Chapter 9
Case Study School 4

Introduction
Case Study School 4 was the only school that had an established evaluation scheme oriented to other than promotion exclusively. It provided a valuable comparison to the other case study schools and the wider statistical survey. Although it was not possible to hold focus group discussions with the students, the response of fifteen staff members to the survey presented a good cross section of teacher responses. An additional benefit was that this school reviewed its evaluation system, and reissued new instructions during the period of the research, providing for a comparison of old and new documentation. To maintain consistency, the former procedures are retained in this chapter contiguous to the teacher surveys, since it is that to which teachers were responding. The prospects for change are then examined in the newer documentation that was to be phased in during 2005.

Teacher Surveys
Teacher 4A – Mixed feelings
Teacher 4A was a permanent part time female classroom teacher in her early fifties who had been teaching for 21-25 years, 11-15 of those at this school. She had completed no post-graduate learning.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation
This teacher had frequently experienced formal evaluation, both in her current school and in other career situations, including in the year of the survey. Her evaluations had been for teaching practice and for her advancement to Advanced Skills Teacher (AST1) status at her previous school. She had received training in evaluative techniques and procedures, but had been unable to attend specific professional development on the evaluation process because she ‘was absent that particular day caring for a sick child.’

Inputs to Evaluation
The inputs to the evaluation consisted of self and student evaluation questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation. However, none of the Danielson (1996) list was indicated as mandated, raising some doubts as to the content of the inputs.
Management of Evaluation
Teacher 4A was generally positive about evaluation in her school. She expressed a high level of confidence in the teaching skills of her evaluator, and felt that the inputs were reconciled to ensure consistency, and were reported accurately. Personality issues did not intrude, and the evaluation covered the full range of her pedagogy. This teacher strongly denied that evaluation was used as a compliance tool. It positively affected both individual and collective teaching practices in the school, positively supported school objectives, and made her feel part of a professional community. The process was open to staff input, and had been reviewed for effectiveness and equity. Evaluation benefited the whole school community, changed teaching practices for the better, enhanced professionalism and collegiality, and was a valuable conduit for teacher professional communication about their work and aspirations.

However, this teacher expressed some uncertainty as well. She lacked complete trust in the evaluation process, and felt that the procedures for redress were unclear. The evaluation process reinforced hierarchical power relationships by judging employees and their personalities in the fulfilment of a bureaucratic function that was owned by the administration alone. Evaluation had little effect on the enhancement of student outcomes.

Individual Responses to Evaluation
Teacher 4A’s emotional responses to evaluation were concern, fear, bewilderment, apathy, and ambivalence. She strongly denied any anger feelings. Following the evaluation, she felt renewed and positive, personally reflected on her practice, reviewed any shortfalls, and set goals for the future. She strongly denied trying to forget it until next time, or trying to change how she taught to please her supervisor.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
This teacher had completed three days of school/department sponsored professional development. The self-initiated column was marked as ten days, but this was annotated ‘school trip’. If this figure of professional development credits represents the school trip exclusively, then Teacher 4 might have undertaken no self-initiated learning directly related to her pedagogy.

Teacher 4A was very positive about professional development. She strongly supported it as an opportunity to enhance her skills, and accepted ownership of it as an invigorating element of...
modern teaching practice. At the same time, she admitted that she had no specific opinion on the matter, but sought effective opportunities to improve her teaching. Professional development objectives were set by the school, and these were refined further by the faculty and the individual. Objectives were reconciled to ensure consistence and economy, and individual objectives were reviewed and approved by the professional development officer. Thereafter Teacher 4A made her selections based on the amount of money available, the interesting options that came up each year, and finding something that was likely to be fun. She strongly denied seeking to miss classes, doing only what she was told, or avoiding the use of personal time.

**Professional Development Outcomes**

Professional development had improved Teacher 4A’s pedagogy in all of the proposed areas. These were validated to the school through a short note on the professional development form, as well as a verbal report to the faculty. In addition, this teacher’s supervisor discussed the activities to see that they met her needs. However, there was no further follow up by the professional development officer or the school to determine the impact of her learning on her teaching or student outcomes. Teacher 4A noted that her evaluations failed to examine the impact of her learning, and she was left feeling that her professional development occurred in isolation so that it contributed neither to organisational objectives or educational change. Despite this shortfall, this teacher continued to feel that professional development made her part of a learning community on a journey of lifelong learning.

**School Professional Development Practices**

Teacher 4A considered professional development in her school was efficient and responsive, well managed and dynamic, with an appropriate mix of training that met all of her needs and made her feel part of a process of constantly developing teaching practice. Despite her having noted that the evaluations failed to examine the impact of her professional development on teaching, this teacher still considered it to be clearly connected to the evaluation system.

Professional development in this school covered all of the forms proposed in the survey, including internal mentoring and opportunities for reflection. Whilst whole school events were generally stimulating and well developed, they remained fanfare occasions with few concrete outcomes. They were not something that took this teacher away from more important class teaching, but, equally, they were not seen as opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion. Notably, Teacher 4A responded in the negative to the proposal that whole school professional
development was regularly conducted and a major force for change, but underlined the *major force for change* phrase.

**School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations**

This teacher saw her school as encouraging teachers to demonstrate their worth in different ways, and actively mobilised them as agents of change in a collaborative culture without cliques that strongly encouraged cross-grade and cross-curricular dialogue. Whilst the school appreciated the positive aspects of older teaching styles as well as new, it neither analysed nor modelled good teaching practice and did not encourage parental feedback on teaching styles.

As an individual, Teacher 4A had high personal expectations, strongly enjoyed being with the students, and worked to understand them rather than just transmit content. She was supportive of change, which she always tried to embrace to enhance education, and was always trying new approaches. In her aspirations, this teacher wanted to increase open dialogue with colleagues to the extent that she could acknowledge mistakes and seek assistance in overcoming them. Teacher 4A wanted formative evaluation of her pedagogy to be separated from institutional assessment, and for professional development to be more responsive to her individual needs. She also was keen to feel less isolated, and for both the positive and negatives in her teaching to be the subject of open and frank discussion and acknowledgement.

**Comments on Teacher 4A**

Teacher 4A’s mixed feelings appeared to cover both the evaluation and professional development areas because neither seem to be directed to meeting her particular classroom teaching needs. She acknowledged the positive value of an evaluation process, but felt suspicious and constrained by the lack of ownership that made her feel defensive and suspicious, and thus unable to derive real benefit in her teaching. Similarly, whilst there were many positives in the professional development process in her school, she did not feel that it followed through to the extent where it impacted on her classroom teaching. This teacher appeared to perceive that conduct of the professional development itself had become the endpoint rather than the classroom, so she remained professionally unfulfilled. Teacher 4A saw her school as unable to effectively analyse or reward good teaching practice, because neither the evaluation nor the professional development met the real needs of teachers or students. Nonetheless, she retained some positive attitudes to both the school and her needs as an individual professional. As an individual, Teacher 4A appeared to be both sufficiently positive and committed as to embark on a reflective evaluation process, but only if supported, and if it
overcame the shortfalls she has identified in the present system. This is revealed in her additional comments:

A very detailed and thought-provoking survey. I found some parts very difficulty to answer, as my response fell in between categories, or in the “generally agree” area. This survey would be useful as the starting point for a whole staff discussion of both PD & evaluation procedures.

**Teacher 4B – Evaluation is superficial**

Teacher 4B was a permanent part time female AST1 equivalent who filled a leadership position. She was in her early thirties and had been teaching 11-15 years, 6-10 of them at this school. She had undertaken no post-graduate learning.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

This teacher had experienced evaluation frequently, for teaching practice, altered responsibilities, and the achievement of Advanced Skills Teacher (AST1) equivalent. She had been evaluated in the past four years, although not the year of the survey. She had received professional development on the evaluation process, had acted as an evaluator, and claimed a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

The inputs to Teacher 4B’s evaluation consisted of self-evaluation questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation. Student evaluation questionnaires were not included. This teacher identified most of the Danielson (1996) list as being mandated for coverage, exceptions being knowledge of resources, organisation of physical space, maintenance of records, and communication with families.

**Management of Evaluation**

Teacher 4B had a very high level of confidence in her evaluator, whom she felt was as good a teacher as herself. The evaluator was well trained to conduct the process, and personality issues did not intrude. The full range of pedagogy was covered, and inputs were reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective. Whilst Teacher 4B saw the procedures for redress as clear and unambiguous, she failed to answer the question on complete trust in the evaluation process.

More than anything else, Teacher 4B saw evaluation as the fulfilment of a school bureaucratic function. Whilst it had been reviewed for effectiveness, was open to staff input, and positively
supported school objectives, evaluation had little effect on student outcomes and was owned by the administration. Evaluation was not a tool for enforcing compliance or power relationships, and judged the skills of professionals, rather than the personalities of employees. Nonetheless, it also failed to enhance teaching practices, and did not make this teacher feel a part of the school as a professional community.

Evaluation benefited the whole school community, and did not reinforce the hierarchy or gender imbalances. Enhancement of teachers’ individual pedagogy and teaching practices were agreed to, but both of these responses were annotated as ‘weak’. Teacher 4B did not see evaluation as beneficial to defining or communicating her career needs, and it failed to enhance the professionalism of the school or her commitment to the organisation.

Individual Responses to Evaluation
Teacher 4B’s emotional response to evaluation was confidence and concern, balanced by defensiveness, resentfulness, and fear. She strongly denied suspicion and apathy, but enthusiasm also figured as a strong negative. After the evaluation, Teacher 4B felt renewed and positive. She personally reflected on her practice, set goals, discussed her training needs with the professional development officer, and enthusiastically pursued promotion opportunities. However, as with her emotional response, this teacher also complained to her peers and strongly remembered the negatives. What she failed to experience was increased commitment to the school’s objectives, or motivation to work harder to get a better report.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
This teacher had completed three days each of school/department sponsored and individual professional development. She had a welcoming attitude to professional development as an invigorating aspect of modern teaching practice, but admitted that it was still a good chance to get a break from class. Professional development objectives were set for the staff each year in accordance with school aims, and she also set her own objectives based on individual need, although this was without consultation with her supervisor. The various objectives were not reconciled within the school to ensure economy and consistency, and her individual objectives were not subjected to any review by the professional development officer. Whilst her supervisor provided some advice, Teacher 4B’s professional development selections were based on the availability of funds, the range of interesting options available, and finding something that was likely to be fun. Nonetheless, this teacher strongly denied seeking to miss as many classes as possible.
Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 4B’s professional development in the past year had improved only her professional knowledge of subject area, and her personal communication skills. These activities were validated by a short note on the professional development form and a verbal report. Whilst her supervisor checked to determine that the learning had met her needs, the school failed to follow up on the impact of the professional development on her teaching or on student learning. However, her evaluations analysed the effect of the professional development on her pedagogy, so that professional development represented more than just a heading on the evaluation form. Teacher 4B did not see professional development as an isolated and uncoordinated activity, but rather as something that contributed to meeting school goals, and made her feel a professional member of a learning community.

School Professional Development Practices

This teacher strongly denied that professional development was a token gesture. She saw it as very efficient and responsive, well managed and dynamic, and directed to enhancing the pedagogical needs of teachers through an appropriate mix of activities. Although professional development made her feel a lifelong learner who was constantly developing her practice, and it was clearly connected to the evaluation system, Teacher 4B expressed some doubt about that connection being sufficiently strong as to help her determine her individual professional progress.

Professional development in this school consisted of a broad range of activities, including workshops, seminars, attendance at outside courses, and mentoring. However, there were no opportunities for reflection on pedagogy. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, was stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change. However, whole school events took her away from the real work of teaching ‘a bit’!

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 4B was powerfully supportive of her school, strongly agreeing that it was collaborative and supportive of different teaching styles in an open atmosphere of change. Contrary to Teacher 4A, she considered that the school regularly analysed good teaching practice and rewarded it regardless of seniority. Even parental feedback was encouraged, although this was ‘weak’. This teacher similarly had an exceptionally high opinion of her practice, strongly agreeing that she set high personal expectations and was reflective. She identified with the
students and worked to understand them, and openly discussed her teaching with her colleagues. She also agreed that she sought new approaches and attempted to embrace change, but noted that ‘It depends on the change!’

Teacher 4B’s professional aspirations were more illuminating in that she strongly sought more time to work collegially with colleagues, whilst also seeking for the positives and negatives in her teaching to be acknowledged. Interestingly, this teacher did not want to more openly discuss classroom teaching with her colleagues as ‘It’s already open!’ However, she did wish to feel less isolated in the classroom from her colleagues. Similarly, Teacher 4B neither wanted the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom needs, nor did she want formative evaluation of her teaching to be separated from institutional evaluation. In accordance with her previous support of change, this teacher also sought to feel that her teaching was developing with educational change, and sought to share more openly both her positive and negative experiences in the implementation of change.

Comments on Teacher 4B

If Teacher 4B identified evaluation in her school as an administration owned bureaucratic procedure that failed to penetrate her pedagogy, and if the professional development system did not evaluate her learning, one can question the source of her satisfaction with the extant system, where interesting and fun selections took precedence over personal review of her training requirements. It may well be that the superficial and ineffective evaluation, coupled with a less than perfect professional development system, feels safer than actual exposure of her teaching to colleagues. Perhaps Teacher 4B was isolated in reality, and felt more secure in maintaining a veneer of contrived collegiality where benefits to teaching practice are accepted as lesser outcomes of the evaluation and professional development systems. Her acknowledgement of the shortfalls of the appraisal process, and yet satisfaction with her evaluator, suggests that this teacher and the supervisor may have concluded an informal treaty which is mutually beneficial in meeting the bureaucratic demand and counteracting her negative emotions.

The outcome is that Teacher 4B seeks to feel less isolated and more open, but perhaps not to the extent where her pedagogy is truly revealed for discussion and remediation with her colleagues. Certainly, the lack of ownership of the current bureaucratic evaluation process does not appear to encourage Teacher 4B to engage in a more intimate and worthwhile reflective evaluation on her teaching practice and career, to the extent that her professional development selections would extend beyond individual enjoyment. Meanwhile, she seems satisfied with a
less than perfect professional development system that fails to verify her learning or its benefits for student outcomes. Ultimately, Teacher 4B is the subject of an accountability process that is not connected with enhancing pedagogy, and an inadequate professional development system that fails to penetrate to the classroom. Any moves towards reflective evaluation for this teacher would have to remediate her understanding of, and establish the connection between, both areas.

**Teacher 4C – Supportive of a flawed system**

Teacher 4C was a 41-45 year old part time female contract class room teacher who had been teaching for 6-10 years, 4-5 years of that time at this school. She had another Bachelor degree additional to her Bachelor of Education, but had completed no higher degree qualifications.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

This teacher had experienced evaluation frequently, for both promotion and teaching practice, including the year of this survey. She claimed to have a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school, but had received no professional development about the evaluation process. Teacher 4C had neither been trained in evaluation techniques, nor acted as an evaluator.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

Inputs to evaluation included most of the proposed list, with the only exception being the professional diary. The mandated elements of the evaluation in the Danielson (1996) list included knowledge of content and pedagogy, establishment of rapport and management of student behaviour, engagement of student learning, assessment of student learning and provision of feedback, professional development, and self-reflection on teaching. However, it omitted design of coherent instruction, knowledge of resources, selection of instructional goals, the maintenance of records, organisation of physical space, and communication with families.

**Management of Evaluation**

Teacher 4C demonstrated a high level of confidence in the evaluation process, accepting that her evaluator was trained, as good a teacher as herself, and that personality issues did not intrude. She had complete trust in the evaluation process, that inputs were accurately reflected in the report and interview, and that issues about her pedagogy and school procedures were considered fully. The only disagreement related to differences in assessment being examined in detail and reconciled.
This teacher strongly felt that evaluation in her school was open to staff input and had been reviewed and validated for effectiveness and equity. Evaluation was owned by teachers as well as the administration, positively supported school objectives, and positively affected both her pedagogy and teaching practices. Teacher 4C disagreed strongly that the evaluation judged employees rather than professionals, and saw it as more than the fulfilment of a bureaucratic school function that reinforced power relationships. However, she did admit to evaluation allowing her superiors to enforce compliance.

Evaluation benefited the whole school community, enhanced both professionalism and organisational collegiality, and was useful for career planning and communication purposes. However, this teacher did not see it as enhancing individual pedagogy, or changing teaching practices for the better.

**Individual Responses to Evaluation**
Teacher 4C’s emotional response to evaluation was optimism and confidence, including strong disagreement with any of the negative emotions. Following the evaluation, she was very renewed and positive, motivated to reflect on her practice, and set goals. She then discussed her training requirements with the professional development officer in an atmosphere of increased commitment to the school’s objectives. This teacher marked *Unable to Answer* responses to propositions on remembering the negatives, and reviewing shortfalls to analyse them for corrective action, suggesting that Teacher 4C had no negative evaluation experiences.

**Professional Development Motivation & Selection**
Teacher 4C had completed our days of school/department sponsored, and eight days of self initiated, professional development. She welcomed professional development as an invigorating opportunity to renew her ideas and outlook, and considered it a key part of modern teaching practice. She strongly denied seeing it as an opportunity to avoid classes, or just advance her promotion opportunities. Professional development objectives were set for the staff each year in line with school goals, and then faculty and individual goals were developed based on the school objectives. Whilst her supervisor did not work with her to develop her individual professional development objectives, these were submitted for review and approval by the school professional development officer. Teacher 4C’s professional development selections were then based on a review of her annual training requirements, and what interesting options arose each year.
Professional Development Outcomes
Professional development in the past year had developed this teacher’s professional subject area knowledge, evaluation and reporting, and instructional techniques in the classroom. These were validated to the school by a short note on the school’s professional development form. Teacher 4C admitted that the professional development heading on her evaluation was merely a place where her activities were listed, and strongly disagreed that anyone in the school followed up or validated the impact of her learning on her classroom practice or student outcomes. Nonetheless, she continued to strongly assert that professional development contributed to organisational change, and made her feel part of a community of continual learners.

School Professional Development Practices
Teacher 4C was a very strong supporter of professional development in her school. She considered it to be efficient, well managed, and responsive to individual teacher needs with an appropriate mix of training. It very much made her feel a life long learner constantly developing and enhancing her practice. However, this teacher equally strongly disagreed with professional development being clearly connected to evaluation and responding to specific pedagogical needs. This shortfall also hindered her perspective on her practice as a professional.

Professional development in this school consisted of the full range of suggested activities, including internal mentoring and opportunities for reflection. Whole school events were regular, stimulating, and a major force for change in the school. Teacher 4C strongly denied that they took her away from the real task of teaching, or that they were opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations
Teacher 4C had a high opinion of her school, seeing it as collaborative, open to dialogue, supportive of change, and accepting of differing teaching styles. It regularly analysed and modelled good teaching practice, appreciated the positive aspects of older teaching styles, and encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in differing ways. However, it neither encouraged parental feedback on teaching standards, nor actively mobilised this teacher as an agent of change.
This teacher strongly perceived herself as reflective and felt that being with the students made teaching worthwhile. She set high personal standards, always tried new teaching approaches, and openly discussed her classroom with her colleagues. Whilst she accepted the validity of educational change, this teacher acknowledged not embracing all changes.

In her aspirations, Teacher 4C sought strongly to have more time to work collegially with fellow teachers, to openly share negative as well as positive experiences, and to feel that her practice was advancing with educational change. She wished to better understand changes she was asked to implement, for the good aspects of her teaching to be acknowledged, and for the formative evaluation of her teaching to be removed from institutional assessment. However, Teacher 4C did not seek to feel less isolated in the classroom, or for the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom teaching needs.

**Comments on Teacher 4C**

Despite all of her positive feelings and attitudes, Teacher 4C admitted that evaluation neither improved teaching practices generally, nor individual pedagogy in particular. It also was divorced from her professional development, which was not validated or followed up. Despite her strong claims to collegiality, it is notable that this teacher neither wished to feel less isolated in her classroom nor for the obviously flawed professional development process to be more responsive to her intimate pedagogical needs. The latter may have flowed from such needs having never been raised in her evaluations, due to the absence of negative judgements.

The responses of Teacher 4C suggest that she was meeting the accountability demands of the evaluation processes in this school, and that felt comfortable with its demands, as well as those of the professional development system, provided that they did not intrude into her actual classroom practice. The positive feelings of collegiality and exchange thus appear to occur outside, in the public domain. With her classroom practice not the subject of objective and intimate discussion, Teacher 4C can remain very supportive of a current evaluation process where she was obviously successful, and accept both evaluation and professional development as organisationally beneficial, despite its obvious weaknesses. Once again, it appears there might have been an informal treaty, this time between the individual, operating successfully within the necessary parameters of organisational compliance and participation, and the school, which has secured a supportive and generally happy teacher. Both sides appear to accept that evaluations and professional development do not impinge on actual classroom teaching, or else are restricted to anecdotal benefits rather than objective analysis. Meanwhile, the reflection on
pedagogy that Teacher 4C strongly asserts to conduct, is likely to be at a level that is neither professional, nor seriously self-critical. There appears to be no need for serious analysis of her pedagogy for the benefit of enhanced student outcomes because she appears to be successful at school with processes that reinforce her current condition.

**Teacher 4D – Happily conforming**

Teacher 4D was a 36-40 year old permanent full time male teacher who had been teaching between 6 and 10 years and had achieved advanced skills teacher (AST1) level. He had undertaken no post-graduate learning.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

This teacher had been evaluated frequently in this and other career situations including the current year of the survey, but these were for advancement only and not teaching practice. Despite his experience, this teacher did not have a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in his school, and had received no specific professional development or training on the evaluation process.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

The inputs to this teacher’s evaluations were self and student evaluation questionnaires, peer assessment, and classroom observation. Most elements of the Danielson (1996) list were mandated, with the exceptions of knowledge of resources, selection of instructional goals, levels of flexibility and responsiveness, maintenance of records, and communication with families.

**Management of Evaluation**

Teacher 4D had a very high level of confidence in his evaluator, whom he felt was well trained to act in the role and was an equally good teacher. Personality issues did not intrude, and the full range of pedagogy was covered in the evaluation, with inputs accurately reflected and reconciled to ensure balance, although differences between assessments were not reviewed in detail. Despite the positive responses to his evaluator, this teacher lacked complete trust in the evaluation process, and felt that the redress procedures were unclear and ambiguous.

Teacher 4D saw evaluation in his school as owned by the teachers as well as the administration, open to staff input, and positively supporting school objectives. It enhanced individual and collective teaching practices, and made him feel a member of the professional community of
the school. This teacher strongly denied that there was little enhancement of student outcomes from evaluation. He also did not consider evaluation to be a bureaucratic tool to enforce compliance on employees. However, Teacher 4D doubted that the process had been reviewed for effectiveness or equity.

This teacher considered evaluation benefited the whole school community. It enhanced individual and collective teaching practices, and increased the professionalism of teaching in the school. Evaluation also supported individual career planning and communication, and helped teachers feel more a part of the organisation. Nonetheless, evaluation also reinforced the school hierarchy.

Individual Responses to Evaluation
Teacher 4D’s primary responses to evaluation were confidence and optimism. He strongly denied any feelings of defensiveness, resentfulness, apathy, or suspicion. After the evaluations, this teacher positively reflected on his practice, reviewed any shortfalls, and established goals for the next reporting period. He felt renewed with an increased commitment to school objectives, and enthusiastically pursued promotion opportunities. However, he remembered the negatives, did not work harder to secure a better outcome, and did not discuss his training requirements with the professional development officer.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
This teacher had completed 3 days of school/department sponsored, and 4 days self initiated professional development. He denied that professional development was something done to, rather than by, him, and strongly considered it to be a key part of modern teaching practice. Whilst Teacher 4D welcomed professional development as an opportunity to refresh his ideas and outlook, he also admitted it was a good break from classes.

Faculty and individual objectives were set in response to laid down school objectives, developed in response to school goals. Teacher 4D’s supervisor helped him set his objectives, which were then submitted to the professional development officer for approval. However, such objectives were not reported up the school system to ensure consistency and economy within the organisation. Teacher 4D then based his professional development selections mainly on what interesting options appeared each year. Whilst he also considered advice from his supervisor, this teacher sought the least strenuous activities that would be enjoyable, and meet the annual requirement with the least amount of effort.
Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development had improved Teacher 4D’s pedagogy in all areas, and most particularly classroom management. These outcomes were reported via a detailed evaluation sheet. However, there was a complete absence of any follow up by the school to determine the impact of the professional development on either his teaching or student outcomes. Although this teacher considered that the professional development heading on his evaluation was more than a place where activities were listed, the evaluations similarly failed to penetrate the actual impact of his professional development on his classroom teaching. Nonetheless, Teacher 4D continued to feel that professional development was an obvious contributor to organisational change and made him feel a member of a community of ongoing learners.

School Professional Development Practices

Teacher 4D strongly denied that professional development was a token gesture. It consisted of most types of activities, including internal mentoring, but excluded opportunities for reflection on teaching. The professional development system in this school was efficient and responsive, well managed and dynamic, and clearly directed to enhancing individual and collective pedagogy. It had an appropriate mixture of training to meet Teacher 4D’s needs, and was a clear input into the evaluation system so that he was able to monitor his development as a professional. However, at the same time, this teacher denied that the connection of professional development to evaluation was sufficient as to make it responsive to identified pedagogical shortfalls.

In spite of all of his positive statements, Teacher 4D considered whole school events to be generally fanfare events that took him away from the real work of teaching, and had few concrete outcomes other than the enrichment of consultants. However, they were not seen as opportunities for hierarchical self promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 4D perceived his school in a very positive light. It encouraged broad dialogue and feedback, and was a collaborative environment where teachers were actively encouraged to demonstrate their individual worth and adopt new teaching initiatives. The school regularly analysed good teaching practice, and the environment enabled teachers to share failure as well as success. However, Teacher 4D did not feel that good teaching was modelled regardless of seniority, and also considered that he had not been mobilised actively as an agent of change.
As an individual, Teacher 4D had very high personal expectations. He felt strongly that being with the students was worthwhile, and worked hard to understand them rather than just dispense content. This teacher saw himself as reflective, always trying new teaching approaches, and happy to openly discuss his classroom with colleagues. Although he did not doubt the validity of educational change, Teacher 4D did not embrace it wholeheartedly.

With regard to future aspirations, Teacher 4D was supportive of formative evaluation of his teaching being separated from institutional evaluation, sought greater time to work collegially with colleagues, and wished the good things in his teaching to be acknowledged explicitly. Notably, he did not wish to feel less isolated in the classroom, or freedom to acknowledge mistakes and seek assistance to rectify them. However, because of a desire to feel his pedagogy was advancing with educational developments, such admission of mistakes was acceptable if it was within the implementation of educational change.

**Comments on Teacher 4D**

Teacher 4D appeared to be a happy and enthusiastic teacher with a strong positive orientation to his school and teaching in general. However, the dysfunction between evaluation and professional development suggests that he was deriving full benefit from neither. In the first instance, Teacher 4D had not been evaluated for teaching practice, but advancement alone. The differing requirements of each means that it was unlikely that Teacher 4D had been required to fully reflect on his teaching in a methodical manner, and thereafter identify areas for relearning. He was not assisted by the fact that the professional development structure was not directly connected to evaluation and responsive to identified pedagogical shortfalls, acknowledged by this teacher in his responses. Despite the consultation that might take place about professional development, that Teacher 4D was able to base his own choices on minimal effort and ease rather than professional need, and also not have to demonstrate positive outcomes from his learning, suggests that the majority of time and money for his professional development is wasted. The process of deriving objectives at the various levels is thus reduced to a sham because the teacher is able to ignore them once the bureaucratic submission process has been completed.

From the perspective of the school, it appears to be failing to derive the maximum benefit from this teacher in that he is not being developed professionally to the full extent. He may certainly be meeting institutional requirements, as evidenced through the appraisal system, and indeed this may be underpinning his support for and commitment to the organisation. However,
procedural shortfalls in connecting the evaluation to professional development and validating
the outcomes means that the school is not assisting Teacher 4D to enhance his pedagogy, and
may in fact be wasting time and money on what professional development does occur. On an
individual level, Teacher 4D seemed satisfied in a system where he appeared successful, but
where he did not have to confront his professional practice in real terms. If he did, then the
motivations for professional development might shift away from the enjoyment side to a review
of training requirements and consultation with the professional development officer. Given his
age, career experience, and generally strong positive attitudes to evaluation, the role of
professional development, and his school in general, Teacher 4D could be a valuable agent of
change and increased school effectiveness. In the absence of a reflective evaluation
environment, the readjustment of professional development towards reflection and effective
validation would represent an easy and effective way to elicit this teacher’s support and
enhance his classroom performance.

Teacher 4E – Enigmatic
Teacher 4E was a 56-60 year old permanent full time female advanced skills teacher (AST1)
who had been teaching for 31-35 years, 11-15 of those at this school. She had another Bachelor
degree, but had undertaken no higher post-graduate study.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation
This teacher frequently had experienced evaluation, including within the past four years, with
such evaluations being of both teaching practice and to receive her AST1 grading. She claimed
a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school and had received training in
evaluative procedures and techniques, although never having acted as an evaluator herself. The
question on specific professional development on the evaluation process in her school was
unanswered.

Inputs to Evaluation
The inputs to evaluation were self and student evaluation questionnaires and peer input only.
The evaluation process mandated coverage of almost all the Danielson (1996) list, with the
exception of design of coherent instruction, self-reflection on teaching, and maintenance of
records.
Management of Evaluation

Teacher 4E had a high level of confidence in her evaluator, whom she felt was well trained to conduct the process and was as good a teacher. The inputs from various sources were reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective in the evaluation, and issues of concern were addressed and not overlooked. However, the full range of her pedagogy was not addressed, inputs were not accurately reflected in the report and interview, reasons for differences in assessments were not examined, and personality issues intruded. The procedures for redress were unclear or ambiguous, so that Teacher 4E was left feeling distrustful of the evaluation process as a whole.

This teacher considered evaluation affected her teaching in a positive way. It enhanced both teaching practice and the achievement of school objectives, had been reviewed for equity and effectiveness, and was owned by teachers as well as the administration, although it was not open to staff input. Nonetheless, evaluation also was an essentially bureaucratic function that judged employees, was used to enforce compliance and reinforce power relationships, and did little to enhance student outcomes.

More than anything, Teacher 4E saw evaluation as reinforcing the hierarchy of the school. It failed to act as a communication medium for her career planning, and did not make her feel more committed to the organisation. Despite these negatives, Teacher 4E saw evaluation as of benefit to the whole school community, and to individual, if not collective, pedagogical practices.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 4E’s emotional response to evaluation was anger, defensiveness, resentfulness, concern, and suspicion, all balanced by confidence alone. She strongly disagreed with feelings of ambivalence, optimism, enthusiasm, and fear. Her response after the evaluation was a mix of positives and negatives. On the one hand, Teacher 4E personally reflected on her practice, reviewed any shortfalls, discussed her needs with the professional development officer, and enthusiastically focussed on promotion opportunities. However, she also remembered the negatives, complained to her peers, kept a low profile, and changed the way she taught to keep her supervisor happy. She also tried to forget the experience until next time.
Professional Development Motivation & Selection

This teacher had completed five days of school/department sponsored, and eight days self initiated professional development. The questions in this section were not answered completely. However, Teacher 4E welcomed professional development as a part of modern teaching practice that allowed her to refresh her ideas and outlook. Professional development objectives were set for the staff each year and laid down in accordance with school goals. Each teacher submitted individual objectives for review by the professional development officer. Thereafter, this teacher based her professional development selections on a review of her annual training requirements, and advice from both her supervisor and the professional development officer. At the same time, she still sought something that might be fun from the interesting options that appeared each year.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development over the past year had improved this teacher’s professional knowledge of subject area, evaluation and reporting, and personal communication skills. These were validated to the school by a verbal report, a short note on the school’s professional development form, or a comprehensive written report. Thereafter the school made no attempt to determine the impact of the professional development on Teacher 4E’s teaching, or on her students’ outcomes. Her evaluations merely listed her activities, and failed to examine her professional development outcomes. Despite this, professional development still caused Teacher 4E to feel she was a member of a continuous learning community.

School Professional Development Practices

This teacher felt that professional development in her school was an efficient, well managed, and dynamic process that had an appropriate mix of training for her individual needs. It was clearly directed to enhance teaching quality, and made her feel a life-long learner. However, she did not feel it was responsive to individual needs.

All types of activities were conducted in the school, including internal mentoring and opportunities for reflection. Whole school events were regularly conducted, generally stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change in the school. Although they were not fanfare events or opportunities for the enrichment of consultants, they were nonetheless an opportunity for hierarchy members to promote themselves.
School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 4E identified her school as a truly collaborative culture, which encouraged dialogue on failure as well as success, was open to parental input on teaching standards, and was also supportive of teachers demonstrating their worth in varying ways. At the same time she did not see it as regularly analysing good teaching practice, or as being appreciative of older teaching styles as well as new. Furthermore, her school failed to actively encourage Teacher 4E to adopt new initiatives in the classroom or mobilise her as an agent of change.

At the individual level, this teacher set high personal standards, and considered herself to be reflective. She felt that being with the students made teaching worthwhile, and worked to understand them rather than just transmit content. Whilst she was open to change, Teacher 4E doubted the validity of some educational changes she was asked to introduce. In her aspirations, Teacher 4E sought to enhance collegiality and openness in teaching, including the sharing and acknowledgement of both successes and failures. She hoped to feel less isolated, and for the evaluation of her pedagogy to be separated from assessment of her as a member of the institution. Notably, Teacher 4E did not want the professional development system to be more responsive to her teaching needs in the classroom.

Comments on Teacher 4E

This older and very experienced teacher is somewhat enigmatic and difficult to judge. Her comments reflect a clear understanding of the shortfalls of both the evaluation and professional development processes in her school. However, she manages to identify very positive outcomes from both. It may be that Teacher 4E is an optimist who manages to derive positives for both herself and others from inadequate school procedures that she is not in a position to change. However, the enigmatic element may also illustrate well-established survival techniques that this teacher has constructed in the absence of a means to develop true collegial professionalism. Consequently, unable to make changes herself, Teacher 4E may have become of a compliant employee, secure within her classroom that is penetrated by neither evaluation nor professional development. Meanwhile she is free to select the positive aspects from these external factors. Nevertheless, such a posture may not completely eliminate feelings of frustration and irritation at the shortfalls of procedures in her school.
Teacher 4F – *Conforming and isolated*

Teacher 4F was a 51-55 year old female teacher who had been teaching for 26-30 years, 11-15 of which had been at this school. She was permanent part time, but had a high teaching load of 85%. She had undertaken no post-graduate learning.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

This teacher had experienced frequent evaluations for teaching practice, promotion, and altered responsibilities. She had acted as an evaluator, but had received no training or professional development in evaluation procedures. Nonetheless, she claimed a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

Inputs consisted of self-evaluation and student questionnaires, classroom observation, peer input, and the examination of teaching documentation. These covered most of the Danielson (1996) list, with the exception of the selection of instructional goals, organisation of physical space, questioning and discussion techniques, and the maintenance of records.

**Management of Evaluation**

Teacher 4F strongly asserted that evaluation covered the full range of her pedagogy, and that sources for differences in assessment were examined in detail and assessed. She had confidence in her evaluator, whom she felt was trained to conduct the process, and was as good a teacher. She had complete trust in the evaluation process, and felt that the procedures for redress were clear and unambiguous. However, personality issues intruded, and issues that concerned this teacher in her teaching or school procedures were overlooked.

Evaluation in Teacher 4F’s school was more than just a bureaucratic function. It positively supported school objectives, helped her feel a part of the professional community, was open to staff input, and had been reviewed and validated for effectiveness and equity. However, it neither affected her teaching practice, nor enhanced teaching practices at the school. Although it did not focus on the personalities of employees, evaluation in this school was owned by the administration, and was used to both reinforce power relationships and enforce compliance. Evaluation had little effect on the enhancement of student outcomes.

Whilst it was not aimed to reinforce the hierarchy or gender inequalities, evaluation benefited the school, but not the students or teachers. The process neither enhanced teaching practices in
general, nor individual pedagogy. Consequently, it failed to enhance either teaching professionalism or organisational collegiality. Evaluation was, however, a useful conduit for teacher career and institutional communications.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 4F’s responses to evaluation were confidence, optimism, and ambivalence. Following the evaluation, this teacher personally reflected on her practice and set goals for the next reporting period. She felt renewed and positive, reviewed any shortfalls, and discussed these with the professional development officer. Although she did not focus on the negatives, Teacher 2F did not work harder to improve her outcomes, or experience increased commitment to the school’s objectives. She certainly did not complain to her peers or adopt a low profile.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

This teacher had completed five days of school/department sponsored, and seven days of self initiated professional development, two days of the latter being a conference. She strongly viewed professional development as a part of modern teaching practice, which she welcomed with enthusiasm as a chance to enhance her skills. Teacher 2F claimed ownership of her professional development, and strongly denied that professional development was a chance to get a break from class, or that she steered her efforts towards promotion.

Professional development objectives were primarily derived within the faculty, in accordance with individual needs and school goals. Teacher 2F’s supervisor worked with her to determine her needs, and these were submitted to the professional development officer for approval and consolidation. Whilst this teacher took advice from both her supervisor and the professional development officer on learning options, she primarily based her choices on what interesting options appeared each year. The selection of least strenuous and fun items was strongly denied.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 4F’s professional development had primarily enhanced her subject area knowledge, although it also improved her assessment and instructional techniques. These were the subject of verbal reports exclusively. Her supervisor objectively discussed the professional development to see that it met her needs. However, the professional development staff certainly did not follow up to check the application of her new learning, and the school failed to determine the impact of her professional development on student outcomes. Nonetheless, Teacher 4F denied that professional development occurred in isolation. Her learning outcomes
were examined in her evaluations, and this made her feel that she was a member of community of ongoing learners.

**School Professional Development Practices**

Professional development in this school was particularly well managed and dynamic, very responsive, and with a mix of training that met the individual needs of most teachers. Consequently, it enhanced individual and collective pedagogy. However, Teacher 4F felt that it was not clearly connected to the evaluation system and responsive to identified pedagogical shortfalls. It thus prevented her from seeing her individual development as professional.

Teacher 4F identified almost all of the types of professional development as occurring in her school, including opportunities for reflection on pedagogy, but excluding mentoring. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, generally stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change in the school. It certainly was neither made up of fanfare events, nor did it promote the hierarchy and enrich consultants.

**School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations**

Teacher 4F viewed her school as a collaborative culture which appreciated differing teaching styles and actively encouraged teachers to be agents of change, and to adopt new initiatives in the classroom. It both analysed good teaching and modelled it regardless of seniority. Despite this, Teacher 4F did not consider her school encouraged either cross-curricular dialogue, or parental feedback on teaching standards.

As an individual, this teacher had an exceptionally positive view of herself as a reflective, child-centred practitioner who set high personal standards, and was open to discussion with her colleagues. Whilst she did not doubt the validity of educational change, she did not always embrace it. Furthermore, she did not seek greater opportunity to be part of the changes. In her aspirations, Teacher 4F very much wanted more time to work collegially and openly with her fellow teachers to improve her practice, and to feel that she was moving ahead with educational change. However, she strongly denied wanting to feel less isolated. Propositions on more open discussion about classroom teaching, the honest admission of errors, formative evaluation of teaching practice to be separated from institutional assessment, and a professional development system more responsive to classroom pedagogy, were all rejected.
Comments on Teacher 4F

Teacher 4F appeared well aware that her evaluation was an institutional appraisal that had little impact on either her pedagogy or student learning. Whilst the evaluation appeared to be reasonably sensitive and not openly threatening to this teacher, it still raised some minor suspicions because it remained the property of the organisation, which applied it for purposes other than the enhancement of teacher pedagogy and student outcomes. Similarly, this teacher appeared to recognise the validation shortfalls of the professional development system, and that it did not connect with teacher and student real learning needs. However, she appeared to have done nothing to overcome these problems.

The absence of dialogue between teachers and with parents, ownership of evaluation by the administration, and effective follow up of the impact of professional development on teaching and learning, coupled with an absence of aspirations to open her practice, suggest that Teacher 4F remains secure in her own classroom behind well established defences that protect her from scrutiny. If this is the case, then her positive responses about evaluation and the forms of professional development may reflect a well rehearsed compliance behaviour that can be maintained so long as the collegial interactions and scrutiny are maintained at a superficial level. Teacher 4F’s negative responses to propositions of less isolation, the separation of formative evaluation of teaching practice from institutional assessment, and professional development responding better to actual classroom needs are rejected in the survey because they threaten potential criticism of her teaching that can be avoided under the present system. If Teacher 4F, and to some extent her colleague of similar years and experience Teacher 4E, are manifesting well established compliance behaviours, it is unlikely that any other than intimate, open, and objective reflective evaluation would get through to the teaching reality. Any threat or concern likely would trigger these compliance practices, which, given the experience of these teachers, could be far more easily amended to cope with the new threat rather than take the serious step of honest collegial exposure.

**Teacher 4G – Satisfied and successful**

Teacher 4G was a 31-35 year old permanent part-time female classroom teacher who had been teaching for 11-15 years, only 1-3 of them at this school. She had undertaken no post-graduate learning.
Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation
This teacher had frequently experienced evaluation for teaching practice only, including within the past four years. She had received professional development on the evaluation process, and claimed a strong knowledge of its application in her school.

Inputs to Evaluation
The inputs consisted of all forms other than a professional diary. Most of the Danielson (1996) list was covered, with the exception of selection of instructional goals, design of coherent instruction, organisation of physical space, questioning and discussion techniques, and communication with families.

Management of Evaluation
Teacher 4G was a strong supporter of the evaluation process with strongly positive responses to trust in the process, confidence in her evaluator, the extent of coverage of her pedagogy, and the accuracy of reflection of inputs. Unable to answer responses to questions about reconciliation of differences in assessment, or the glossing over of issues of concern, suggest that this teacher’s evaluation experiences had all been positive and successful. Consequently, evaluation affected her teaching in a positive way, and made her feel a member of the school professional community working towards the achievement of school objectives.

Teacher 4G perceived evaluation as open to staff input as it was owned by the teachers as well as the administration. The process had been reviewed for equity and effectiveness, and the procedures for redress were clear and unambiguous. This teacher strongly denied that evaluation was a bureaucratic tool to reinforce compliance and power relationships. Evaluation benefited the whole school community, enhanced collective and individual teaching practices, and was a valuable conduit for teachers to discuss career issues. It consequently made her feel more a part of the organisation.

Individual Responses to Evaluation
Teacher 4G was very confident, enthusiastic, and optimistic about her evaluation. Afterwards, she felt very renewed and positive and increasingly committed to the school’s objectives, so she personally reflected on her practice and set goals, discussed her needs with the professional development officer, and oriented herself towards promotion. Once again, this teacher noted Unable to answer to questions on reviewing any shortfalls, and remembering the negatives, suggesting that she had only ever experienced positive outcomes from evaluations.
Professional Development Motivation & Selection
This teacher had completed four days of school/department, and seven days self-initiated professional development. She strongly welcomed professional development as an invigorating element of modern teaching practice that refreshed her ideas and outlook. Teacher 4G’s objectives were set by herself alone and these were submitted for review and approval by the professional development officer. She strongly denied that objectives were reported back up the system to ensure economy and consistency. Teacher 4G based her selections on advice from the professional development officer, the range of interesting options that arose each year, and finding something that was likely to be fun. She strongly denied seeking out the least strenuous options, or trying to miss the maximum number of classes.

Professional Development Outcomes
Professional development had improved this teacher’s pedagogy primarily in professional knowledge of her subject area, as well as assessment and reporting. This was validated to the school by a short note on the professional development form or a verbal report to the faculty. Her supervisor followed up to see that the professional development met her needs, and her evaluations examined the impact of her learning her teaching practices, instead of just listing activities. However, Teacher 4G strongly indicated that the school failed to determine either her application of new skills, or their impact on student learning outcomes. Despite this, Teacher 4G felt that professional development did not occur in isolation and was an obvious contributor to organisational change. Consequently, she strongly felt a member of a community of ongoing professional learners.

School Professional Development Practices
Commensurate with her other positive comments, Teacher 4G was very supportive of professional development practices in her school. She saw it as very efficient and well managed, completely responsive to her needs, and clearly directed to enhancing collective pedagogy and learning quality. It was also clearly connected to the evaluation system so that she was able to monitor her development as a professional. Most types of professional development activities were conducted, with the exception of opportunities for reflection on teaching. Whole school professional development activities were certainly not fanfare events. They were regularly conducted and well directed, and a major force for change in the school. Nonetheless, they took this teacher away from the real job of teaching.
School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 4G saw her school as a particularly collaborative and open organisation that encouraged dialogue, rewarded good teaching, and supported differing teaching styles. It actively mobilised her as an agent of change, analysed and modelled good teaching, and encouraged her to adopt new initiatives in the classroom. However, parental feedback on teaching standards was certainly not encouraged.

As an individual, this teacher strongly identified herself as a reflective and student centred practitioner who set very high personal expectations of herself and her teaching, and was constantly reflecting on her teaching practice. She always tried new teaching approaches and never doubted the validity of educational change she was asked to introduce. Not only did she find being with the students was worthwhile and try to do more than just load them with content, Teacher 4G was also very open to discuss her teaching with her colleagues.

Teacher 4G very much sought greater opportunities to work collegially with fellow teachers, and share both successes and difficulties. She also wished the professional development system to be more responsive to her needs. However, this teacher did not aspire to more openly discuss classroom teaching with, or feel less isolated from, her colleagues. Furthermore, Teacher 4G did not wish for the evaluation of her pedagogy to be separated from assessment of her as an institutional member.

Comments on Teacher 4G

Teacher 4G appeared to be very satisfied with the current system, and her negative responses in the aspirations area were likely related to her not feeling isolated or separate from her colleagues due to the very positive outlook she had on all aspects of the survey. As an essentially optimistic teacher at the height of her powers in age and experience, Teacher 4G would be a valuable conduit for any changes to a more reflective self-evaluation regime. The most significant contribution she makes to this survey is in identifying that even a confident and apparently successful teacher may not be correctly motivated in her professional development selections, and thus not deriving maximum benefit from them. Through her individual reflection on teaching, she should be able to identify areas for improvement in an active rather than passive process. However, since this does not appear to have occurred, perhaps Teacher 4G may have benefited from organised reflection opportunities within her professional development. Also significant is the continuation of negative responses to the professional development staff validating the impact of training on teaching and learning. With
merely a verbal report and a short note on the form, Teacher 4G appears to be receiving no assistance in extracting maximum benefit from the time and funds expended in her professional learning.

An additional issue from the perspective of this study is that Teacher 4G appeared very happy within her current situation. Her evaluations appear to have revealed no cause for concern, and she seems to feel successful in both organisational and pedagogical terms. This teacher does not need to be ‘rescued’ from her current situation, and thus she might be unwilling to move away from a success option to a condition of untried professional responsibility that cannot guarantee obvious returns. Conversely, her positive outlook, youth, and feeling of success would be beneficial in any environment.

**Teacher 4H – Doesn’t own evaluation, but satisfied**
Teacher 4H was a 26-30 year old permanent part time female classroom teacher who had been teaching for 4-5 years, all of them at this school. She was one of the few case study teachers undertaking post-graduate study, in this case a Doctorate.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**
This teacher had frequently experienced formal evaluation, including within the past four years. She had received professional development on the evaluation process at this school and claimed a strong knowledge of the process. Although she claimed to have been evaluated in response to specific promotion needs, the only purpose indicated was tenure.

**Inputs to Evaluation**
Teacher 4H identified the inputs as student and self-evaluation questionnaires, peer input and classroom observation. These covered around half of the Danielson (1996) list, with a number of *Unable to answer* responses. The mandated elements included: knowledge of students, design of coherent instruction, assessing student learning, establishment of respect and rapport, management of student behaviour, self-reflection on teaching, communication with families, contribution to school and professional community, and professional development. Excluded were: selection of instructional goals, and knowledge of resources. Unable to answer responses included: knowledge of content and pedagogy, organisation of physical space, engagement of students in learning, provision of feedback to students, clear and accurate communication, and maintenance of records.
Management of Evaluation

This teacher expressed confidence in her evaluator as being trained and as competent a teacher. The inputs were reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective, and these were accurately reflected in the report and interview. Issues of teaching or school procedure that concerned her were considered. Teacher 4H had complete trust in the evaluation process, but admitted that personality issues intruded, and that the procedures for redress were unclear or ambiguous. Sources for differences in assessment were also not examined in detail, and this teacher could not answer as to whether the full range of her pedagogy or teaching skills were covered in the evaluation.

Teacher 4H considered that evaluation affected her teaching practice in a positive way, and made her feel a part of the professional community of the school. It positively supported school objectives, and was definitely not a bureaucratic tool to enforce compliance, or reinforce power relationships. Evaluation did not judge the personalities of teachers ahead of their skills, or treat them as mere employees. Nonetheless, ownership of the process rested with the administration and not teachers, and had not been reviewed or validated for effectiveness and equity. This teacher was also unable to answer whether evaluation enhanced teaching practice at her school.

Teacher 4H felt that evaluation benefited the whole school community, and enhanced individual pedagogy and teaching professionalism. However, she denied that it improved teaching practices. Evaluation was a valuable conduit for communication between teachers, but did not help her communicate her needs or aspirations upward in the organisation. It certainly was not used to reinforce the hierarchy or gender imbalances in the school.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 4H responded to evaluation with mixed feelings; confidence, optimism, and enthusiasm were balanced by fear, concern and defensiveness. Her strongest reactions to the evaluation were personal reflection on her practice, matched up against remembering the negatives. Nonetheless, most of her response was positive. In addition to feeling renewed and positive and an enhanced commitment to the school’s objectives, she reviewed the shortfalls and identified corrective action, set goals, and oriented herself towards a greater efforts and promotion. However, she did not discuss her training requirements with the professional development officer.
Professional Development Motivation & Selection
Teacher 4H had completed one day of school/department sponsored, and ten days of self-initiated professional development, the latter perhaps related to her post-graduate study. She strongly supported professional development as an invigorating element of modern teaching practice, and she undertook it with a strong sense of personal ownership. Objectives were set for the staff in response to school goals, and these were further developed at faculty level. Teacher 4H also set her own objectives in consultation with her supervisor, and these were submitted for review and approval by the professional development officer. However, the various objectives were not reported back up the chain to ensure economy and consistency within the organisation. Teacher 4H then based her professional development selections on advice from both the professional development officer and her supervisor, as well as what interesting options arose each year.

Professional Development Outcomes
Professional development over the previous year had improved this teacher’s subject knowledge, and her instructional techniques in the classroom. These were reported back to the school by either a verbal report or short note on the professional development form. Although Teacher 4H’s supervisor discussed the outcomes of her professional development, and these were also clearly analysed in her evaluations, the school made no effort to check on the application of her new learning in the classroom, or verify the impact of her professional development on student learning. Teacher 4H strongly disagreed that professional development occurred in isolation, but, rather, perceived it as an obvious contributor to organisational change. It made her feel strongly that she was on a journey of lifelong learning within a professional educational community.

School Professional Development Practices
Teacher 4H considered that professional development in her school was efficient and responsive, well managed and dynamic, and had an appropriate mix of training to meet individual and collective teachers’ needs. Whilst professional development was a key input to the evaluation system so that she could determine her professional progress, the connection between the two was not such that professional development could respond to identified pedagogical shortfalls.

Professional development in this school consisted of all forms, including mentoring and opportunities for reflection on teaching. Whole school professional development was regularly
conducted, stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change in the school. It certainly was not made up of fanfare events aimed at enriching consultants or promoting the hierarchy.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations
Teacher 4H was another respondent who felt very positively about the school and her teaching. She saw herself as a member of a collaborative learning community which encouraged dialogue, valued and rewarded diversity in teaching styles, both examined and modelled good practice, and particularly encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in various ways. However, it did not encourage parental feedback on teaching standards.

This teacher strongly asserted her professional commitment. She saw herself setting high personal standards, and regularly reflecting on her practice as she worked to understand student needs. She was open to change, and openly discussed her classroom with colleagues as she constantly tried new teaching approaches. Teacher 4H aspired to increases in collegial openness to share classroom teaching with her colleagues, and to acknowledge both successes and errors, particularly in the implementation of educational change. She sought to have formative evaluation separated from the assessment of her as an organisational member, but did not see a need for professional development to be more responsive to classroom teaching needs. Teacher 4H also did not wish to feel less isolated, perhaps because her responses suggest she is already very open in her attitudes and teaching.

Comments on Teacher 4H
Teacher 4H represents probably one of the most satisfied and confident teachers in the survey. Her youth and career position suggest significant enthusiasm and energy in her teaching. Another factor may be that this is one of the few teachers in this research currently undertaking post-graduate studies, which followed on from an Honours degree in education. Certainly this teacher is likely to be equipped with the intellectual motivation and knowledge to engage in reflection on her teaching practice.

Her awareness of organisational ownership of evaluation, doubts about some of the mandated input elements and the impact of evaluation on enhancement of teaching practices, as well as the absence of validation processes for professional development, reveal an awareness of the shortfalls of the current accountability directed system in this school. However, whilst aware of the shortfalls of the present system, Teacher 4H has actively embraced both the school’s
appraisal and professional development systems to focus on, and enhance her teaching practice. In this sense, Teacher 4H may be a true professional, operating well within the current structures. Certainly, her post-graduate study singles her out from many of her peers as seeking deeper understanding of either her subject area or teaching practice, or both.

**Teacher 4I – Satisfied but not improved**

Teacher 4I was a 51-55 year old permanent part time male in a Year Group Coordinator position who had been teaching for 26-30 years, 11-15 of those at this school. He had undertaken no post graduate study.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

This teacher did not answer the question on frequent evaluation, but had been evaluated within the past four years. This had been in response to promotional requirements for advancement to Advanced Skills Teacher (AST1) and his leadership position, as well as teaching practice. He received specific professional development on evaluation and claimed a strong knowledge of it in his school.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

Inputs to evaluation were self-evaluation and student questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation. These covered most of the Danielson (1996) list, other than knowledge of content and pedagogy. Furthermore, Teacher 4I was unable to answer about provision of feedback to students, level of flexibility and responsiveness, and maintenance of records.

**Management of Evaluation**

Teacher 4I was a strong supporter of evaluation in his school. He had complete trust in the process, strongly asserted that personality issues did not intrude, and that his evaluator was both well trained to conduct the process and as good a teacher. The full range of his pedagogy was covered in comprehensive inputs that were reflected accurately in the report and interview, so that no issues of concern were omitted. For this teacher, the procedures for redress were clear and unambiguous.

Evaluation affected the teaching practice of both Teacher 4I and his colleagues in a positive way, and made him feel a professional member of the school community. It was certainly not a tool for the enforcement of compliance or power relationships, or merely the fulfilment of a bureaucratic function. Teachers were treated as professionals, and assessed on their skills, not
personalities. Although Teacher 4I saw evaluation in this school had been reviewed for equity and effectiveness, and was open to staff input, he admitted that it was owned by the administration rather than the teachers. Furthermore, he could not answer on the enhancement of student outcomes.

Teacher 4I saw evaluation as benefiting the whole school community. It made him feel more a part of the organisation, was a valuable tool for communication about career needs and aspirations, and improved individual pedagogy. However, he did not see evaluation as enhancing teacher professionalism, and could not respond as to whether it improved teaching practices.

Individual Responses to Evaluation
Teacher 4I’s emotional responses to evaluation were confidence, defensiveness, concern and fear. Following the evaluation, he felt renewed and more committed to the school’s objectives, so that he reflected on his practice, reviewed any shortfalls, and set goals for the future. Although he was motivated to work harder to get a better report, Teacher 4I remembered the negatives. Notably, he did not discuss his training requirements with the professional development officer.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
This teacher had completed four days of school/department sponsored, and three days self-initiated professional development. He enthusiastically welcomed professional development as a key part of modern teaching practice that helped him fresh his ideas and outlook. He felt ownership of professional development, and genuinely saw it as more than an award requirement.

Professional development objectives were not set for the staff in one with school objectives, but developed at faculty and individual level. Teacher 4I’s supervisor helped him establish his objectives, and these were submitted to the professional development officer for review and approval. Objectives were not reported back up the school structure to ensure economy and consistency. Having established his objectives, Teacher 4I based his selections on a review of his annual training requirements, advice from his superiors, and the amount of money available.
Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development had improved this teacher’s pedagogy in the areas of classroom management, instructional techniques, assessment and reporting, and personal communication skills. These were only reported verbally to the faculty or professional development officer. Although his supervisor discussed the professional development to see that it met his needs, the school took no other steps to determine the impact of his learning on either his teaching or student outcomes. Teacher 4I denied that the professional development heading on his evaluation was a place just to list activities, but also admitted that the evaluation failed to clearly examine the impact of professional development on his teaching. Nevertheless, this teacher considered that professional development was an obvious contributor to organisational change, and made him feel a continuing learner within his educational community.

School Professional Development Practices

Teacher 4I perceived professional development in his school as efficient and responsive, well managed, and clearly directed to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in the school. It was responsive to individual teacher needs and made him feel that he was continually improving his practice. However, this teacher also admitted that professional development was not clearly connected to the evaluation system and responsive to pedagogical shortfalls, and that this hampered his view of his development as a professional. Additionally, despite having stated that professional development was responsive to teachers’ needs, Teacher 4I denied that the mix of training was such as to meet his pedagogical, personal, and organisational requirements.

Professional development in this school consisted of all activities, including internal mentoring and opportunities for reflection. Whole school events were regularly conducted, stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change. Teacher 4I stressed that they were not opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 4I was very pleased with his school, seeing it as a collaborative institution that valued teaching diversity, and encouraged broad dialogue. It regularly modelled and analysed good teaching, and rewarded positive initiatives and efforts, regardless of seniority. This teacher was also one of the few to state that parental feedback on teaching standards was encouraged.
More than anything Teacher 4I considered being with the students made the job worthwhile, and he worked to understand them, rather than just load them with content. He set high personal expectations, tried to cover prescribed material, and sought open discussion with his colleagues to support ongoing reflection on his practice. However, he did not try to embrace every change in an attempt to enhance education. In his aspirations, Teacher 4I was keen to feel less isolated, to increase collegial interaction, and openly share both positive and negative teaching experiences. He sought to better understand change, and feel that his teaching practice was improving alongside educational developments. Whilst this teacher also wished the professional development system to be more responsive to his individual needs, he did not want formative evaluation of his teaching to be separated from assessment of him as an institutional member.

Comments on Teacher 4I
Teacher 4I was positive towards the school and apparently happy and successful. He seemed aware of the primarily organisational nature of the appraisal system in his school, that it was owned by management and not teachers, and that it did not fully permeate down to teaching practices or student learning. On an emotional plane, appraisal continued to cause Teacher 4I more anxiety than satisfaction, but it has monitored his performance and rewarded it, for which he has returned both loyalty and commitment. This teacher was complimentary of the professional development system, even though he was aware that neither the professional development staff nor the evaluation process examined the impact of his learning on his teaching.

Despite all of the positive responses, there are a number of indicators that Teacher 4I was aware that verification of outcomes on student learning was a lesser issue in both the evaluation and professional development systems, and that the disconnect between the two meant his pedagogical needs were not being fully satisfied. At the same time, reluctance to have formative evaluation of his pedagogy separated from institutional judgement of him, suggests that the Teacher 4I is both aware and satisfied that his actual classroom teaching is quarantined by the existing structure. If this is the case, then Teacher 4I’s experience may highlight that teachers working well and successfully within current appraisal systems, despite awareness of their shortfalls, may not readily throw off that which has worked well for them, to assume a more radical and individual centred pedagogical evaluation process.
Teacher 4J – Suspicious of ‘big brother’

Teacher 4J was a permanent advanced skills teacher (AST1) who had been teaching at this school for 6-10 years. Questions on age and gender were not answered. This teacher had completed a Graduate Certificate of Education.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation

Teacher 4J claimed a very strong understanding of evaluation in this school, having received specific professional development on the process and been trained as an evaluator. This teacher had also been evaluated in the year of the survey. The purposes for evaluation were tenure, altered responsibilities, and a leadership position.

Inputs to Evaluation

The inputs were self-evaluation and student questionnaires, peer input, classroom observation, and a professional diary. These covered the complete Danielson (1996) list.

Management of Evaluation

Teacher 4J considered that the evaluator was trained and an equally competent teacher. The full range of pedagogy was covered and reflected in the report and interview, and differences in inputs were reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective. However, Teacher 4J strongly felt that personality issues intruded, and that the procedures for redress were unclear or ambiguous. This teacher lacked complete trust in the evaluation process.

Evaluation enhanced individual and collective practices, made Teacher 4J feel a professional member of the school, and positively supported school objectives. Although it treated teachers as professionals and judged their skills rather than personalities, evaluation essentially was used to reinforce power relationships. It was owned by the administration, was the fulfilment of a bureaucratic school function, and was not open to staff input.

Evaluation benefited the teachers by enhancing their teaching practice individually and collectively. However, it did not benefit the students, but reinforced the school hierarchy. The process had no career planning benefits, failed to enhance professionalism, and did not help Teacher 4J feel a part of the organisation.
Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 4J’s emotional responses to evaluation included confidence and optimism, but these seemed overwhelmed by feelings of defensiveness, resentfulness, concern, fear, and bewilderment. Despite these feelings and the previously referred to lack of trust, following the evaluation this teacher was strongly motivated to reflect on teaching practice and set goals for the next reporting period. Teacher 4J felt renewed and positive, and reviewed any shortfalls for corrective action. Although this teacher did not complain to fellow teachers, Teacher 4J also did not experience increased commitment to the school’s objectives. Notably, the professional development officer was not consulted about training requirements flowing from the evaluation.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

This teacher had completed four days of school/department sponsored, and seven days self-initiated professional development. Teacher 4J enthusiastically welcomed professional development as an opportunity to refresh teaching ideas within modern teaching practice. This teacher felt ownership of professional development, and did not see it as an opportunity to get a break from class.

Teacher 4J appears to have misunderstood the question about professional development being laid down in accordance with school goals, as there was no response rating, but it was overwritten with the phrase ‘only 3 or 4 days’. Objectives were set by the faculty and individual teachers, and these were reported back up the system to ensure consistency and economy within the organisation. Individual objectives were submitted for review and approval by the professional development officer. Teacher 4J’s supervisor did not assist with the development of individual professional development objectives. Thereafter Teacher 4J based event selections on a review of her annual training requirements, and the interesting options that appeared each year. Missing the maximum number of classes, or seeking the least strenuous option were both strongly denied.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development in the past year had improved Teacher 4J’s knowledge of subject area, and instructional techniques in the classroom. These were validated to the school either by a verbal report, or a short note on the school’s professional development form. Teacher 4J’s supervisor objectively discussed the professional development to ensure that it met this teacher’s needs. The school actively sought to determine the impact of this teacher’s
professional development on student outcomes, and the evaluations clearly addressed this issue instead of merely listing activities. However, the professional development staff did not follow up after each training event to determine application of the new knowledge and skills. Teacher 4J appears not to have considered such follow up as this question was overwritten ‘big brother!’ Professional development did not occur in isolation, but was an obvious contributor to school goals, that made Teacher 4J feel a member of a community of continuing learners.

School Professional Development Practices
Teacher 4J considered professional development in this school to be efficient and responsive, well managed and dynamic, and clearly directed to enhancing pedagogical standards at both the individual and collective level. It met individual teacher’s needs and satisfied their pedagogical, personal, and organisational requirements. However, Teacher 4J doubted the connection with evaluation was such that professional development could respond to identified pedagogical shortfalls. The absence of such a connection also limited the ability of teachers to review their development as professionals.

Whilst professional development in this school consisted of all of the suggested forms, including mentoring and opportunities for reflection, Teacher 4J did not judge that there was a sufficient range of activities based on each teacher’s learning needs. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, and was judged by this teacher as stimulating, well directed, and a major force for change in the school. These certainly were neither fanfare events, nor opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations
Teacher 4J saw the school as regularly analysing good teaching practice and supportive of dialogue across grades and subjects, although this was annotated ‘Time!’ The school encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in new ways, to be agents of change, and to adopt new initiatives in the classroom. It also supported parental feedback on teaching standards. However, Teacher 4J felt that the school did not model and reward good teaching styles regardless of seniority, or appreciate the positive aspects of older teaching styles.

Teacher 4J had a positive individual perspective, as one who was reflective with high personal expectations, open to discussion and trying new teaching approaches. This teacher valued being with the students and sought to understand them rather than just load content. Whilst open to change, Teacher 4J maintained some doubts about imposed educational changes. Teacher 4J
strongly desired greater opportunities to work collegially with fellow practitioners, to be able to
acknowledge both strengths and weaknesses in teaching, and to feel that individual pedagogy
was advancing along with educational change. Although this teacher desired formative
evaluation of pedagogy to be removed from institutional assessment, they neither wanted to
feel less isolated, nor for the professional development system to be more responsive to
classroom teaching needs.

Comments on Teacher 4J
Teacher 4J has clearly identified the limitations of the appraisal system and manifests the
suspicions and concerns flowing from the administration owning this evaluation process.
Whilst appreciating the current professional development system, this teacher was aware of
some shortfalls in this area as well. However, Teacher 4J appears reluctant to seek greater
openness because of the absence of an alternative vision that would penetrate the suspicion and
concern that manifested in the responses in this survey. Against such possibly suppressed
negative perceptions, the introduction of reflective evaluation and professional development
focused on greater disclosure of teaching practice and the remediation of individual classroom
pedagogy, may threaten a level of exposure for which this teacher may be unprepared,
evidenced by a reluctance to reduce classroom isolation. Indeed, too rapid and radical change
would trigger the expressed concern of ‘big brother’ taking over. Undoubtedly, the first step for
Teacher 4J would be to assume ownership of the means to remediate individual pedagogy in
order to identify the types of activities that are needed.

Teacher 4K – Distrustful of bureaucratic evaluation
Teacher 4K was a 51-55 year old permanent full time female Advanced Skills Teacher (AST1)
who had been teaching for over thirty years, 15-20 of them at this school. She had completed
no post-graduate study.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation
This teacher had frequently experienced evaluation, including in the current year, for the
purposes of both tenure and teaching practice, as well as in response to specific promotion
needs. These experiences, as well as specific professional development, made Teacher 4K feel
that she had a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in the school.
Inputs to Evaluation

All forms of input were included, and these covered most of the Danielson (1996) list. The exceptions were: knowledge of students, selection of instructional goals, knowledge of resources, design of coherent instruction, and questioning and feedback techniques.

Management of Evaluation

Although she felt that personality issues did not intrude and that the full range of her pedagogy was covered in the evaluation, Teacher 4K lacked trust in the evaluation process and doubted the teaching capabilities of her evaluator. The inputs from the various sources were not reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective, and differences in assessments were not examined in detail. Issues of concern to her in teaching or school procedures were glossed over. This teacher also was unable to verify that her evaluator had been trained to conduct the process.

Teacher 4K considered that evaluation supported school objectives and affected her teaching practice in a positive way, but she did not see it as improving teaching overall in the school or enhancing student outcomes. The evaluation process had been reviewed for effectiveness and equity, and was open to staff input, but was the fulfilment of a bureaucratic school function that was owned by the administration and used to enforce compliance. It did not make Teacher 4K feel more a member of the school as a professional community.

Whilst this teacher agreed that evaluation benefited the whole school community, and changed teaching practices for the better, these responses were annotated ‘theoretically’, suggesting that she doubted this outcome in reality. Teacher 4K restated that evaluation reinforced the school hierarchy, and did not see any benefits for herself in career planning.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 4K’s only response to evaluation was ambivalence. Negative responses were denied, and any positive attitudes, such as confidence, optimism, and enthusiasm, were marked Unable to answer, suggesting that they were so low that they weren’t even worth considering in this response. Nonetheless, after the evaluation, this teacher reflected on her practice, reviewed any shortfalls, set goals for the next reporting period, and consulted the professional development officer regarding training requirements. Whilst she did not complain to her peers, or put the evaluation out of her mind, Teacher 4K also did not feel renewed or positive. She neither changed the way she worked to please her supervisor or improve on her outcomes, nor did she feel any increased commitment to the school’s objectives.
Professional Development Motivation & Selection

This teacher had completed 3.25 days (her fractions) of school/department sponsored, and 9.25 self-initiated professional development. She undertook professional development with enthusiasm, seeing it as a key part of modern teaching practice, and an invigorating opportunity to refresh her ideas.

Objectives for the staff were laid down in accordance with school goals. Teacher 4K also set her own objectives based on individual pedagogical need, and without assistance from her supervisor. These were submitted to the professional development officer for review and approval. Faculty group and individual objectives were not developed, and objectives were not reported back up the school system to ensure consistency and economy. Teacher 4K based her professional development selections on a review of her annual training requirements, advice from the school’s professional development officer, and the interesting options that appeared each year. The question on advice from the supervisor was not just denied, but annotated ‘none given’.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development in the past year had improved this teacher’s knowledge of her subject area, and assessment and reporting techniques. These were validated to the school through a short note on the professional development form only. Teacher 4K’s supervisor did not discuss her professional development to determine that it had met her needs, and the school made no effort to follow up the impact of the knowledge or skills on her teaching and student outcomes. Evaluation also failed to clearly examine her professional development and the impact on her teaching, so the heading on the evaluation form merely listed her activities. Nonetheless, Teacher 4K did not see professional development as occurring in isolation. It remained an obvious contributor to organisational change, and made her feel an ongoing learner within the professional educational school environment.

School Professional Development Practices

Teacher 4K did not see professional development in her school as a token gesture. It was efficient and responsive, well managed, and responsive to individual pedagogical, personal, and organisational needs with an appropriate mix of training. It enhanced collective pedagogy, and made this teacher feel she was constantly developing her practice. Although Teacher 4K considered professional development was clearly connected to the evaluation system and
responded to identified shortfalls, she denied that it was a key input to evaluation so that she could see how she was developing as a professional.

Professional development in this school consisted of all forms, including mentoring and opportunities for reflection on teaching. Whole school events were regularly conducted, generally stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change in the school. However, Teacher 4K also felt they were fanfare events with few outcomes, other than hierarchical self-promotion.

**School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations**

Teacher 4K had a reasonably negative view of her school which, although encouraging cross grade and subject dialogue, was made up of conflicting cliques. It did not encourage teachers to demonstrate their worth in different ways, so Teacher 4K was encouraged neither to adopt new initiatives in the classroom, nor be an active agent of change. The culture was not so collaborative as to allow this teacher to generally share failure as well as success; she noted ‘only within immediate section’. The school did not analyse good teaching, or reward it, regardless of seniority. Parental feedback on teaching standards was not encouraged.

As an individual, Teacher 4K set high personal expectations and perceived herself as reflective, child centred, and open to discuss her teaching with colleagues. She sometimes doubted the validity of educational change she was asked to introduce, so did not support them all. In her aspirations, this teacher was supportive of enhancing collegial interaction and the more open discussion of pedagogy, including mistakes as well as successes. Teacher 4K also wished to better comprehend change and to feel that her practice was improving along with educational advances. She supported the separation of formative evaluation of her pedagogy from assessments of her as an institutional member. However, the area between *Agree* and *Disagree* was circled on questions of reducing isolation and making the professional development system more responsive to individual classroom teaching needs. This suggests that Teacher 4K may have been suspicious of the motivations behind such suggested change, or been unable to conceptualise a different environment where such changes could occur to her benefit.

**Comments on Teacher 4K**

Teacher 4K appeared to recognise the bureaucratic purpose of her school’s current appraisal system, but to be sufficiently self-controlled as to derive some benefit within parameters of her own choosing. Her emotional response of ambivalence initially suggests a withdrawal posture,
but the actions subsequent to the evaluation demonstrate some reflective and remedial efforts, whilst avoiding notice by the administration. It is probable that Teacher 4K appreciates some positive pedagogical outcomes from the organisational imposition and control of the appraisal process, and she participates on that basis, in the absence of any alternative mechanism. Similarly, this teacher appears aware that the total absence of any effort to validate professional development outcomes means that the efforts of both it and evaluation are directed to other than the improvement of student learning.

From the survey alone, it is difficult to determine if Teacher 4K is a cynic manifesting some withdrawal behaviours, or else a teacher who is operating largely independent of the current system in a somewhat self-reflective condition. Unfortunately, there is no evidence in the form of post-graduate learning, for example, that would indicate individual independent efforts to move beyond the limitations of the current school processes. This would appear to have directed her to compliance behaviours, manifested by ambivalence, rather than anger at the shortfalls of the current situation. Given her experiences, it is probable that Teacher 4K would be suspicious of any new evaluation regime, particularly if initiated or sold by the administration. Furthermore, if stage theory is invoked, then this teacher might not see huge benefits from changing at this phase of her teaching life, and the effect of major evaluative change might also generate a negative reaction purely because of her age and established position in the organisation.

**Teacher 4L – Evaluation distrusted**

Teacher 4L was a 26-30 year old permanent full time male classroom teacher who had been teaching 4-5 years, 1-3 of those at this school. He had undertaken no post-graduate study.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

Teacher 4L had experienced evaluation frequently, including within the past four years, for tenure and teaching practice. He had received specific professional development on the evaluation process, and claimed a strong knowledge of its application in his school.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

The inputs to evaluation were self-evaluation and student questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation. These incorporated the full Danielson (1996) list as mandated elements.
Management of Evaluation

The evaluation covered the full range of Teacher 4L’s pedagogy and teaching skill. Inputs for the evaluation were reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective, and accurately reflected in the report and interview. However, this teacher lacked trust in the evaluation process, did not have a high level of confidence in his evaluator, and felt that the procedures for redress were unclear or ambiguous. Issues that concerned him in teaching and school procedures were glossed over. Teacher 4L was unable to comment as to the quality of his evaluator’s teaching, or whether the evaluator had been trained to conduct the process.

This teacher perceived that evaluation supported school objectives, enhanced both individual and collective pedagogy, and made him feel a member of the professional community of the school. The process judged the skills of professionals, was open to staff input, and had been reviewed for equity and effectiveness. Nevertheless, it represented the fulfilment of a bureaucratic function that was owned by the administration and not teachers, and was used by superiors to enforce compliance. Evaluation benefited the whole school, and enhanced the professionalism of teaching this school. However, it did not change teaching practices for the better, failed to improve Teacher 4L’s individual pedagogy, and reinforced the school hierarchy. Evaluation did not fulfil a useful communicative function or support teacher career planning or management.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 4L’s emotional response to evaluation was a combination of confidence and defensiveness. Following the evaluation, this teacher reflected on his practice, reviewed any shortfalls, and set goals for the next reporting period. However, he did not change his work levels, and remembered the negatives. He never discussed the consequent training requirements with the professional development officer.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

This teacher had completed four days each of school/department sponsored and self initiated professional development. He welcomed it with enthusiasm as an invigorating part of modern teaching practice that gave him an opportunity to refresh his outlook. He felt ownership of professional development and denied that it was a good opportunity to get out of class. Neither the school nor the faculty set higher professional development objectives. Teacher 4L decided his professional development objectives based on individual needs, and without the advice of his supervisor. These were submitted for review and approval to the professional development
officer, and then reported back up the school system to ensure economy and consistency. Teacher 4L based his professional development selections on what interesting options appeared each year, and finding something that was likely to be fun.

Professional Development Outcomes
Professional development over the previous year had improved this teacher’s professional subject knowledge and classroom instructional techniques. This was validated to the school through a short note on the school’s professional development form only. The school made no effort to determine the impact of Teacher 4L’s professional development on his teaching, or the effect on his student’s learning outcomes. The evaluations also did not examine professional development outcomes. Nevertheless, Teacher 4L did not see professional development as an isolated process. He considered it was an obvious contributor to organisational change, and it made him feel a member of a community of continuous learners.

School Professional Development Practices
Teacher 4L saw professional development in his school as efficient and responsive, well managed and dynamic, and responsive to teachers’ individual needs with an appropriate mix of pedagogical, personal, and organisational training. However, professional development was weakly connected to evaluation and did not respond to identified pedagogical shortfalls. This also hampered a good understanding of his development as a professional.

Professional development in the school was of all forms, including mentoring and opportunities for reflection. Whole school events were neither regularly conducted, nor a major force for change in the school. Although Teacher 4L thought they were generally stimulating and well directed, he also considered them opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations
Teacher 4L identified his school as a collaborative culture, which encouraged dialogue and the sharing of failure as well as success. It modelled and rewarded good teaching regardless of seniority, and encouraged staff to adopt new initiatives and demonstrate their worth in different ways. However, it neither analysed regularly what was good teaching practice, nor welcomed parental feedback on teaching standards. Additionally, the school was made up of conflicting cliques, and failed to actively mobilize this teacher as an agent of change.
As an individual, Teacher 4L felt that he was a child centred reflective practitioner who had high personal standards, and was open to discuss his classroom performance with his colleagues. Whilst open to trying new teaching approaches, he did not try to embrace all changes. This teacher agreed with all of the aspirations put forward in the survey. He sought to reduce isolation and increase collaboration, and to subject both his strong points and weaknesses to sensitive scrutiny by his colleagues. In addition to having formative evaluation of his teaching separated from institutional appraisal, he also wished the professional development system to be more responsive to his classroom teaching needs. A greater understanding of changes would also help him to feel that his pedagogy was developing as part of educational developments.

Comments on Teacher 4L
Teacher 4L was relatively new to his career and, whilst his school has many positive values, it had neither established in him a confidence in the evaluation system, nor an understanding of how it could be connected to the professional development process. Consequently, this teacher sees appraisal from Pusey’s (1976) perspective, something owned and manipulated by the organisation and threatening to the individual, even if it does generate some positive outcomes for teaching practice in the school. Its failure to penetrate individual pedagogy, or act as a conduit for communications, suggests that Teacher 4L has already erected defensive barriers which ultimately will hinder his own practice as the barriers themselves remain the endpoint, rather than the enhancement of teaching. The failure of the system to associate evaluation with professional development through effective validation processes means that Teacher 4L has already fallen into seeing professional development selection as based on interest and fun rather than professional pedagogical need. Whilst he maintains a positive view of the learning itself, the outcomes must be called into question since the basis for his choices are flawed and unlikely to be directed towards this teacher’s best professional interest. Even more significant is that, if the attitudes and perspectives reflected by Teacher 4L are ingrained early in a career, suspicion and bad habit might well combine to hinder any proposed change in perspective and practice. Thus, current appraisal practices may in effect be continually sowing the seeds of the future ineffectiveness of other evaluation processes.

Teacher 4M – Participating in a bureaucratic process
Teacher 4M was a 61-65 year old permanent full time male classroom teacher who had been teaching for 15-20 years, 11-15 of them at this school. This teacher had a Masters Degree,
making him one of the few teachers with post-graduate qualifications. He did not complete all questions in detail, so the responses in some sections remain brief.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**
Teacher 4M had been evaluated within the past four years, but the purposes were listed as tenure only.

**Inputs to Evaluation**
The mandatory areas for the evaluation were identified as knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of resources, establishment of respect and rapport, engagement of students in learning, self-reflection in teaching, maintenance of records, communication with families, contribution to school an professional community, and professional development. All other elements in the Danielson (1996) derived list were marked *Unable to answer*. The means for collection of such information was problematical, as Teacher 4M disagreed with all of the input methods.

**Management of Evaluation**
This teacher had a high level of confidence in his evaluator, who was well trained, and as good a teacher. The full range of Teacher 4M’s pedagogy was covered, inputs were very accurately reflected in the report and interview, and no areas of pedagogical or organisational concern were overlooked. Consequently, this teacher strongly agreed to having complete trust in the evaluation process, the redress procedures for which were clear and unambiguous.

Teacher 4M considered that evaluation in his school positively supported school objectives. It was open to staff input, and was not used to reinforce power relationships. Nevertheless, it represented the fulfilment of a bureaucratic school function, and had little effect on the enhancement of student outcomes. Although Teacher 4M was then able to disagree with evaluation reinforcing gender imbalances, he was unable to answer any questions on the benefits of evaluation.

**Individual Responses to Evaluation**
Teacher 4M’s sole emotional response to evaluation was confidence. He denied negative emotions, such as anger and resentfulness, more than positives, such as enthusiasm and optimism. Following the evaluation, this teacher felt renewed and positive. He denied negative responses, such as complaining to peers, or keeping a low profile, and also did not discuss his
needs with the professional development officer. However, he was unable to attest to any constructive action, such as reflecting on his practice, or setting goals for the next reporting period.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
This teacher had completed four days of school-sponsored, and ‘10(+)’ days of self-initiated professional development, representing the highest self-initiated level in the case study. Teacher 4M considered professional development to be a key part of modern teaching practice, and he selected useful courses. He exclusively set his objectives based on his individual needs, and these were submitted to the professional development officer for review and approval. Thereafter, he made his choices from interesting options each year.

Professional Development Outcomes
Teacher 4M’s professional development had improved his subject area knowledge alone. This was validated to the school in a detailed evaluation sheet. Any other form of evaluation or school follow-up was left blank. The only response noted was that the professional development heading on this teacher’s evaluation form merely listed activities. Nonetheless, professional development made Teacher 4M feel he was on a journey of lifelong learning.

School Professional Development Practices
This teacher saw professional development as responsive to his individual needs. It was made up of a broad range of activities based on each teacher’s learning needs, and covered most professional development forms. Internal mentoring and reflection on teaching were not answered, so they may not occur. Whole school professional development was seen as made up of boring fanfare events that achieved few concrete outcomes, but helped enrich consultants. They also very much took Teacher 4M away from the real business of teaching.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations
The only response noted in the school perception area was that it encouraged cross-grade and cross-curricular dialogue. As an individual, Teacher 4M strongly identified himself as a child-centred reflective teacher who had high personal expectations, and tried very hard to understand his students and not just load them with content. He considered himself as open in discussing the classroom and to trying new teaching approaches as he attempted to incorporate changes, the sense of which he sometimes doubted. In the aspirations area, Teacher 4M most wanted the good things in his teaching to be explicitly acknowledged, and to be able to
acknowledge and share mistakes in implementing curricular change. This teacher also desired increased honest and open collegiality, to better understand changes he was asked to implement, and for the professional development system to be more responsive to his classroom needs.

**Comments on Teacher 4M**

The major difficulty with deducing Teacher 4M’s attitudes was the high volume of missing responses. Nonetheless, those that were answered raise questions about the effectiveness of both the evaluation and professional development systems. The negative responses on the inputs, and the identification of evaluation as bureaucratic function, suggest that Teacher 4M does not utilise the existing evaluation process to enhance his teaching. He appears reasonably successful as the emotional responses are not negative, but this success appears to be one of participation rather than fully engagement in a reflective process. *Unable to answer* responses on such key issues as personality versus skills, the reinforcement of power relationships, and ownership, indicate that Teacher 4M either was very poorly informed, or had failed to sufficiently analyse the evaluation process to vouch an opinion. This put him very much at odds with all other survey responders who had views on these critical issues of evaluation. Similarly in the professional development area, Teacher 4M identified himself as the only source of objectives and acknowledged the absence of any connection to evaluation, one of the few responses actually filled in. Certainly whole school professional development falls on unresponsive ears in this case.

Whilst Teacher 4M identified himself as keen to work collegially, and sought greater openness in the implementation of change, the absence of a comment on both reduced isolation and greater formative evaluation of teaching are perhaps indicative. Along with other responses they suggest that Teacher 4M was a very independent, and perhaps, isolated teacher. He may have participated in, but did not appear to consciously and actively engage with, either the evaluation or professional development processes in the school. This does not mean that he was not reflective, or that he was not continually enhancing his teaching. Rather, the high level of individual initiated professional development, as well as post-graduate study suggest that he has turned his attention outwards to satisfy needs currently unfulfilled in the school. However, in failing to engage with his peers or his students through questionnaires, Teacher 4M may have cut himself off from those who are closest and potentially the most supportive in helping develop his teaching skills. The consequent intellectual isolation that Teacher 4M could enhance his knowledge, but it might not translate effectively to the classroom where it matters
most. The purpose of the post-graduate study and his increased knowledge may thus be invalidated.

**Teacher 4N – Fearful of bureaucratic evaluation**

Teacher 4N was a 46-50 year old permanent full time Advanced Skills Teacher (AST3) who had been teaching for 26-30 years, 4-5 of them at this school. She had both an additional graduate diploma as well as a Masters degree.

**Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation**

This teacher had experienced formal evaluation frequently, including within the past four years. She had acted as an evaluator and claimed a strong knowledge of the process in her school. She had not received specific professional development on evaluation, and the question on training in evaluative techniques was unanswered. The reasons for this teacher’s evaluations were tenure, teaching practice, her advanced skills grading, and for promotion to a leadership position.

**Inputs to Evaluation**

The inputs to Teacher 4N’s evaluations consisted of self-evaluation and student questionnaires, peer input, classroom observation, and examination of teaching documentation. The mandated elements covered around half of the Danielson (1996) list. Those elements not covered included knowledge of resources, management of student behaviour, questioning and discussion techniques, clear and accurate communication, provision of feedback to students, and communication with families.

**Management of Evaluation**

Teacher 4N had a high level of confidence in her evaluator, whom she felt was as good a teacher. The inputs into the evaluation were accurately represented and reported, and differences in assessment were examined in detail and reconciled. The full range of her teaching skills were covered, and matters of pedagogical or organisational concern were not overlooked. The procedures for redress were also clear and unambiguous. However, despite these positives, Teacher 4N did not think her evaluator was well trained to conduct the evaluations, and felt that personality issues intruded. She also lacked complete trust in the evaluation process.
Evaluation made Teacher 4N feel a part of the professional community of the school, and enhanced teaching practice. It had been reviewed for effectiveness and equity, was open to staff input, and was certainly not a tool for the reinforcement of power relationships. Staff members were treated as professionals, and evaluation judged skills rather than personalities. Nevertheless, Teacher 4N considered evaluation was the fulfilment of a bureaucratic function that was owned by the administration and not teachers. Whilst it might enhance some student outcomes, it did not affect her teaching in a positive way, and failed to positively support school objectives.

Teacher 4N acknowledged that evaluation benefited the school and the students, enhanced individual and collective teaching practices, and acted as a valuable communication medium for teacher career planning. However, whilst it enhanced the professionalism of the school, it also reinforced the hierarchy. Also Teacher 4N did not see evaluation as benefiting her, and it did not make her feel more a part of the organisation.

Individual Responses to Evaluation
This teacher’s responses to evaluation were fear and concern only. After the evaluation Teacher 4N primarily reflected on her practice and reviewed the shortfalls for corrective action. She set goals for the next reporting period and discussed her needs with the professional development officer. However, she also remembered the negatives and complained to her peers. She certainly did not feel renewed and positive, increasingly committed to school objectives, or motivated to pursue promotion.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
Teacher 4N had completed four days school/department sponsored, and three days self-initiated, professional development over the previous twelve months. She had a feeling of ownership of her professional development, which she pursued with enthusiasm as a key part of modern teaching practice that refreshed her ideas and outlook. It was most definitely more than just a break from class.

Professional development objectives were not laid down for the staff each year by the school, but were developed by the faculty and individuals in consultation with supervisors. Objectives were submitted to the professional development officer for review and approval, and these were then reconciled to ensure consistency and economy within the school. Teacher 4N made her activity selections based on what interesting options appeared, and advice from her
supervisor. This teacher strongly denied trying to miss the most number of classes, or avoiding the use of her own time.

**Professional Development Outcomes**

Professional development had improved Teacher 4N’s knowledge of her subject area, assessment and reporting, and classroom instructional and management techniques. These were validated back to the school through a verbal report to the faculty, and a short note on the professional development form. Whilst Teacher 4N’s supervisor discussed the professional development to see that it met her needs, the school made absolutely no other efforts to determine the impact of the professional development on her teaching or student learning outcomes. The evaluation also did not examine the impact of professional development, although Teacher 4N thought that the space on the evaluation form did more than just list activities. Professional development made Teacher 4N feel that she was on a journey of continuing learning within the educational community of the school. However, she did not see it as an obvious contributor to change and an additional impetus to her learning.

**School Professional Development Practices**

Professional development in this school was perceived by Teacher 4N as efficient and responsive, and well managed and dynamic. It consisted of an appropriate mix of training that met diverse individual needs and made her feel part of a professional learning community. However, the connection to evaluation was poor, so that professional development did not respond to pedagogical shortfalls. As a consequence, Teacher 4N found that professional development and evaluation did not combine to illuminate her progression as a professional.

Professional development was made up of a broad range of activities based on teachers’ learning needs. Internal mentoring was conducted, but there were no opportunities for reflection on teaching. Whole school events were regularly conducted, were stimulating and well directed, and a major force for change. Teacher 4N did not see them as either ineffectual fanfare events, or opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion.

**School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations**

Teacher 4N considered her school to be a collaborative culture, which encouraged broad dialogue and supported teachers demonstrating their worth in different ways. However, this teacher did not feel that she was mobilized actively as an agent of change, or encouraged to adopt new initiatives in her classroom. The school failed to model good teaching, regardless of
seniority, or regularly analyse good practice. Parental feedback on teaching standards was not encouraged. As an individual, Teacher 4N most strongly asserted that she tried to understand students rather than just load them with content. Beyond that, she felt that she was a student centred and reflective practitioner, who maintained high personal expectations, and was always trying new teaching approaches. Whilst Teacher 4N felt she was open to change, she doubted some of the changes she was asked to introduce.

In her aspirations, Teacher 4N sought greater collegiality with fellow teachers, and more opportunities to share the positive and negative aspects of her practice, particularly that associated with educational change. She wanted the very good things in her teaching to be acknowledged, and to feel that her practice was advancing and improving along with educational change. Nevertheless, Teacher 4N did not seek to more openly discuss her classroom teaching with colleagues, or to feel less isolated in the classroom. She did not wish formative evaluation of her teaching to be separated from institutional appraisal, or for the professional development structure to be more responsive to her classroom needs.

Comments on Teacher 4N
Teacher 4N appeared to mistrust evaluation, and acknowledge the shortfalls of professional development in her school, and yet be reluctant to open her teaching to the collegial reflective practices that might redress both issues. This apparent contradiction could be explained by her perception that neither the evaluation, nor professional development in this school permeated the fundamentals of classroom teaching and student learning. Evaluation is perceived as a bureaucratic function that generates fear only. The impact of professional development in the classroom is neither determined nor directed back to the evaluation process, and thus the professional development itself may be undermined. The failure to analyse and model good teaching in the school may also reinforce these feelings. Consequently, Teacher 4N appeared not to connect her classroom with the organisational processes occurring beyond it. Her reluctance to reduce isolation, and open her classroom to greater collegial penetration and formative evaluation, may illustrate this consequence. Given her established emotional responses to evaluation of fear and concern, this very experienced and well-qualified teacher may need some significant support and encouragement to adopt new professional practices that might rectify her concerns and the failings of the present system. Once again, the case of Teacher 4N illustrates that current appraisal and professional development practices may be working against the development of reflective professional practices by focussing on other than the enhancement of student learning.
Teacher 4O – Damaged and angry

Teacher 4O was a 26-30 year old male full time contract teacher who had been teaching 4-5 years, 1-3 of those at this school. He had completed no post-graduate studies.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation

This teacher had frequently experienced formal evaluation as a teacher, and in other career situations. He had been evaluated in the year of the survey, and claimed a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in his school, despite having had no professional development on the process.

Inputs to Evaluation

The inputs to evaluation consisted of self-evaluation as well as student questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation. These covered the majority of the Danielson (1996) list as mandated elements. Exceptions were: establishment of a culture of learning, management of student behaviour, organisation of physical space, questioning and discussion techniques, and communication with families.

Management of Evaluation

Teacher 4O was extremely negative about evaluations in his school, and he had absolutely no trust in the system where the most significant element was the intrusion of personality issues. He denied confidence in the qualifications and educational skills of his evaluator. The interview and report failed to reflect inputs accurately, did not cover the full range of his pedagogy, and overlooked his concerns with pedagogy or school procedure. The procedures for redress were either unclear or ambiguous.

Evaluation was identified as primarily a means to enforce compliance and reinforce power relationships through judging the personalities of teachers as employees. The process was completely owned by the administration with no input from staff. It had not been reviewed for effectiveness and equity and was nothing other than the fulfilment of a bureaucratic function. The evaluation failed to support school objectives and had zero impact on the enhancement of student outcomes. Because it represented nothing other than a tool for the reinforcement of hierarchical power, it benefited no-one in the school community, did not act as a conduit for teacher communication, and alienated this teacher from the organisation.
Individual Responses to Evaluation
Teacher 4O’s emotional responses to evaluation were primarily anger, defensiveness, resentfulness, suspicion, and fear, followed by concern and apathy. Not surprisingly, this teacher remembered the negatives, kept a low profile, complained to his peers, and tried to forget it until next time. Teacher 4O certainly did not feel renewed or positive, or more committed to the school’s objectives. However, he still reflected on his practice.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection
Teacher 4O had completed five days of school/department sponsored, and one self-initiated day of professional development. He felt no ownership of professional development that he completed merely as an award requirement. He neither welcomed it as an invigorating opportunity to refresh his ideas as part of modern teaching practice, nor steered it to promotion needs. However, he also denied it was a good break from class.

Professional development objectives were set for the staff in line with school goals. These were then translated into faculty and individual objectives, the latter in consultation with his supervisor. These objectives were submitted for review and approval by the professional development officer, and these were then reported back up the system to ensure economy and consistency within the organisation. Thereafter, Teacher 4O based his selections on a broad range of factors. He reviewed his annual training requirements, and took advice from his supervisor and the professional development officer. He also sought fun and easy activities from the interesting options that appeared each year. Although this teacher did not attempt to miss the maximum classes, he avoided use of his own time.

Professional Development Outcomes
Professional development in the previous twelve months had improved Teacher 4O’s pedagogy in the area of assessment and reporting alone. This was validated to the school by a verbal report to the faculty and a short note on the school’s professional development form. The supervisor did not discuss the professional development to see that it met his needs, and the school made no attempt to determine the impact of it on his teaching or student learning. This left the heading on Teacher 4O’s evaluation form as merely a place for listing activities. Whilst professional development was an obvious contributor to organisational change and was an impetus to his learning, Teacher 4O had no feeling of being a continual learner within an educational community.
School Professional Development Practices

Whilst he disagreed that it was a token gesture, Teacher 4N primarily viewed professional development as inefficient and unresponsive. It was poorly managed, not responsive to teachers’ needs, and lacked an appropriate mix of training to meet Teacher 4N’s pedagogical, personal, and educational requirements. Professional development was not directed to enhancing the pedagogy of teachers. It was disconnected from the evaluation system and did not respond to identified pedagogical shortfalls.

Professional development in this school covered most forms, including internal mentoring, but lacked opportunities for reflection on teaching. It also lacked a broad range of activities based on each teacher’s learning needs. Whole school professional development events were regularly held and a major force for change in the school, but Teacher 4O saw them as completely boring fanfare events that achieved not concrete outcomes, and were pure opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion. They were poorly directed and removed him from the more important task of teaching.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Despite so many negative comments about evaluation and professional development, Teacher 4O commented positively about his school. He saw it as an organisation that encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in different ways, and supported teachers as agents of change in the incorporation of new classroom initiatives. It was a collaborative culture that encouraged broad dialogue, and where good teaching practices were regularly analysed and modelled. Nonetheless, the school was made up of conflicting cliques, and did not appreciate the positive aspects of older teaching styles. Parental feedback on teaching standards was not encouraged.

As an individual, Teacher 4O’s strongest motivation was towards being with the students. He saw himself as a reflective teacher with high personal expectations, and willing to share his practice openly with colleagues. Whilst open to new teaching approaches, he did not try to embrace every change. This teacher aspired to further open collegiality with his colleagues, and to share and acknowledge both successes and failures. He sought to have formative evaluation separated from institutional appraisal of him (for obvious reasons) and for the professional development system to be more responsive to his classroom needs. Interestingly, Teacher 4O did not wish to feel less isolated in the classroom or to feel that his teaching was improving with educational change.
Teacher 4O was also one of the few survey respondents to write an additional comment. He noted:

While many of my comments reflect a negative attitude towards professional development and educational change, this stems from frequent experiences of poorly constructed/targeted professional development with little practical benefit. Similarly, I am resistant to change for the sake of change but I welcome new ideas/approaches when they fix a problem, bring freshness to the classroom, or provide some other practical benefit to the school.

Comments on Teacher 4O
Teacher 4O’s strongly negative responses stand out as being against the general stream of other surveys from this school. In the absence of the content of his evaluations, this research was unable to determine whether the criticisms levelled at him were based on pedagogical shortfalls or difficulties with the institution. This in itself is a significant difficulty in an appraisal structure where it cannot actually determined whether the fault is with the subject’s teaching, the institution itself, or the evaluator, who is clearly seen as having based judgements on personality and not professional practice. The consequence of Teacher 4O’s experience is that he clearly will continue to be openly hostile and defensive to evaluation that is embedded in the hierarchy, and which fails to clearly demonstrate a commitment to the real objective of learning. In the interim, anything less would make his evaluations worthless from a pedagogical enhancement viewpoint, because he will either develop improved conformity behaviours or continue to rage against the current system to the point where he leaves the school or the profession.

Similarly, Teacher 4O already has a very cynical view of professional development for one still relatively new to the profession. He simply does not see the current system as relevant, and this is no doubt the reason behind a very low rate of self-initiated participation. The failure to establish a clear connection to the evaluation system, or validate the impact of Teacher 4O’s learning on his practice and student outcomes, means that the motivational framework for self-development appears not to have been established. Indeed, Teacher 4O is in a quandary. He feels that the evaluation system is attacking his personality and his position as an institution member, and that makes him closed to any suggestions or recommendations resulting from it. This would undermine his motivation for professional development. Shortfalls in professional
development validation mean that areas for improvement or further learning are not identified, and these cannot be fed into the evaluation, because the connection between the two is poor. Consequently, useful pedagogical enhancement information is not available to Teacher 4O in his evaluation, allowing a focus on other aspects, such as institutional conformity. Clearly, both evaluation and professional development needs to be redirected to the enhancement of pedagogy.

Discussion of Teacher Surveys

Evaluation

It was immediately noticeable from the surveys that evaluation has been practised reasonably effectively in School 4 for purposes other than advancement. Evaluation for tenure and teaching practice, even in an appraisal format should touch on classroom performance to some extent, so, in that sense, some form of focus on teaching practice would seem inevitable. Most of the teachers claimed a strong understanding of the appraisal system and there was clearly training to support this, although such training appears not to have been universal or sufficiently regular. The fact that Teacher 4O, the most negative of all respondents from this school, asserted that he had not received training raises issues of equity in the judging teachers’ performance without a full disclosure of the requirements and expectations against which their performance was to be measured. Conversely, Teachers 4C, 4D, and 4F, who survived the evaluation in the absence of professional development, achieved positive outcomes and thus were happy to express satisfaction.

The teachers in this school can be broken into four basic groups: those who were satisfied with evaluation (4D, 4F, 4G, and 4H), those who were generally happy but saw that evaluation did not affect pedagogy (4C, 4I, and 4M), those who saw evaluation as essentially a bureaucratic game of power and control (4B, 4J, 4K, 4L, 4N, and 4O), and a confused group (4A, and 4E). Despite these groupings, most of the respondents clearly identified the hierarchy or administration as owning the appraisal process. If one looks at the emotional responses in broad terms, there are similarly four groups: the optimistic (4C, 4D, 4F, 4G, 4M), those with mixed feelings (4H, 4B, 4I, 4J, 4L), the ambivalent or apathetic (4A, and 4K), and the defensive, fearful, and angry group (4E, 4N, 4O). There appears to be a broad correlation between the perceptions of ownership and satisfaction, with negative feelings associated with teacher suspicion of the formal bureaucratic level of the school directing the evaluation for its own purposes. This does not mean that positives cannot flow from the process, and a number of the
teachers, such as 4A, 4C, and 4D, saw evaluation as reinforcing school objectives and benefiting the school community.

On a procedural level, whilst some respondents (4E, 4F, 4H, 4I, 4N, and most notably Teacher 4O) saw personality issues as intruding, or doubted the capabilities of their evaluator (4K and 4L), there seemed to be a genuine effort in this school to be reasonably objective and thorough in the application of the appraisal process. However, the fact that it was hierarchically based and conducted by a superior meant that the evaluation was unlikely to be a free and open discussion of pedagogy, as indicated by Teacher 4B. Furthermore, given the nature of hierarchical power in school organisations, and the existence of personal differences between teachers, the potential for subjective issues to permeate the process also appears high. Teacher 4O may have had a significant personality clash with his supervisor that was then translated into appraisal failure and his consequent anger. Clearly, where the hierarchy owns evaluation, it will involve accountability and focus on adherence to organisational norms, perhaps ahead of classroom teaching and learning. It is for this reason that even satisfied teachers acknowledged the lack of impact on individual pedagogy and student outcomes.

Few of the surveys in School 4 came from teachers in senior positions, those responsible for conducting the appraisal process in this school, particularly in light of the general feeling amongst the respondent subordinates that their evaluation system basically supported the hierarchy in the fulfilment of a bureaucratic function. If we assume that these senior personnel were subject to the same form of evaluation, there should be no reason for responses not to have come from a broader cross section of the staff. Indeed, as practising teachers, hierarchy members should equally be motivated towards improvements in pedagogy. One might speculate that the lack of response from the evaluators themselves may indicate that they already saw the appraisal system as meeting the needs of the organisation. Such a perception of satisfaction would flow from the absence of open dissent from teachers whose primary objective was to survive the evaluation through manifesting organisationally appropriate behaviours. The consequent conformity and compliance looks like success, but remains superficial. Underneath there is satisfaction at meeting organisational needs (Teachers 4C and 4D), confusion (Teacher 4A), withdrawal (Teacher 4M), and hostility (Teacher 4O).

In addition, what cannot be deduced from surveys alone is whether the success perceived by the satisfied group of teachers is due to a proper objective evaluation. In a similar process to Elmore’s (2000) “loose coupling” at the school level, supervisors in some cases may have a
greater affinity with their teachers and thus shield the subordinate levels from the power of senior management. In such a situation, successful evaluation would involve the department head as supervisor rewarding classroom teachers for maintaining a culture of sub-organisational success and unity. The department head then appears to be both efficient and a good leader to the formal management, which may not penetrate the departmental culture. To all intents and purposes, and in the absence of a crisis or external surveillance, the system would appear to be successful, with happy hard working teachers and a positive organisational environment. However, organisational survival and not pedagogy would be the reality. In this scenario, Teacher 4O could have paid the price for not conforming to particular cultural norms, perhaps negating support from his supervisor.

Issues of ownership and purpose in the evaluation when directed at teaching resulted in confusion amongst a number of the respondents. Teachers, such as 4E, appreciated the benefits and positive outcomes from evaluation, but it became difficult for them to distinguish between educational and organisational demands. There was no agreement amongst the respondents of coverage of the Danielson (1996) list of evaluation elements, noting also that the question referred to those mandated in the evaluation. Answers ranged from most (4B, 4D, 4E, 4F, 4G, 4I, 4J, 4K), through to some (4C, 4H, 4M, 4N), to none (4A, 4O). Omission of critical elements of pedagogy in some cases, such as knowledge of content and pedagogy, selection of instructional goals, and design of coherent instruction, coupled with the variation in responses to this question, suggests either that teachers actually did not know what was mandated (after all they don’t have ownership of the process), or else evaluators were able to manipulate the process based on their own perceptions. Whichever the case, the evaluations did not appear to help teachers review their practice in any systematic and thorough fashion. The responses of Teachers 4E, 4F, 4I, 4J, and 4N suggest that, where organisational demands take precedence in an administration owned process, teachers cannot truly benefit in their pedagogy to the extent where it enhances student learning.

The major input methods of self-evaluation, student questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation met the needs of both the organisation and individual on a superficial level. However, the occasional and unusual observation of a lesson has previously been discounted, by research referred to in this study and by student focus groups in other case study schools, as a realistic method of judging teacher performance. Student questionnaires are very useful if students are used to being consulted and open to express honest opinions. Self-evaluations and peer assessments have the limitations of both subjectivity and the impact of classroom
isolation. Nonetheless, they might work in concert if applied properly. However, few teachers in School 4 mentioned the use of professional diaries (4J, 4K) or teaching portfolios (4C, 4G, 4K) that would encourage continuous reflection on teaching itself. If the objectives of the evaluation system in this school were directed to pedagogical rather than organisational needs, one would expect to see greater use of these two tools and indeed coverage of most of the Danielson (1996) list. The rare use of portfolios and diaries, within a process that is primarily owned by the school and not the teachers, supports the impression that reflection on pedagogy was a secondary issue in the evaluation. As for the teachers, conformity to a bureaucratic need was unlikely to spur efforts to expose their teaching further than directed by the laid down procedure.

Despite their concerns or negative emotions, most teachers pursued some form of positive action after the evaluation; they reflected on their practice or consulted the professional development officer. Even Teacher 4O was moved to reflect on his practice in spite of his negative responses. This suggests that evaluation of any form has some positive outcomes in focussing teachers on their practice, and this would place School 4 ahead of those with no evaluation structure. However, the benefits do not appear to follow through to classroom teaching practice or student outcomes because the primary objective for teachers is survival of a process entrenched in Pusey’s (1976) formal dimension. The affective dimension of the classroom remains closed, in spite of classroom observation and student consultation. Indeed, if one combines the confusion over what areas of pedagogy are actually covered, with the perception of many of the respondents that evaluation failed to improve either their teaching or student learning (4B, 4E, 4F, 4H, 4I, 4J, 4K, 4M, 40), we essentially have a statement of the failure of the process in School 4 to systematically affect improvement where it really matters, within teaching practice in classrooms.

**Professional Development**

The most significant factor permeating the professional development responses in School 4 was the absence of any systematic validation of the learning undertaken. Occasionally there were detailed reports (4D, 4E, 4M), but in most cases a verbal report and short note on the school’s professional development form represented the only feedback. Apart from Teacher 4J, no respondent identified professional development staff as following up with teachers to determine if there was any noticeable impact on their teaching or student learning. However, close to half of the supervisors checked with teachers in what appeared to be an informal review (4A, 4B, 4G, 4H, 4I, 4J, 4N). This rate of follow up rate accords almost exactly with the 46.2% in PD
2000 if we accept that such follow up by the supervisor is equivalent to the ‘sometimes’ response in that study. If follow up is defined as a far more comprehensive process, then the School 4 response rate is around 6%, much lower than the PD 2000 figure of 23.9% (McRae et al. 2001, p.9).

Consequent to the absence of validation of professional development, over half of the surveyed teachers saw the connection between their evaluation and professional learning as weak (4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4I, 4K, 4L, 4N, 4O). The evaluation did not clearly lead to professional development requirements, and the outcome of professional development itself did not generate the identification of knowledge gaps requiring further education. Based on this disconnect, one can question the validity of any statements made in these surveys regarding the effectiveness or responsiveness of professional development in this school. Responding teachers identified areas where their pedagogy had improved, but there was no mechanism by which this could be verified objectively. Consequently, these responses look more like subjective opinion, rather than evidence of real outcomes. From the analysis of the state wide survey, such perceived improvement may result from teacher identification of professional development participation, rather than classroom implementation, as improvement. This would accord with the findings of PD 2000, that ‘teachers are interested in “big ideas”, educational trends and new knowledge not immediately applicable in the classroom’ (McRae et al. 2001, p.12).

With evaluation owned by the hierarchy and focussed less on actual pedagogy, the setting of professional development objectives by teachers in School 4 could only be from above, or else based on individual interests. Respondents were split three ways on the question of who set professional development objective. Just over half answered that objectives were set by the school and then translated down to faculty and individual aims (4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4H, 4K, and 4O). Some saw the faculty as the starting point, after which individual objectives were incorporated (4F, 4I, 4J, 4N). The third group stated that objectives were set based on their individual needs alone (4G, 4L, and 4M). Most of the respondents reported their objectives for review and approval by the professional development officer, but only a minority acknowledged reconciliation of the various objectives to ensure economy and efficiency (4A, 4B, 4J, 4L, 4N, and 4O). However, the value of the professional planning process was called into question by just over half of the respondents basing their own professional development choices on the possibility of interesting, and often fun options, suggesting a passive approach based on whim rather than a true professional learning process. Such selection accords with PD 2000, which found that the personal choice from a range of options was the strongest selection
factor (McRae et al. 2001, p.136). Despite this less than professional approach, most of these School 4 teachers considered that professional development contributed to school goals, organisational change, and made them feel part of a community of ongoing learners. Once again, participation and interest in the ‘big ideas’ referred to previously, may be the justification for these teachers’ views, rather than proper selection for classroom outcomes.

Doubts about the worth of whole school professional development were not limited to the angry Teacher 4O. Close to half of the respondents commented on it either being made up of fanfare events, or providing opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion (4A, 4D, 4E, 4K, 4L, 4M, 4O). With whole school events not based on any collective needs analysis (a significant demand at any time if one accepts stage theory) or subjected to any validation, the aims of such training are more likely to be directed to management derived ends rather than teachers’ pedagogical enhancement. Where teachers expressed satisfaction with whole school professional development, this may have reflected again a passive acceptance of delivery by some. Alternatively, such satisfaction may be with well presented information on curricular changes, or compliance or other organisational training, both which figured as significant elements of the professional development offerings reported in PD 2000 (McRae et al 2001, p.9). Meanwhile, most product would be wasted on those staff who perceived whole school events as unnecessary or irrelevant, or were prejudiced about, and suspicious of, hierarchical self-promotion.

School and Individual Perceptions
Teachers in School 4 generally had positive opinions of their institution, with most seeing it as a collaborative culture where teachers were encouraged to demonstrate their worth in various ways and engage in dialogue about their practice. However, Teachers 4A and 4J denied that good teaching practice was analysed and rewarded, and Teachers 4K, 4L, and 4O saw the school as made up of cliques and failing to actively motivate them as agents of change. The problem here is that, even in what may be seen as a good school, the failure to differentiate between the wielding of hierarchical bureaucratic power and the act of teaching undermines the collegiality that is increasingly demanded of modern teaching practice. The motivation of teachers as agents of change in a collaborative framework is not an institutional direction, but a pedagogical imperative. However, the mechanisms that allow this to occur - evaluation and professional development focussed on verified pedagogical outcomes - are currently oriented in this school to the institutional rather than the pedagogical requirement, and may be hindering, instead of supporting, the objective of enhancing and transforming teaching. In this case, those
The purpose of the performance review system was noted as arising:

teachers who responded most positively about their school may have based their opinions not on educational outcomes, but, rather, support for the institution into which they have been socialised. For teachers such as 4F, 4G, and 4H the school was seen as collaborative, positive, and supportive of good teaching. They were successful in their appraisals, and professional development was delivered efficiently. However, they also accepted that their professional development was neither validated nor integrated into the evaluation system. This does not mean that these teachers are necessarily lacking in skill or personal professional application, but their strong acceptance of the status quo may indicate professional complacency that is satisfied to accept adherence to institutional norms above critical reflection on individual professional standards and needs.

The status quo indeed seemed acceptable to most of the teachers in School 4, aside from Teacher 4O, who had more to gain by changes to the current system. There appeared to be no overwhelming demand by the respondents in this school to throw off isolation, separate institutional from pedagogical evaluation, and make professional development more responsive to classroom needs. Certainly Teachers 4C, 4F, 4G, and 4H were not motivated to change as they were successful in the current system, whilst Teacher 4L, who perceived the present system as an enforcement tool, was happy to see everything change. However, others such as Teachers 4B and 4N, who either saw the current appraisal system as ineffectual or distrusted it, were not motivated to separate evaluation of their pedagogy or have a more classroom responsive professional development system. Within the survey group, there appeared to be no indication of teachers willing to assume an independent stance on either evaluation or professional development as professionals in charge of their own destiny. The closest were Teachers 4L and 4O, both males of 26-30 years of age. However, neither was in a power position, and both were relatively new to this school.

**Documentation**

**Evaluation Documentation at the Time of the Survey**

The procedural manual for performance review and evaluation ‘including induction, promotion and re-classification procedures’ in use at the time of the survey of teachers was dated 2003. Although this was the date on the cover, the only date or origin or amendment was at the conclusion of the section on formal evaluation that referred to redrafting in October 2001, suggesting that the current iteration had been in operation for three years at the time of the survey.

The purpose of the performance review system was noted as arising:
from our desire to reward good performance and to deal fairly and promptly with unsatisfactory performance. It also recognises that in order for a contemporary school to show it is fulfilling its obligations to its students it needs to be constantly evaluating and improving its teaching and other work practices. The most important way of doing this is to provide all staff with frequent high quality feedback on the way in which they are performing their duties.

The language of the first paragraph of this document indicated clearly who had ownership of the process. It was the administration that offered to reward or deal fairly and it was the school demonstrating it was fulfilling its obligations. Any teacher reading these initial paragraphs would be in no doubt that what followed was the school looking at him or her, and that the end point was not the pursuit of enhanced learning outcomes for their own sake, but the meeting of contractual obligations. At the same time, the stated objective of evaluating and improving...teaching intimated that the process laid out in the documentation was directed to enhancement of pedagogy. Consequently, the procedures in this manual apparently were designed to meet both organisational accountability and pedagogical evaluation purposes.

The process outlined in the introduction was to include ‘frequent observation’ and ‘client’ feedback from both students and teachers. The feedback ‘in the case of teaching staff will require students and parents to have some input’. However, half of the survey teachers (4A, 4C, 4G, 4H, 4K, 4L, 4N, AND 4O) indicated that parental feedback on teaching was not included, suggesting that parental input was not a regular element of the evaluation, despite the direction in the documentation.

The evaluation was based on a four year cycle, commencing with a full formal evaluation for confirmation of appointment, then annual performance reviews up to year four when another formal evaluation would take place. Full evaluations were also recommended for promotion and re-classification applications. Therefore, teacher experience of evaluation would normally be the annual performance review, which was aimed to affirm strengths, and identify professional development requirements. In this sense the document appeared to charge the system with enhancing teaching, and providing a strong connection with professional development as the means of weakness rectification. Although teachers might normally welcome such an opportunity, responsibility for execution of this process was with the ‘senior staff person responsible for their performance review.’ Provision was made for possible
changes to the senior staff person if long-term exposure was thought not to be beneficial. However, the final arbiter of the top of the formal system was the Principal. This introduction sent a series of mixed messages aside from the clear and unambiguous ownership by Pusey’s (1976) first formal dimension of the evaluation process. At one level it set up the process to meet two needs concurrently. Teaching and employee duty were considered equal, and the absence of distinction and weighting meant that conformity and dutiful adherence to organisational requirements could be equated as teaching suitability.

The procedural sections of the handbook outlined time frames and requirements for each stage. For the new inductee, a peer mentor was allocated with consultation and feedback from the supervisor over the first three months, including informal observation. The formal review of performance was initiated in the fourth month, with the initial formal evaluation conducted at the end of second term, and concluding with the confirmation or termination of employment, or extension of probation. Beginning teachers were programmed for a full formal evaluation only in their second year. For those confirmed in their position, the requirement for annual reviews over the next three years was supported by an expectation of a ‘planned program of professional development and appraisal.’

The annual review was defined as a time for staff to meet ‘with their supervisor for a review of their performance’. The contents were listed as a recent professional development record, duty statement where applicable, self-appraisal sheet or student feedback results, and a draft of the report made out by the individual (Appendix 8). The supervisor was to come armed with the procedural documents and input ‘from other senior staff to whom the staff member is responsible.’ Even if the supervisor was ‘affirming, welcoming and supportive’ and stressed the ‘two-way nature of discussion’, the annual review dialogue remained between a superior and subordinate with the potential of dealing ‘fairly and promptly with unsatisfactory performance’, as stated in the introduction to the instructions. The event was required, laid out, and conducted by the administration. It is no wonder that many teachers in this school felt they had no ownership of the evaluation process and expressed negative feelings of concern and mistrust. However, for those conforming to the expectations of the school, acceptability was likely to be reaffirming: they fit in, are doing the right thing, and rewards may be expected down the track.

The annual reviews did not actually involve the collection of teaching data. This was reserved for the formal evaluation, which normally occurred four yearly for normal classroom teachers,
and was suggested for ‘other staff seeking promotions or undergoing a review of senior appointment.’ The formal evaluation procedure was laid out as taking significantly longer. Once again, the supervisor and the school’s mechanisms dominated with the requirements laid out. Student surveys and classroom visits were to supplement the documentation normally brought to reviews. A self-assessment methodology was to be agreed with the supervisor, as was a timeframe for classroom observation, both item specific and unannounced. The infrequency of observation events was revealed by the need for the classroom teacher to explain ‘to students reasons for supervisor’s visits.’ During the classroom visit, the supervisor was to ‘take reasonably detailed notes’ and these were to form the subject of both a briefing and draft evaluation report. This was followed up by a meeting of about one hour duration, where the draft evaluation report was to be discussed and a formal record of the meeting kept and placed on the teacher’s file. The final formal report was then submitted to the teacher for signature, and passed on to the Principal for formal acknowledgement if satisfactory. Where there was dissent ‘the supervisor should submit the report without the staff member’s signature and the staff member may provide the Principal with a written explanation of their reason for dissent.’ The Principal then would arrange another formal interview with the teacher and other hierarchy members ‘to determine any consequent action.’ Where a particular clash occurred between a teacher and supervisor, ‘the supervisor, after consultation with the staff member, [was to] ask another senior staff member to help complete the evaluation process.’

Eight common criteria were listed on the formal evaluation with a note that ‘Additional criteria may be included as agreed at the preliminary meeting prior to evaluation’ (Appendix 9). The criteria were:

- acceptance and practice of school policies
- level of knowledge and skill relevant to work, including expectations of teachers
- organisational skills – planning, reliability, problem solving, and time management
- inter-personal and pastoral skills – relationships with students and colleagues, conflict resolution, and leadership
- communication skills
- application and effort
- effectiveness
- professional development and ongoing improvement.
Whilst there is some broad correlation to the Danielson (1996) list developed for the teacher survey, in the absence of further guidance on the form, the allocation of some key capabilities such as ‘selection of instructional goals’ must be assumed under the second criteria. Furthermore, ‘application and effort’ appears to be more of an organisational assessment of work levels rather than an issue of pedagogy. In addition, ‘effectiveness’ may be interpreted as ‘engagement of students in learning’. However, in the absence of definition, it would appear that the teacher would have to negotiate the interpretation of the criteria with the supervisor in the first instance, or else during the evaluation process. Some guidance was provided in an optional appraisal sheet, the submission of which was stressed as not being required as part of the evaluation (Appendix 10). A perusal of this form reveals less about pedagogy and more about workplace participation and conduct. Phrases as ‘consider your commitment’, ‘rate your ability to apply effort’, and ‘rate your ability to cope with high volumes of work’, are included, but there is a notable absence of terminology such as ‘Establishment of a Culture of Learning’ and ‘Engagement of Students in Learning’ that were in the Danielson (1996) derived list in the teacher survey.

The weak connection between professional development and evaluation was clearly evident in the annual review process with a listing of ‘PD plans for the next 12 months’ the only requirement. The professional development and ongoing improvement heading in the optional appraisal form contained the following supplementary questions:

[Professional Development] Record – is your [professional development] record satisfactory? Does it cover a range of skills and focus on your specific needs? Note any areas that need further attention.
Planning for improvement – do you have some clearly articulated plans for the next three years? What will you do to improve your job skills and performance?

Whilst this might be seen as allocating professional responsibility to teachers for their own development, the nature of this evaluation experience was likely to focus teachers on finding an appropriate entry rather than reflecting on their own practice in an ongoing fashion. Another possibility is that completion of the stressful and threatening experience was likely to terminate interest in its contents, so that teachers were more likely to rejoice at survival rather than take their evaluation as an active starting point for development. The signing off would effectively remove the evaluation, and thoughts of professional development relevance, from teachers’
consciousness, leaving them open to select events based on interest and enjoyment rather than actual pedagogical needs.

The School 4 teachers were clearly the subject of a bureaucratic review and had no ownership of a process that was laid down in form, content, procedure, and time frame. The ultimate destination of the evaluation was the Principal, accompanied by a ‘Recommendation in relation to future appointment, re-evaluation, or promotion as relevant’, directly above the signatures of the teacher and supervisor. As teachers signed, there would be no doubt about the “bottom line” of the process. This does not mean that the evaluation had to be either cold and unsympathetic, or draconian. In fact the procedures for rectifying weaknesses were reasonably sympathetic: attendance at professional development or other training, counselling sessions, and visits to other teacher’s classes. However, the identification of the weakness by the supervisor, and confirmation by the Principal would send a clear signal that the teacher had failed the evaluation. In particular, where a teacher’s difficulties had not been identified over a number of the annual reviews, the sudden identification of shortfalls and recommendations for remediation in a formal evaluation that actually had some inputs about learning, must have come as a rude shock. Because the review process allowed the avoidance of issues by not confronting pedagogy on an ongoing basis, it is possible that it reinforced teachers’ perceptions that they were teaching well, by conforming to organisational expectations alone. At the same time, difficulties with a supervisor must have lent the reviews an air of ominous premonition as the larger evaluation loomed.

School ownership of such an accountability process and its irregular conduct was unlikely to encourage teachers to manifest reflective behaviours, or take risks in their teaching. Indeed, if it was perceived as a time of fault finding, the remainder of the year was more likely to be spent in concealment activities or preventive behaviours, rather than self-examination and experimentation. Furthermore, the most easily executed concealment activity would be classroom isolation. If this was the case, then it explains why three quarters of the teachers surveyed in this school did not want to reduce classroom isolation. To do so would be to invite in the type of scrutiny that they had been trained to fear by the very process that theoretically was meant to encourage better teaching performance.

The procedures handbook for evaluation in School 4 provided no grounds for a teacher to welcome evaluation. In fulfilling bureaucratic demands for time lines, content requirements, and chains of responsibility, it discouraged teachers from undertaking their own reflective
evaluation practices. There was no mention within the procedures of admissibility, or desirability, of continuing review of pedagogy through frequent student consultation, or the maintenance of professional diaries or portfolios. By confusing institutional conformity and teaching quality, there was no guarantee that this would be of any value anyway, as the type of teaching undertaken by an individual might clash with established norms, regardless of its success, and potentially earn sanction by a supervisor.

Few of the respondents doubted the teaching competence or training of their evaluator (4K, 4L, 4N, and 4O). Interestingly, these teachers also felt that the evaluation was an issue of power and control. Although it represents only a quarter of the survey respondents, the significance may be in that perceptions of the quality of the evaluation, and feelings of satisfaction may say less about the teachers and more about the quality, training, competence, attitudes, skills, prejudices, and management style of the supervisors. If the teachers doubted the teaching skills of their evaluator, they may well have been accurate. However, because of the bureaucratic nature of the procedure, organisational superiority adds a level of credence that may not be warranted in pedagogical terms. If one of the teachers was to question the competence of their supervisor evaluator, then they may also be questioning the hierarchy that both selected the superior and directed the evaluation. Herein lies the most significant flaw in such bureaucratic hierarchical processes. Teacher 4O may have been a brilliant teacher, but, if he challenged the established supervisor, he could not hope to win because that same person was in a position to affect his employment.

The fact that surveyed teachers felt that the evaluation had little effect on either teaching practices or outcomes means that the evaluation failed to meet its stated objectives in educational terms. What it rather signified was that successful teachers had established coping strategies to isolate Pusey’s (1976) affective domain from this intrusion. With many of those suspicious or distrustful of School 4’s evaluation having served successfully in excess of six years in the school, either these behaviours were well developed, or teachers may have formed informal treaties with their supervisors. Conformity and adherence to norms on the organisational scale may result in a superficial and procedural conduct of the examination of teaching. With classroom observation so limited already, attendance at better classes at more appropriate times of the day, and taking into account ‘the immaturity of many students’ clause in the procedural introduction, supervisors and teachers could ignore all but the most significant pedagogical failings. The return for the supervisor would be a veneer of happiness and success in their area of responsibility, a veneer that could not be penetrated by those higher.
up the bureaucratic chain because of the subordinate’s instinct for self-preservation. The endpoint in such cases would be a form of contrived collegiality and illusory pedagogical quality that could be sustained by the evaluations. Fortunately, the only time that such a treaty could be exposed and tested would be in the fourth year of the cycle, when stress levels would run high. The annual reviews could be relegated to reaffirmations of the treaty with the ‘What were the difficulties?’ question an opportunity to identify some areas for remediation in order to maintain the illusion of improvement and keep the system satisfied. In such an environment, Teacher 4O’s negative evaluation would appear to be the aberration and his anger unusual. Whilst there might be sympathy, he would probably be isolated ultimately as others maintained their own treaties and focussed on self-preservation.

Professional Development Documentation
School 4’s professional development handbook had been initiated in 1990 and updated about every three years, 2005 being the most recent issue. This handbook identified the rationale of professional development as the need ‘to support morale and desire for excellence through high levels of satisfaction in work in an environment where each staff member’s contribution is recognised and affirmed’. Effective professional development was seen as a ‘continuing and integrated process with each aspect linked into a coherent program.’

Staff participation was ‘designed to assist staff to reflect on their practice, achieve their professional goals and sustain personal growth’. Notably, these were not further defined in this area. Rather, the very next section alluded to the industrial relations agreement defining the number of days that teachers had to complete in a given period, after which came the breakdown of options to make up the time requirement. Very early, anyone reading this publication is left in no doubt that workplace procedures, and industrial time demands are the focus, rather than pedagogy; quantity not quality. Furthermore, the rational for the professional development program refers to the ‘workplace’, and the need to update skills, but there is no reference to enhance student outcomes, more effective learning, or other pedagogical terminology.

The subsequent guidelines defined recognised professional development. These were very broad and ranged from tertiary study, participation in planning groups, and skills directed courses through to approved programs of self-study. However, it was essential that professional development had the following characteristics:

- an organised structure
• a clear set of objectives including professional development outcomes for participants
• a definite framework for communicating knowledge and or information of an educational and technical nature
• a definite framework for demonstrating that professional development outcomes have been achieved
• require involvement by the participants.

Thereafter the handbook concentrated on defining approved forms prescriptively, as well as funding and time release provisions.

Quite clearly, given the industrial relations statement early, and the definition by the school of the prerequisites for what is acceptable, professional development ownership rests with the administration which defines, approves, and records activities to meet its staff needs and that of the industrial agreement based upon which it pays workers. There was no mention of teachers enhancing their pedagogy to improve the quality of student learning and their outcomes. The only reference to evaluation was in the guidelines where ‘Teacher appraisal’ is listed as an approved professional development activity. In the absence of any indication in this, or the evaluation documentation, of the close connection between teacher classroom performance and professional learning, it is not surprising that the two processes were not integrated to maintain and reinforce teacher quality.

Even if it is accepted that management has a role in the maintenance of staff training, the failures of this current system were readily apparent in that the essential characteristics as laid down were not being met. Teacher survey admission of selection of interesting and fun items contravened the need for clear objectives, or else such clear objectives were construed and not revealed due to the lack of validation. Reporting only through a short note on the professional development form, the lack of follow up to validate learning, and the absence of any effective evaluation of pedagogy, all contravened the stipulation of a ‘framework for demonstrating that professional development outcomes have been achieved’.

However, the ownership issue remains most significant in that nowhere did this document acknowledge that the responsibility for professional learning rests with teachers. In making it an employer defined requirement, teachers were expected to respond as employees, checking that they had the required number of days and that their particular activity met the guidelines
and thus warranted approval. When coupled with the appraisal system which was also employer owned, this professional development structure works against teacher professional independence and reinforces the bureaucratic nature of school. Teachers thus see professional development not as something that is an inherent part of their everyday practice and a means for both remediation and enhancement of pedagogy, but rather as a duty of employment. Successful completion of the time requirement and verification of participation, in the evaluation, not the manifestation of the learning in the classroom, further embeds the practice.

**New Evaluation Documentation**

Subsequent to the initial research for this study, School 4 reviewed its evaluation procedures for implementation during 2005. The revision provided this research with an opportunity to determine whether there might be some expectation that schools in the light of experience and research would adopt procedures supportive of teacher professionalism and reflective evaluation aimed at enhancing pedagogy.

The newer *Professional Pathways* documentation portrayed evaluation as more professional, current, sympathetic, and relevant to teachers. However, the most notable aspect was that this remained clearly a management document, owned by the hierarchy and not teachers, who are never mentioned as equal parts of the process, but consistently as subordinates. The following extracts from the preamble set the tone:

we expect [teachers] to engage in suitable processes or pathways. The most common of which requires them to evaluate and reflect on their current work practices and plan for improvement….we have the capacity to create our own highly professional environment. We can, to a large degree, define the qualifications and experiences needed by those who wish to join our professional group. We can articulate what we believe our professional standards and conduct should be as well as the expectations and responsibilities associated with those standards…Through this vision the School has developed three Professional Pathways…The most common and crucial pathway is the Annual Reflection and Planning review. The purpose of the review is to help every employee be more effective.

These statements clearly illustrate the agenda. The *We* referred to is not the teachers but the Principal who signed off on the document, and by extension the hierarchy members who drafted it. Teachers are again relegated to the position of “employees” who are to be helped to
be more effective. Clearly School 4 was unaware of, or chose to ignore, the research conducted into both evaluation and teaching standards over recent years, and was content to remain entrenched within a bureaucratic perspective that appeared increasingly paternalistic, rather than more conscious of the professional qualities of teachers. The words and approach may have changed to appear friendly and inclusive of teachers. However, as evidenced by the documentation, School 4 clearly remained within the hierarchical paradigm. This was illustrated also in that, although teaching and non-teaching staffs were to have different formats, the preamble above was directed to all members of the school community, teacher, gardener, and secretary alike. Furthermore, an examination of both the annual review (Appendix 11), formal evaluation (Appendix 12), and staff appraisal documentation (Appendix 13) reveals that very little had changed, and the documentation in some cases is exactly the same. This raises the question of whether any actual research was conducted to determine the development of research and literature in the area of evaluation, and the potential for the enhancement of teaching and student learning above employee conformity behaviours.

Nowhere in the new documentation was there any mention of the primacy of teachers understanding their pedagogy, or, indeed, the enhancement of teaching being necessary to facilitate greater student learning and independence. The focus is on procedural details, responsibilities, flow charts, and forms. As noted above, mention is made of professional standards, but these were not articulated in any way. One might assume that the authors of the document somehow expected there to be some concurrence on what such amorphous standards may be, but the work of Danielson (1996) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards suggest that agreement is difficult to achieve on the complex professional activity of teaching. In the absence of such articulation, the standards may be interpreted differently by those within the hierarchy and those without, possibly to the detriment of the latter.

The annual reflection process was defined as being in the interest of the teacher (or non-teacher, since, again the supporting instruction was common to all staff) such that ‘each staff member contributes most to his or her reflection and planning’. However on the same page are statements that:

It is the supervisors’ responsibility to ensure the reviews are completed…Each staff member meets once year with their supervisor for a discussion of their work and plans…A preliminary discussion occurs the first time the staff member meets with their supervisor…Prior to the ARP
[Annual Reflection and Planning] meeting, the staff member should e-mail/provide these documents to the supervisor.

On sheer volume alone, it is easy to see where the critical mass is focussed. Even at the end ‘the supervisor prepares the final copy of the report or amends the supplied draft as agreed at the meeting’.

The Performance Review, which replaced the previous formal evaluation, was directed ‘to formally acknowledge sound, or exemplary performance and to deal quickly and fairly with unsatisfactory performance’. The review was ‘to be conducted by the designated supervisor’, and aimed at tenure, promotion, and where there were concerns about performance. The eight common criteria included acceptance of school policies, organisational skills, and interpersonal skills, but they did not actually include the full range of teaching skills or an effective measure in some cases. For example, ‘Relationships with students’ was one of only five suggested areas for consideration under inter-personal and pastoral skills. The others were relationships with colleagues, the handling of pressure, conflict resolution, and leadership. Parents were not included. There was mention of quality of work perceived by others, but since there was very little consultation of students, surveying of parents might be less likely. Furthermore, if student input on the question of relationships were to be considered and examined, then a broad range of student surveys would be required over a period of time, as a spread of returns would be necessary to yield data of ongoing and consistent performance. In the absence of such data, any judgement of this area would be limited. The same would apply to parents.

In neither the reflection, nor the review process were there questions that asked the participant to consider how their students had learned, or to reflect how they, the teacher, could improve the classroom learning opportunities for all their students. The supervisor and peers are asked for inputs, and there are classroom visits, but once again there was no consideration that students might have a right to comment on teaching, or that parents have a right to express their satisfaction with the teacher’s support of the development of their child. The consumers are left out in the cold with the practitioner’s art. The reason is that they are of no relevance to the bureaucracy, the concerns of which remain focussed on worker productivity and a veneer of satisfaction over conformity and greater efficiencies.
On the positive side, there was mention of a portfolio to support professional development participation, and to illustrate units of work developed. However, once again this was undermined by the philosophical direction of the document. Such a portfolio was to be presented to ‘the supervisor’ prior to the reflection meeting. Unfortunately, this caveat meant that teachers would not be willing to produce units of work where they have tried something and failed, or units that students disliked. Just as with the set piece classroom visitations, they are more likely to be examples of work that fit the prevailing ideology of the period and the school, and show the subject in a positive light. The portfolio could thus be defined as an active defence, tabled before the interview.

Professional development is mentioned in both the evaluations with reflection on what was successful, and how the individual put it into practice. The Performance Review was a bit more specific, asking ‘is your [professional development] record satisfactory? Does it cover a range of skills and focus on your specific needs?’ Thereafter comes the question ‘do you have some clearly articulated [professional development] plans for the next three years? What will you do to improve your job skills and performance?’ Since the reviews are management owned and dominated, it is unlikely that teachers would answer in the negative to satisfaction, but make as broad ranging positive statements as possible to avoid criticism. For those feeling exposed to scrutiny, it is likely that their statements would be particularly defensive. Most significant of all, in the absence of any consideration of pedagogy and learning outcomes in the review process, questions of professional development appear more directed to participation in appropriate activities. The source of this major weakness is that School 4 appears to have assumed that the professional development process was meeting the needs of all: school staff training, and development of pedagogy to assist student learning. In ignoring the latter, any mention of professional development must be flawed as it deals only with half of the learning demand. Even if this was acceptable, the drafters of the review have focussed on organisational conformity and management needs, but failed to balance the changes with measuring and upgrading the other half of any standards process, the systems for learning and re-learning. Consequently, the school hierarchy appears to be satisfied to act as judge, but fails to accept any responsibility for helping employees overcome shortfalls. Consequently, the collegial words in the preamble are unlikely to overcome the concerns and distrust already present in the minds of a number of teachers in this school.
School 4 Conclusions

An examination of the design elements derived in Chapter 2 should give some indication of the effectiveness of both the previous and revised evaluation system in this school:

(1) In the old system there was no clear distinction between organisational requirements and pedagogy so that a number of teachers were confused as to the objectives, whilst others clearly saw it as a tool of enforcement, something not stated in the documentation. Certainly the development of reflective individual professional teachers was not stated. The new process has the same flaws in spite of the more collegial language, but this is only if it indeed has the improvement of teaching as an aim. In the absence of any such statement, we can only give the school the benefit of the doubt. At the very least there is confusion. At the most there remains only one aim and it has less to do with quality of teaching and more with accountability. In the absence of clear, consistent, and agreed teaching standards, the activities or behaviours of any teacher may be interpreted by the hierarchy as not in accordance with their standards.

(2) There certainly appears to be some motivation to reflect and reinforce teaching practice after the previous evaluation process, even by the maligned Teacher 40. However, this could be motivated by fear and the need to avoid future criticism, as much as by increased professionalism and the desire to teach better. Given the negative feelings of a number of the respondents in this school, the previous evaluation system certainly did not appear to have positively reinforced the enhancement of pedagogy. The new Professional Pathways process clearly states the need for greater improvement and effectiveness, but in remaining hierarchically directed, and as such equally threatening as the former procedure, the only thing teachers could get better at is in managing their defensive responses.

(3) The absence of trust as well as confusion as to what exactly was contained in the evaluation, and the absence of guidance in the documentation, suggested that the original evaluation process examined the employee and not the teaching. By making reference to employee effectiveness in its preamble, and the absence of examination of pedagogy in preference to organisational functions, the real work of teaching seems to have been subordinated again in the revised version. The only defence that could be made by the School 4 is that it is, in fact, examining work from a broad perspective.
However, its failure to examine pedagogy and student learning serves to illustrate the
gulf between organisational and true perceptions of teaching.

(4) The presence of distrust amongst many of the teachers, as well as the view that the
previous evaluation system was owned by the school, clearly raises doubts about
mutual confidence and professional equality. In the new procedures nothing appears to
have changed, since it was handed down to teachers by the Principal and remains
administered by his hierarchy. Professional equality cannot occur where the
bureaucratic hierarchy owns and manages a system over teachers. Distrust and
suspicion follow automatically in accordance with organisational theory.

(5) The previous evaluation system in School 4 was summative because there was no
mention of any formative process. The newer Professional Pathways at least has an
annual reflection process, which can be claimed to be oriented to meet this
requirement. Unfortunately, neither the annual review nor the performance review is
directed at teaching. With a very broad selection of ‘feedback tools’ for examination,
and the absence of standards, the actual direction and remediation of pedagogy may be
manipulated, primarily because no teacher would direct the feedback tools to their area
of weakness. And if the supervisor pressed for a particular feedback instrument into a
specific area then the process would be hostile and compromised.

(6) There was no evidence of any teacher participation in the development of either
system, and this represents the critical weakness of both. Teachers clearly remain
subordinate employees rather than professionals and this suggests that any reflection
associated with evaluations in this school will be restricted to the reporting period
alone instead of a constant daily process.

(7) Both systems in School 4 were site specific, but there was little mention of the
students, and no reference to the community, because the evaluations were derived by,
and for, the employer. The needs of teachers and students effectively are ignored.

(8) Discipline specific evaluation appears to have taken place with faculty supervisors
generally having responsibility for the evaluations. However, since pedagogy was
secondary to organisational conformity, the benefits of professional knowledge to
support pedagogy could be masked by, and confused with, organisational compliance.
(9) The previous system lacked guidance in the documentation to determine if duties were included, but the newer version makes far greater efforts to determine teacher satisfaction and seek input to work tasks. However, the supporting value is lost in the absence of pedagogical considerations.

(10) There was no mention in either process of a high-level quality assurance program, and teachers’ doubts about the abilities of their supervisors in the surveys raised questions as to how effective any such procedure would have been. Certainly, if the evaluation is aimed towards reinforcing hierarchical power, then subordinates are unlikely to be admitted to the outcomes of their superior’s evaluation. The overwhelming tone of the new process is that the supervisor is superior by virtue of position in the hierarchy, and, as the broader quality assurance issues of the school, such as effectiveness of management, are not identified as open to review, teachers can be excused for feeling that they are open to specific scrutiny. If the counter argument was made that the senior staff is responsible to the school board and the Department as well as other authorities, then this overlooks the accountability of the hierarchy to both parents and students. If reflection and review are to work effectively then those below - students and classroom teachers - should be entitled to comment on the performance of their organisational superiors.

(12) Most of the teachers in this school had been evaluated in the past four years, few of them in the year of the survey, although there was mention in the documentation of annual reviews. The newer process obviously seeks to redress the shortfalls of the previous process by reinforcing the annual review process. However, the existence of the annual review itself is not sufficient. For it to have any value, it must translate into teaching, but this is not the agenda. The reflective process is not measured in years or months, but should be a daily occurrence, as classes work or do not, and students achieve deep understanding, or miss out on, learning.

(13) School 4 in no way meets the design element of evaluation processes being positive and learner centred, and expressed in such terms. The objectives are organisation centred and expressed as such. There is no mention of learners in either document, clearly illustrating the position of the authors.
(14) The new system of review in School 4 initially appears to be in response to changing conditions. However, in reality very little has changed from the appraisal system seen in the initial research in this school. Student learning needs, and the demands of changing pedagogies, are not mentioned. Quite clearly, what the new system does is meet organisational needs in a better, if somewhat gentler worded, fashion.

(15) The established hostility and distrust of the appraisal/review amongst a number of teachers, confusion in others, and a broader perception of the evaluation as a management conformity tool was unlikely to encourage reflection and openness in the new system. Rather, it would illustrate to teachers that management is getting better at managing, and dressing up, its processes. Undoubtedly teachers would up the ante, get smarter at meeting demands, and hide the reality better.

An examination of the professional development design elements derived in Chapter 3 outlines the current status of professional development at this school:

(1) The weak connection between evaluation and professional development, the absence of effective follow-up, and the ability of many teachers to select their professional development activities based on whim, does not suggest a systematic management of individual pedagogical needs in this school. Rather, it appears that teachers were treated as both equal and equivalent in their needs. This may appear to be democratic on the surface, but it assumes a standard profile of ‘teacher’ that does not exist. To an extent, the professional development management at this school appears to have abrogated any responsibility for this function by allowing teachers to choose what they like, apart from whole school events, where the effort may have been directed to ensure maximum publicity, regardless of whether it permeated down to the classroom or not.

(2) A determination on professional development being an ongoing process of career-long learning embedded in what teachers do each day, is difficult in the absence of student input. However, the selection of fun activities from what appears, and the lack of a clear connection with evaluation, do not suggest the actions of teachers focussed on everyday classroom needs.

(3) No response from teachers in School 4 suggested that professional development was an opportunity to take risks and experiment to meet student needs, and allow teachers to experiment in new forms of practice. Rather, in this school, as well as others, it
appeared to be something that teachers simply “do”. The focus of the professional development documentation on industrial obligations, qualifications, and definitions, does nothing to focus teacher attention toward student learning as the ultimate beneficiary of professional development activities.

(4) Neither the evaluation nor professional development procedures in this school suggest the development of independent professional autonomy amongst teachers. In an environment where evaluation is more a process of bureaucratic surveillance, and where professional development is the fulfilment of industrial obligations and economic reconstruction expectations, classroom pedagogy and its transformation attract significantly lower priorities. Rather, there is a feeling in the surveys that professional development is something to which teachers conform. They meet their time expectations and participate in whole school events, aware that neither may end up in the classroom or the basis for individual transformation. However, why should they? Such efforts and changes are not the subject of the evaluation and are not rewarded.

(5) For professional development to ultimately result in positive changes in the classroom, effective planning and validation would seem to be mandatory. In the case of School 4, some planning appears to have occurred with the development of objectives and the submission of the same to the professional development staff for review and approval. However, validation was absent. Furthermore, the targeting of the evaluation was toward purposes other than pedagogy, so it was not designed to draw out areas for further development. These were left to the individual to suggest. In the absence of a procedure to capture individual need, and determine the outcome of previous learning, the planning function would seem to have been superficial at best, since there were no inputs upon which to determine either individual or collective need. In the absence of planning and validation, teachers were free to pursue their whims so that connection with classroom pedagogy was totally dependent on the reflective practices of individuals operating within an environment that failed to ascribe it relevance. In many cases, the pursuit of interesting and fun options seemed the easier solution. The outcome of change in the classroom appears not to have been a serious agenda at all.

(6) Student learning was not the primary objective of either the evaluation or professional development systems, because neither appears to have made any attempt in
documentation or practice to penetrate the classroom environment and determine teacher needs and teacher and student outcomes. Any claim for success or worth of professional development could be anecdotal only, because the evaluations were not oriented to classroom pedagogy, and teacher suspicion and concern would ensure defensive compliance behaviours in many cases. Meanwhile, even if one accepts a certain demand for organisational training of a workforce, if the professional development did not examine the impact on teaching, the reasons for the selection of, or participation in, many activities can be called into question. In the absence of pedagogical justification, the industrial requirement for days and budget expenditure are all that remain.

The initial research at School 4 presented a quandary that seemed to characterise any discussion of evaluation. The school was unusual from the perspective of this survey in that it retained an appraisal system for teachers that had been conducted both consistently, and relatively effectively, over a number of years, as opposed to School 2, for example, where it had lapsed and assumed another form not defined in the documentation. This consistency had yielded in some teachers in the surveys a renewed commitment to their school, whilst others were infected with suspicion, distrust, and outright disappointment. The focus on teaching and learning, even though inappropriate at times, had created a collegial environment where most teachers felt that they were part of a broader advancing educational environment. Certainly, the existence of a top-down hierarchical appraisal system was likely to reduce teachers to employees whose main aim would be defensive conformity rather than any risk taking in the name of education. Nonetheless, the very fact that the school had passed through such an appraisal progression suggested initially that it might be able as an organisation to accept more reflective pedagogical forms of evaluation through ongoing acknowledgement that there is a role for quality assurance in teaching.

The development and introduction of the Professional Pathways more recent evaluation system dispelled this illusion. The newer system merely dressed up all of the negative aspects of the former in more acceptable language, and served to enhance the efficiency of the annual review system. In essence it represented no advance beyond the first generation appraisal system that had been in place previously. This suggests that school organisations do not necessarily learn from experience and move forward to new paradigms where the position of teachers is concerned. Rather, they continue to remain organisations, as defined in theory, with bureaucratic hierarchy maintaining the same priorities of control and efficiency. Consequently,
the strains and distrust referred to in organisation theory also remain. This reflects some of the concerns that caused Linda Darling-Hammond (1997) to suggest the only way forward was to re-conceptualise the whole structure of schooling, so as to move it out of the industrial revolution factory hierarchy paradigm.

In failing to concurrently reconstruct the professional development system, there remained a clear disconnect between evaluation and teacher learning. If the professional development system is not oriented towards the pedagogical needs of teachers, and they can continue to select whatever fun and interesting options that appear, but can also look good on the new annual review, then clearly teaching practice could not improve in any systematic and professionally regulated fashion. Constantly aware of the demands of their new review system, teacher choices, based on needs evasion rather than motivation, establish the basis for any pedagogical improvement as accidental rather than systematic. The absence of any distinction between organisational training, representation at conferences, and outcomes moderation and such, as against actual professional learning directed to pedagogy, further confuses and clouds a process that should be transparent and clearly directed. Meanwhile whole school professional development, regardless of the idealistic view of some teachers, serves the perceived need of the organisation to portray progress and change in an environment of contrived collegiality. The real losers are the staff who remain subservient and serving the needs of the employer rather than the students through their own independent professionalism.