Amendment Act

APPENDIX 1

State Sector Amendment Act 1989

77c. Performance of teachers—(1) 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.

(2) Before the chief executive of the Ministry of Education prescribes any matters under subsection (1) of this section the chief executive of the Ministry shall consult with—

- (a) The Teacher Registration Board and
- (b) The chief executive of the Education Review Office; and
- (c) Representatives of employers of teachers; and
- (d) The organisations of teachers that represent teachers who will be subject to the matters prescribed under this section.

(3) Nothing in this section prevents the prescribing by an employer of matters to be taken into account in assessing the performance of teachers employed by that employer (being matters which are not inconsistent with any matters prescribed under this section by the chief executive of the Ministry and which apply to teachers employed by that employer).

APPENDIX 2

Good morning

MEd THESIS INTERVIEW

Thank you for being willing to be interviewed Thursday 30 September at 11:00 am. The information from the interview will be used within my MEd thesis on teacher appraisal.

The thesis itself looks at the call for greater teacher accountability in many OECD countries and how that has resulted in teacher appraisal/evaluation schemes. In education there are some examples of New Zealand taking on similar policies to those in England and Wales. My thesis, therefore, explores the call for greater accountability in New Zealand, the similarities of the debate with England, and considers why we have not adopted the teacher appraisal approach taken by the British Government in England and Wales.

My specific research questions are: How did teacher appraisal become an item on New Zealand's education agenda? How was the problem, to which teacher appraisal was proposed as a policy response, recognised and defined? How were the alternatives generated? What choices were made from the alternatives? Did political events serve as a stimulus or a constraint?

Following is a copy of the interview guide. The interview will probably take about 40 minutes.

Dear

Thank you very much for helping me with my MEd policy thesis by allowing me to interview you on teacher accountability and appraisal. I appreciated the time and thoughtful consideration you accorded me.

I am enclosing a transcript taken from our discussion. I know I will have down more than I will be able to use - such was the wealth of information that was able to be captured by the tape. You may like to look over these notes and let me know if there are any points that you wanted to make did not come out clearly enough, or that there are mistakes that I should correct. Please let me know if there are any parts you would prefer not to be quoted.

If there are any other points that you wish to make since our interview please telephone me either at work (384 9689) or at home (384 2958).

If I don't hear anything from you, I will assume that you are satisfied with the comments I have recorded as an accurate reflection of our conversation.

I enjoyed having the opportunity to talk with you. Many thanks, once again, for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

APPENDIX 3

ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS DRAFT 12/2

FOREWORD

Dr Maris O'Rourke
Secretary for Education

"Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Section 77C of the State Sector Act 1988 (as inserted by Section 3 of the State Sector Amendment Act 1989 and further amended by Section 20 of the State Sector Amendment (No 2) Act 1989)" viz

Section 77C Performance of Teachers

- (1) *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.***
- (2) *Before the chief executive of the Ministry of Education prescribes any matters under subsection (1) of this section, the chief executive of the Ministry shall consult with -***
 - (a) The Teacher Registration Board; and***
 - (b) The chief executive of the Education Review Office; and***
 - (c) Representatives of employers of teachers; and***
 - (d) The organisations of teachers that represent teachers who will be subject to the matters prescribed under this section.***
- (3) *Nothing in this section prevents the prescribing by an employer of matters to be taken into account in assessing the performance of teachers employed by that employer (being matters which are not inconsistent with any matters prescribed under this section by the chief executive of the Ministry and which apply to teachers employed by that employer).***
- (4) *Nothing in this section shall apply to any teachers employed in any university, technical institute, teachers college, or early childhood institution.***

The following matters are to be taken into account by employers in assessing the performance of teachers.

Essentially the basis of assessing the performance of teachers is for boards of trustees to decide for their school, *provided the following significant factors are included in the process.*

(Note In line with established educational usage the term appraisal will be used in this prescription and will be deemed to embody the process of assessment.

MATTERS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

1. The Legal Basis

i The authority for this document resides in:

Section 77C of the State Sector Act 1988 (*as amended*)

ii Any appraisal process developed and its implementation should acknowledge and accord with all relevant legal and contractual requirements, in particular:

- Personnel Goals and Objectives of the School Charter
- Relevant Teachers Collective (or Individual) Employment Contracts
- Section 77A (General Principles) of the State Sector Act 1988 (*as amended*)
- Codes of Conduct For Primary and Secondary Teachers made pursuant to Section 77B of the State Sector Act 1988 (*as amended*) *when promulgated*
- The Boards of Trustees' Code of Conduct
- Code of Conduct for Principals as appropriate
- Teacher Registration provisions contained in the Education Act 1989
- The school's integration agreement in the case of integrated schools.

2. General

Appraisal has a wide range of benefits for teachers and schools leading ultimately to improvements in the delivery of quality education to pupils and enhancement in the quality of learning.

Appraisal of teachers is a developmental, supervisory and evaluative activity.

Appraisal is an integral part of the management and support of teachers and must not be treated as an isolated exercise.

Appraisal must be based on confidentiality. The integrity of the process is dependent upon appropriate policies which the parties have agreed upon.

3. The Purpose and Aims of Teacher Appraisal

The purpose and aims of appraisal should be clearly established with all parties involved. These should ensure that:

- the quality of education provided in the school is maintained and enhanced;
- individual teacher skills and performance are improved;
- accountability requirements are satisfied;
- professional development of teachers occurs;
- career planning is taken into consideration;
- inservice training and staff development is targetted to teacher need *and the needs of the school*;
- sound management practices are further enhanced and developed;
- necessary and appropriate information is available to those charged with personnel management decisions.

It should be noted that:

- Appraisal procedures may need to differ according to the different purposes of the appraisal;
- The procedures and practices adopted for one purpose may affect those developed for another purpose;
- Information gathered for one purpose may be less reliable and/or valid if it is available for use for another purpose;
- Appraisal procedures should not form any part of competency or disciplinary proceedings as set out in the relevant teachers collective (or individual) employment contract. *Boards and principals should refer to the relevant sections of these contracts where competency or discipline issues are causing concern.*

4. The Principles of Appraisal

The effective appraisal process *should*:

- produce as a consequence better learning outcomes for students;
- acknowledge and be consistent with the stated aims and goals of the school (and, in the case of integrated schools, the Special Character as defined in the integration agreement);
- occur on a regular ongoing basis to an agreed timeline;
- be based on a negotiated and agreed process;
- arise out of the tasks that a teacher is engaged in;
- be based on job descriptions *and* performance agreements;
- be performance based;
- be a clear and open process, operated with professionalism;
- apply fairly and equitably to all teachers within a school;
- report on the achievement or otherwise of mutually agreed specific goals and identify matters related to the achievement or non-achievement of these goals;
- be aware of the different needs of teachers (e.g. EEO designated groups);
- take place within the context of the overall school/teacher development plan;
- identify individual development needs and establish goals for the next appraisal cycle;
- produce as an outcome an appropriate plan for on-going professional development;
- incorporate self appraisal;
- include a process of review if required.

5. Roles and Responsibilities

The board of trustees, principal and teachers each have a role in the appraisal process.

The role of the Board of Trustees

In light of sections 1 to 4 of this prescription, the board of trustees *with* the principal will *establish and monitor* a policy for the appraisal and development of teachers within a school.

The board of trustees will, *in terms of a specified policy*:

- *ensure the goals and objectives of the school are integrated with the performance appraisal and teacher development needs of individual staff (including for integrated schools the Special Character of the school as defined in the integration agreement);*
- *ensure that an appraisal process is implemented in the school;*
- *ensure that the details on any individual appraisal should remain confidential to the parties concerned;*
- *ensure that there is a professional appraisal of the teaching performance of the principal when applicable.*

The role of the Principal

The appraisal of teachers is the responsibility of the principal as the professional leader of the school. Where a principal is required to appraise performance or "attest" to the competent performance of a teacher the process should be carried out in terms of a specified policy.

The principal will, *in terms of the policy approved by the board*:

- *be responsible, as the professional leader of the school, for the management and conduct of the teacher appraisal process;*
- *develop in consultation with teachers effective and efficient principles and procedures by which an appraisal process can be put in place;*
- *be responsible for the development, implementation and monitoring of effective methods of teacher development based on the appraisal process (within allocated resources);*
- *delegate responsibility for appraisal as necessary and appropriate to those having oversight of teachers but recognise that final responsibility and confirmation of those appraisals remains with the principal;*

- communicate *progress and the outcomes* of the appraisal process to the Board of Trustees for accountability and management purposes;
- be responsible for ensuring individual performance agreements are developed with teachers.

The role of the Teacher

The appraisal of a teacher should focus clearly on the principles of appraisal and be based on an effective appraisal process in the interests of the teacher and the students of the school. The teacher may be expected to play a full and active role in the process.

The teacher will

- develop in consultation with the principal effective and efficient procedures by which *an* appraisal system can be put in place as it applies to the teacher concerned *consistent with* the policy developed for the school;
- *assist* in the process of developing individual performance agreements relating to teaching responsibilities;
- meet the professional obligations required to ensure the appraisal system operates within the policies and procedures agreed.

6. Other Matters

Appraisal of Principals

The appraisal of principals (other than teaching principals) is not the subject of this prescription. Principal performance, the appraisal of that performance by boards of trustees *and the appraisal process* are matters for inclusion in either the principal's individual employment contract, performance agreement, or both.

Teaching Principals:

The role of the teaching principal is complex combining as it does both teaching and management roles and will require a separate appraisal process to be *determined and agreed* between the board of trustees and the principal. A teaching principal should be appraised by two appraisers at least one of whom is a principal with a sound understanding of the *nature of a principalship* and who works in a situation similar to that of the teaching principal. *One of the appraiser role's may be undertaken by a board member.*

Itinerant Teachers:

The Board of Trustees who act in the employer role for any itinerant teacher shall be responsible for the appraisal process applying to such teachers. Special provision may need to be made. More than one appraiser may be involved by agreement. The board should ensure that at least one appraiser has professional experience relevant to the special nature of the itinerant teacher's work.

Relevance and Confidentiality:

The Board of Trustees' code of conduct states boards will "ensure strict confidentiality of papers and information related to the board's position as employer" (Charter Framework, January 1990, No 7, Pg 20).

Principals should ensure that any information provided to the board, as employer, relates to the matters covered in the appraisal process.

Information which does not relate to the professional responsibilities and performance of a teacher should not be sought or accepted by the board in respect of an appraisal.

Policies about the collection and storage of appraisal data and records should be jointly developed by parties to the appraisal process.

Issues of confidentiality and relevance must be addressed by such policies.

Complaints Procedures/Arbitration:

Policies and procedures should be developed to ensure any appraisal complaints or differences can be addressed.

Training:

Appraisal to be effective requires specialised skills and appropriate training may be required to ensure both the teacher being appraised and the appraisers have these skills. Where practicable a board of trustees should include such training in staff development plans, from existing resources, ideally for both parties in any appraisal process.

Further inquiries related to this prescription on Assessing the Performance of Teachers should be directed to the Group Manager, Policy, Ministry of Education, P O Box 1666, Wellington.

APPENDIX 4

Comments, concepts or terms referring to overseas programmes – made by Dr Lockwood Smith, in Opposition and as Minister of Education July 1989 – March 1992.

1 'core competencies'

... We will prescribe national standards in the essential subjects I call 'core competencies'. They are English, Mathematics and Science and Technology. They are the fundamental building blocks for learning. Competency must be achieved in them if equity is to be anything more than rhetoric, and if NZ is to compete in the international market place in the future ...

29 Jul 1989	NZ Education Board annual conference, Dunedin
24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham
30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
08 Mar 1990	Hutt Valley Principals Association, AGM, Naenae
22 Mar 1990	Waikato Social Studies Association AGM, Hamilton
05 May 1990	Canterbury Division Conference NZ National Party
06 May 1990	Independent Schools Association, Wanganui
07 May 1990	NZ Area Schools Association Annual Conference, Wellington
11 May 1990	School Trustees Association Inaugural Conference, Auckland
01 Jun 1990	North Taranaki Principals Association, New Plymouth
14 Jun 1990	West Auckland Principals Association, Henderson
23 Jun 1990	NZPTA, AGM, Auckland
25 Jun 1990	Marlborough Boys' College Education Forum, Blenheim
11 Jul 1990	NZPPTA Principals' Conference, New Plymouth
21 Jul 1990	National Party Dominion Conference, Wellington
21 Nov 1990	NZ Principals Federation, Wellington

2 'attainment targets or learning outcomes/objectives'

... In those three subject areas we will redefine the curriculum in terms of attainment targets. We will spell out the levels of achievement that we expect pupils to attain right the way through the compulsory education system...

... It is those attainment targets, or learning outcomes, that establish educational standards in our schools. Yet under Labour's charter those learning outcomes are left up to each individual school ...

29 Jul 1989	NZ Education Board Annual Conference, Dunedin
24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham
30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
08 Mar 1990	Hutt Valley Principals Association AGM, Naenae
04 Apr 1990	NZ Educational Administration Society, Parliament Buildings
06 May 1990	Independent Schools Association, Wanganui
07 May 1990	NZ Area Schools Association Annual Conference, Wellington
11 May 1990	School Trustees Association Inaugural Conference, Auckland
01 Jun 1990	North Taranaki Principals Association, New Plymouth
14 Jun 1990	West Auckland Principals Association, Henderson
23 Jun 1990	NZPTA AGM, Auckland
25 Jun 1990	Marlborough Boys' College Education Forum, Blenheim
11 Jul 1990	NZPPTA Principals' Conference, New Plymouth
06 Sep 1990	NZCER Conference, Wellington
03 Aug 1991	National Party Annual Conference, Christchurch

3 'core curriculum', 'assessment procedures'

... When the Picot taskforce called for greater autonomy for individual schools the vital issue of the core curriculum and assessment procedures clearly required addressing – yet it hadn't been . I immediately saw this gap in the Picot proposals and responded to it, proposing a new approach to the core curriculum and new nationwide assessment procedures to ensure that national standards were maintained ...

29 Jul 1989	NZ Education Board Annual Conference, Dunedin
24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham
30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
08 Mar 1990	Hutt Valley Principals Association AGM, Naenae
06 May 1990	Independent Schools Association, Wanganui
07 May 1990	NZ Area Schools Association Annual Conference, Wellington
11 May 1990	School Trustees Association Inaugural Conference, Auckland
23 Jun 1990	NZPTA, Auckland
25 Jun 1990	Marlborough Boys' College Education Forum, Blenheim
11 Jul 1990	NZPPTA Principals' Conference, New Plymouth
06 Sep 1990	NZCER Conference, Wellington
29 Jun 1991	Northland Province Of Federated Farmers and Northland School Trustees Association Educational Excellence Forum, Whangarei
15 Jul 1991	NZPPTA Principals' Conference, Dunedin
03 Aug 1991	National Party Annual Conference, Christchurch
12 Feb 1992	Education For Enterprise Conference

4 'National Achievement Initiative'

... The National Achievement Initiative will have three components. The first is to redefine the curriculum for English, Mathematics and Science, right the way through the core school system from J1 to Form 5, in terms of attainment targets. They are the objectives of levels of achievement that we are seeking to reach ... The second component is a new criterion referenced assessment system to monitor pupils' achievement at appropriate times in relation to those objectives, or assessment targets ... The third component of that policy is enhanced teaching for pupils that are failing to reach the levels of attainment they must if they are to have any chance of understanding the next level of teaching ...

29 Jul 1989	NZ Education Board Annual Conference, Dunedin
24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham

'achievement initiative'

... I am putting together a policy I am calling National's 'Achievement Initiative' ...

30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
08 Mar 1990	Hutt Valley Principals Association Agm, Naenae
05 May 1990	Canterbury Division Conference NZ National Party
06 May 1990	Independent Schools Association, Wanganui
07 May 1990	NZ Area Schools Association Annual Conference, Wellington
11 May 1990	School Trustees Association Inaugural Conference, Auckland
01 Jun 1990	North Taranaki Principals Association, New Plymouth
14 Jun 1990	West Auckland Principals Association, Henderson
23 Jun 1990	NZPTA AGM, Auckland
25 Jun 1990	Marlborough Boys' College Education Forum, Blenheim
11 Jul 1990	NZPPTA Principals' Conference, New Plymouth
21 Jul 1990	National Party Dominion Conference, Wellington
26 Jul 1990	Regional Transition Association, Foxton
23 Aug 1990	NZPPTA 1990 Annual Conference, Wellington
31 Aug 1990	2nd NZ Conference On Research Into Educational Policy, Wellington
06 Sep 1990	NZCER Conference, Wellington
19 Sep 1990	Association Of REAC Councils Conference, Wellington
21 Nov 1990	NZ Principals Federation, Wellington
17 May 1991	School Trustees Association Annual Conference, Nelson
25 May 1991	Auckland Divisional Conference NZ National Party, Whangarei
29 May 1991	First Seminar On Developing NZ's Human Resource Potential, Wellington
28 Jun 1991	NZCER Self Managing Schools Conference, Wellington
29 Jun 1991	Northland Province Of Federated Farmers and Northland School Trustees Association Educational Excellence Forum, Whangarei
15 Jul 1991	NZPPTA Principals' Conference, Dunedin
03 Aug 1991	National Party Annual Conference, Christchurch
12 Feb 1992	Education For Enterprise Conference
03 Mar 1992	State Of The Nation's Education, Taihape

5 'Harvard University Study, USA'

... Thirteen years of research at Harvard University has shown that by the age of 3 most children have the potential to understand 1,000 words, most of the language they will commonly use for the rest of their lives. The skills which a child will use in much of its future learning are also being established by age 3. ... If we're really to break that cycle of failure that so deprives many families from poor socio-economic backgrounds, we've got to address those vital first 3 years and the parenting environment ...

24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham
30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
03 May 1990	Canterbury Institute Of Education Research, Christchurch
05 May 1990	Canterbury Division Conference NZ National Party
06 May 1990	Independent Schools Association, Wanganui
07 May 1990	NZ Area Schools Association Annual Conference, Wellington
11 May 1990	School Trustees Association Inaugural Conference, Auckland
11 May 1990	NZ Playcentre Federation, Auckland
01 Jun 1990	North Taranaki Principals Association, New Plymouth
14 Jun 1990	West Auckland Principals Association, Henderson
23 Jun 1990	NZPTA AGM, Auckland
23 Jun 1990	NZ Free Kindergarten Union AGM, Porirua
21 Jul 1990	National Party Dominion Conference, Wellington
28 Aug 1990	NZEI 107th Annual Conference, Wellington
31 Aug 1990	2nd NZ Conference On Research Into Educational Policy, Wellington
21 Nov 1990	NZ Principals Federation, Wellington
17 May 1991	School Trustees Association Annual Conference, Nelson
25 May 1991	Auckland Divisional Conference National Party, Whangarei
03 Aug 1991	National Party Annual Conference, Christchurch

6 'Missouri Study', USA.

... My 'Parents as First Teachers' initiative is based on impressive research in the state of Missouri in America ... There a 4 year pilot study involved 380 families who were about to have their first child and who represented a cross section of socio-economic status, age and family configurations ... The programme involved trained parent educators visiting the parents' home and working with the parent, or parents and the child ...

24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham
30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
03 May 1990	Canterbury Institute Of Education research, Christchurch
05 May 1990	Canterbury Division Conference NZ National Party
11 May 1990	NZ Playcentre Federation, Auckland
23 Jun 1990	NZ Free Kindergarten Union AGM, Porirua
11 Jul 1990	NZPPTA Principals' conference, New Plymouth
21 Jul 1990	National Party Dominion Conference, Wellington
28 Aug 1990	NZEI 107th Annual Conference, Wellington
31 Aug 1990	2nd NZ Conference On Research Into Educational Policy, Wellington

... So you can see the PARENTS AS FIRST TEACHERS policy that Mr Bolger described to you is not some half baked system found overseas - we've had too much of that sort of thing in our New Zealand education system already - but it is based on extremely sound research and its development in NZ will be carefully researched ...

03 May 1990	Canterbury Institute Of Educational Research, Christchurch
-------------	--

7 'Lancaster University Study, The School Effect'

... research at Lancaster University in Britain involving 3,000 pupils in 20 secondary schools between 1981 and 1986, has shown that individual schools had a profound effect on the educational achievement of pupils ... The researchers used statistical methods that took into account the levels of attainment and social background of children entering the secondary schools and they concluded that achievement differed radically between the schools ...

... The report entitled 'The School Effect' showed that radically higher levels of achievement in some of the 18 schools in the study could not be explained by pupils' backgrounds, attitudes of parents or previous education ... In that study by Smith and Tomlinson, 2,426 pupils of all racial

groups were monitored from the age of 11 through to 16. The results showed that the most effective schools concentrated on the traditional ways of improving overall standards, emphasising basic literacy and arithmetic skills ...

24 Aug 1989	NZPPTA Conference, Trentham
02 May 1990	Hawkes Bay Combined Teachers Association, Tamatea
03 May 1990	Canterbury Institute Of Educational Research, Christchurch
05 May 1990	Canterbury Division Conference NZ National Party
06 May 1990	Independent Schools Association, Wanganui
23 Aug 1990	NZPPTA 1990 Annual Conference, Wellington
31 Aug 1990	2nd NZ Conference On Research Into Educational Policy, Wellington
06 Sep 1990	NZCER Conference, Wellington

... They go on to recommend that the ERO should monitor overseas and local investigations into ways of measuring the effectiveness of schools ... There is increasing evidence that this is an inadequate recommendation. The work of Lauder and Hughes here in New Zealand and Smith and Tomlinson in Britain shows massive differences between the attainments of students in different secondary school, seven when those attainments, are corrected through regression analysis, for intake characteristics, such as social class and measured ability ... The New Zealand and British work, however, appears to be at odds in terms of the impact of social mix ...

06 Sep 1990 NZCER Conference, Wellington

8 Israeli Study

... Since my having been to Missouri to study their 'Parents as Teachers' work, I have become aware that Israel piloted a similar concept in 1969. Results were so impressive in helping children in areas with low educational expectations that in 1975 the National Council of Jewish Women Sponsored Program was fully adopted by the Israeli Ministry of Education and Culture ... it was observed that Israeli children from a western background were markedly more successful in school than were children from an Eastern background ... It was believed that part of the discrepancy between the two groups lay in the fact that the middle eastern North African parents believed that a child learnt by itself. And so they saw no need to explain or discuss with their child the world around them ... the Home Instruction Programme for pre-school youngsters was implemented. It involved encouraging parents to interact much more with their children to focus on language development, discrimination skills and problem solving ...

... The programme was developed because of concern that children from families of North African cultural descent were performing badly, compared with children of European descent, in their westernised school system. The parallels with Maori under-achievement in our New Zealand schools are obvious ... The HIPPI programme has succeeded in radically reducing the difference in levels of achievement between those two cultural groups in their schools ...

30 Aug 1989	NZEI 106th Annual Conference, Wellington
23 Jun 1990	NZ Free Kindergarten Union Agm, Porirua
21 Jul 1990	National Party Dominion Conference, Wellington
28 Aug 1990	NZEI 107th Annual Conference, Wellington
31 Aug 1990	2nd NZ Conference On Research Into Educational Policy, Wellington

9 'the IEA international survey 1981'

... The IEA. International Survey in 1981 showed that NZ third formers were performing badly by world standards in Mathematics. Sure, our Form 7 pupils did much better but then, we have far fewer of the cohort still studying mathematics at that level ... As we have to compete internationally in an increasingly technological world, our poor performance in mathematics helps us neither as individuals nor as a nation ...

29 Oct 1989 NZ Teachers Colleges Association AGM, Wellington

10 'the international marketplace'

... Our education system must face up to the realities and requirements of the international marketplace. That means the engine room of our education system, the training of our teachers, must be attuned to the competitiveness and realities of that international marketplace ... You see, the wider world doesn't reward sympathetic and generous attitudes in people. When it comes to earning a living in the international marketplace, it's not the most sympathetic and generous that succeed, it's the most competitively successful ...

29 Oct 1989	NZ Teachers Colleges Association AGM, Wellington
08 Mar 1990	Hutt Valley Principals Association AGM, Naenae
22 Mar 1990	Waikato Social Studies Association AGM, Hamilton
19 Apr 1990	Wellington Area Social Studies Association, Thorndon
26 May 1990	Aotearoa Polytechnic Students Union National Conference, Auckland
06 Jul 1990	Waikato Polytechnic Major Staff Development Seminar, Hamilton
06 Sep 1990	NZCER Conference, Wellington
21 Nov 1990	NZ Principals Federation, Wellington
17 May 1991	School Trustees Association Annual Conference, Nelson
25 May 1991	Auckland Divisional Conference National Party, Whangarei
29 May 1991	First Seminar On 'Developing NZ's Human Resource Potential', Wellington

11 General International Comparisons

... While in literacy, New Zealand compares well with the western world, complacency would be dangerous. There is some evidence that standards of achievement in Literacy in Western countries have declined significantly in the last 20 years ... In Arithmetic available evidence indicates that New Zealand school pupils fall way behind such countries as Japan and Germany, even Britain. That is of major concern as poor numeracy skills are such a handicap in the development of science and technology. It's not surprising therefore that New Zealand seems to be even weaker in Science ...

08 Mar 1990 Hutt Valley Principals Association AGM, Naenae

... In New Zealand we rather pride ourselves on our teaching of reading. Yet, it's interesting to observe that an educational list from the United Kingdom the Director of the Education Unit of the Institute of Economic Affairs and Special Education Adviser to two former Secretaries of State for Education in the United Kingdom was brought to NZ last year to examine our system ... He made the comment in his report that he found an unjustifiable complacency in the standards of literacy achieved in our schools ...

03 May 1990 Canterbury Institute Of Educational Research, Christchurch

... Unless things are turned around, we risk losing that race. In countries like Switzerland, Denmark and Austria, less than 10% of their school leavers don't go on to further formal education. In New Zealand, the comparative figure is 60% ...

06 May 1990 Independent Schools Association, Wanganui

... In 1984, 60% of NZ school leavers did not continue on in formal education. At the same time, in countries like Switzerland, Denmark and Austria the equivalent figure was just over 6% ... Little wonder that New Zealand's 17 and 18 year old lag behind all but one of 19 OECD nations in terms of their continuing involvement in formal education ...

17 May 1990	Technical Institutes Allied Staff Association Annual Conference, Dunedin
29 Jun 1991	Northland Province Of Federated Farmers And Northland School Trustees Association Educational Excellence Forum, Whangarei

... While things have improved in recent years by 1988, for 17 and 18 year olds in education or training, the Kiwi was ahead only of Turkey among all the OECD nations ...

... We can't tell the world to stop, that we want to get off. If we don't gear up to help our young people to compete with their peers from other countries, they will surely not enjoy the same standards of living we have enjoyed ...

26 Jul 1990	Regional Transition Association, Foxton
19 Sep 1990	Association Of REAC Councils Conference, Wellington

... What these proponents of a separate system have to understand is that we do not have a pakeha system ... We have an international education system – a system that works well and has been embraced by many other races and cultures. Embraced by countries cultures as diverse as China, Taiwan and Japan. Embraced because they realise an international system is the road to success in the modern, internationally competitive world ...

11 Jul 1990 NZPPTA Principals' Conference, New Plymouth

... where is the equity for our youngsters if they have to compete in the future against children elsewhere in the world, for their standard of living, when businesses are pouring millions of dollars into schools elsewhere to provide extra teachers and equipment, while we here in New Zealand say oh no, the state must do it. That kind of equity won't give our young people much of a future ...

23 Aug 1990 NZPPTA 1990 Annual Conference, Wellington

... In the face of this superficial evidence of a major literacy problem in our education system, educationalists cite more formal studies, such as the surveys of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement which show standards of literacy in New Zealand to compare most favourably with other countries in the western world ... That, of course, begs the question – what has happened to standards of literacy in the western world in the past two decades? ... There is concern that those standards have declined ...

31 Aug 1990 2nd NZ Conference On Research Into Educational Policy, Wellington
06 Sept 1990 NZCER Conference, Wellington

... Increasingly, countries are coming to understand the vital importance of education to their economy and their future standards of living ... Multi-national companies now consider education and skills levels in countries before making investments there. In that context, it's sobering to learn that in special study programmes at Harvard University, programmes for the Chief Executives of multi-nationals, New Zealand's education system is held up as an example of one of the worst in the developed world, competing for that status along with America's.

19 Sep 1990 Association Of REAC Councils Conference, Wellington

... Despite improved retention rates in senior secondary school, the numbers of NZ students leaving school without adequate qualifications are disturbingly high by comparison with other OECD countries, even Australia ... Officers of the Ministry of Education have invested considerable amounts of time and energy into this investigation, looking at overseas experiences, and exploring the literature on the concept of self management of schools ...

17 May 1991 School Trustees Association Annual Conference, Nelson

... What you can see, however, is that the national monitoring proposed in New Zealand is rather different from the national testing programme in England.

15 Jul 1991 NZPPTA Principals' Conference, Dunedin

... It is worth reflecting on the economic growth and improved standard of living of the Japanese since the devastation of 1945 ... They have few natural resources beyond the skills of their people and their determination to be more clever than anyone else. Yet they have harnessed those human resources through their colossal commitment to education ... It should be no surprise, therefore, that our education system has mimicked our economy. It has lacked enterprise and hasn't provided the best for New Zealanders ...

03 Aug 1991 National Party Annual Conference, Christchurch

... If you look at NZ's investment in science and technology you can see that NZ's investment compared with other countries as a proportion of GDP is only 0.95 compared with, say, West Germany on 2.88 and Japan right at the top of the list. But more revealing : look at the share of that which is private investment in research and development ... New Zealand comes right down at the bottom of that list with only 22.3% of the investment actually from private enterprise, the rest being Government investment. We trail the list. Now, as I say, young people make rational decisions individually. I put the challenge back to industry because we must demonstrate the opportunities in this area if students are to want to continue to study in this area. And it is vital as they must ... Our education system in the Western world was really set up to serve the needs of the industrial revolution and as the communications and computer industries move rapidly together we need an education system that can serve the needs of the information revolution ...

... I quote again, this time from a November edition of Education: 'A country which boasts a staying on rate after compulsory education of 90% might appear sufficiently Utopian by our standards to afford to rest on its laurels. Not so. Both Denmark and Sweden are in the throes of major re-organisation in vocational education and training. While Sweden has 0.5% of the world's population, it has 1% of its manufacturing production and 2% of its manufactured exports. It is this consciousness of the need to stay abreast of international technology which drives the current range of (business) partnership activities in both Denmark and Sweden ...

03 Mar 1992 *State of the Nation's Education, Taihape*

12 'articled teachers or graduate teacher trainee scheme'

... I am exploring the concept of a new concept in secondary teacher training, articled teachers. Such a teacher would be a University graduate, enrolled in a Teachers' college, but instead of spending the bulk of their time at teachers' college and a small part of it in a school, the student would spend the bulk of their time in a school as an articled teacher under an approved lead teacher ...

... a new 'Graduate Teacher Trainee Scheme', which will permit University graduates without teaching qualifications to train under the direction of approved lead teachers in schools ...

29 Oct 1989	<i>NZ Teachers Colleges Association Agm, Wellington</i>
05 May 1990	<i>Canterbury Division Conference NZ National Party</i>
11 May 1990	<i>School Trustees Association Inaugural Conference, Auckland</i>
01 Jun 1990	<i>North Taranaki Principals Association, New Plymouth</i>
14 Jun 1990	<i>West Auckland Principals Association, Henderson</i>
23 Jun 1990	<i>NZPTA AGM, Auckland</i>
25 Jun 1990	<i>Marlborough Boys' College Education Forum, Blenheim</i>
11 Jul 1990	<i>NZPPTA Principals' Conference, New Plymouth</i>

13 Head Start, USA

... Both the Harvard research and the Missouri trial work show the vital importance of parental involvement. One of the reasons why it is believed that the very expensive 'Head Start' programme wasn't as successful as was hoped in America, was that it didn't involve parents. The disadvantaged pupils in the programme went home to the same disadvantaged home environment in the evening and much of the good work was undone.

03 May 1990 *Canterbury Institute Of Educational Research, Christchurch*

... Interestingly, from a different body of research, Dr Edward Ziglerone of the founding fathers of Head Start in America, reached similar conclusions. He is quoted in the book 'The Hot House People' as saying 'My own reading of Head Start experiments is that we must change an entire family system so that it is a better background for the development of the child' ...

31 Aug 1990 *2nd NZ Conference On Research into Educational Policy, Wellington*

14 'accountability'

... The national Government agreed reform was needed. We agreed with the findings of the Picot team – that our education system was too inefficient, cumbersome and lacking in accountability ...

17 May 1991 *School Trustees Association Annual Conference, Nelson*

... So let me summarise the Government's view as we enter the wage round ... This will lead to greater accountability of education institutions to their users and to the Government ...

12 Mar 1992 *Meeting with Education Sector Employers*

15 'the competitive advantage of nations, Professor Michael Porter, Harvard University,
USA

... The Porter project, co-ordinated by Professor Michael Porter of Harvard University, has identified a 'desperate weakness' in our human resource as a barrier to our improved productivity and economic performance. He said our schools were turning out skills in no way relevant to industry and students with no motivation to finish their education. 'The human resource base' he said 'needs fundamental recharging and education objectives must be redefined. You have developed the attitude that competition at school is socially bad' ...

... The Porter project cited statistics that showed that on average young New Zealanders spent much less time in formal education than is common in most industrialised nations ... The project concluded that 'in a global economy where high standards are increasingly a function of the levels of education and training in the workforce, these statistics provide cause for grave concern' ... Little wonder the Porter project questioned the very relevance of our school curriculum ...

... as is evident from the work of the Porter project, merely increasing the participation levels of New Zealanders in the tertiary sector is not sufficient ... the Porter team have also identified the need to address a range of other issues ... These include New Zealand's labour relations, the curricula, industry training and the focus and structure of the education system itself ...

... The quality of human resources must be steadily rising if a nation's economy is to upgrade. Not only does achieving higher standards require more skilled managers and employees, but improving human resources in other nations sets a rising standard even to maintain current competitive positions ...

17 May 1991	<i>School Trustees Association Annual Conference, Nelson</i>
25 May 1991	<i>Auckland Divisional Conference NZ National Party, Whangarei</i>
29 May 1991	<i>First Seminar On 'Developing NZ's Human Resource Potential', Wellington</i>
29 Jun 1991	<i>Northland Province Of Federated Farmers And Northland School Trustees Association Educational Excellence Forum, Whangarei</i>
12 Feb 1992	<i>Education For Enterprise Conference</i>
03 Mar 1992	<i>State Of The Nation's Education, Taihape</i>

18 Alberta Report, Canada 1991

... Movement towards self management of schools is not solely a New Zealand phenomenon. In the journal 'Canadian Administrator' of March 1991, Holdaway and Ratsoy of the University of Alberta report on the major types of changes affecting the management of schools and the principals of those schools ... identified and described increased autonomy for schools in Britain, New Zealand, Australia, the USA and Canada ... Nothing in the reviews convinced me that New Zealand was different from Canada, that the published findings ... this year, were wrong in asserting the quality of teaching and learning could be enhanced through schools having more direct control over vital resources.

28 Jun 1991	<i>NZCER Self Managing Schools Conference, Wellington</i>
29 Jun 1991	<i>Northland Province Of Federated Farmers And Northland School Trustees Association Educational Excellence Forum, Whangarei</i>
15 Jul 1991	<i>NZPPTA Principals' Conference, Dunedin</i>

APPENDIX 5

Recorded from a telephone conversation with Beryl Bright, the Minister of Education's senior private secretary, 22 October 1993.

Beryl Bright, the Minister of Education's senior private secretary, advised me that Dr Lockwood Smith spent one week in England and Scotland in 1991. He met with Ministers, officials, academics and visited a bulk-funded school during this time. The Minister's investigations were wide-ranging but focused on curriculum and assessment. The Minister discussed the implementation of education policies, looking at where things went wrong and what to avoid.

In August 1992 the Minister also gave a paper at an education conference held by the Asia Pacific Economic Council in Washington.

The Minister is a member of the Australian Education Council which holds two conferences a year. The Minister has managed to attend two in Australia and one that was held in New Zealand.

Similarly the Minister has had the opportunity to meet with British visitors in New Zealand. The most notable of the politicians have been: Kenneth Baker, Secretary for State in England and Wales visited in 1991, Eric Forth, an Associate Education Minister in 1993. The Minister has also met with visiting academics and researchers such as Professor Paul Black (chair of the TGAT committee and once a member of the Schools Examination Advisory Council); visiting LEA officers Glenys Andrews and Mike Shenstone; two HMIs investigating reading recovery; Ruth Sutton (education consultant on assessment). On other occasions he met with Duncan Graham (chair of the NCC) and Philip Halsey (chair of SEAC).

Whilst in opposition the Minister did a great deal of reading and formed his opinion that the first three years of a child's life was the most vital. At this time he was in the States and had the opportunity to see a Missouri programme *Parents as Teachers* in action from which the New Zealand programme *Parents as First Teachers* was derived.

Beryl Bright indicated that it was equally true that people from overseas learned from New Zealand and recognised our excellent record in education, for example, reading recovery.