

Chapter 6

Case Study School 1

Introduction

Case Study School 1 yielded a total of eleven teacher surveys, a focus group discussion, and access to documentation.

Teacher Surveys

Teacher 1A – Never evaluated, even for promotion

Teacher 1A was a 26-30 year old female whose 6-10 year permanent teaching career had been at one school after completing a Bachelor of Education degree. She had risen to a department/faculty head position in that time. Teacher 1A had participated in no post-graduate training or learning.

Evaluation

This teacher had never been evaluated, even for her promotion, and showed no knowledge of any evaluation processes. She accepted the benefits that could be gained through evaluation in enhancing both professional and pedagogical outcomes, but acknowledged that her response to the matter was characterised by fear and suspicion.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1A's professional development participation was high, with ten school sponsored, and four self initiated days in the previous year. She strongly welcomed professional development as an opportunity to enhance her skills, but acknowledged that it was also an opportunity to get a break from the students. This teacher's professional development objectives were based on personally assessed needs or departmental requirements rather than school objectives, and these were reviewed by the professional development officer. She had improved her pedagogy in her professional subject area as well as classroom management, and assessment and reporting. Teacher 1A based her professional development selections primarily on interest and enjoyment. Nonetheless, she saw professional development as a dynamic and positive influence on her learning.

Professional Development Outcomes

In the absence of evaluation, Teacher 1A naturally disagreed with the proposition that professional development was a key input to evaluation to gauge her learning needs. Whilst

professional development as a whole was valued as an ongoing learning experience, validation occurred only as a short note on the relevant form, and there was a serious shortfall in all other evaluation follow up and validation procedures. This teacher disagreed with all propositions on the following up of professional development to determine outcomes and impacts on classroom teaching.

School Professional Development Practices

The format of professional development in the school was the whole range of standard workshops and seminars, but excluded both mentoring of fellow teachers, and opportunities for self-reflection on teaching. Despite Teacher 1A's generally positive view of professional development, she felt that whole school events generally lacked stimulation, were more fanfare than substance, and served the self promotional needs of hierarchy members.

School and Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 1A's attitude to the school was very supportive with positive responses to most areas of teacher dialogue and collaboration, and the appreciation of teaching styles. However, it was notable that she felt that the school did not actively encourage her to adopt new initiatives within her classroom, something that should have been more positive at a time of major curriculum change. Furthermore, this admission correlates back to the absence of evaluation and self-reflection opportunities mentioned previously in her response.

This teacher's very strong personal image, as one open to embracing and discussing change, conflicted slightly with her professional response, which, whilst seeking to be able to acknowledge mistakes, was less directed to interaction. Teacher 1A did not wish to more openly discuss classroom teaching with colleagues or seek more time to work collegially. She also did not wish to feel less isolated.

Comment on Teacher 1A

Overall, Teacher 1A appeared professional, but was satisfied to operate within the current system despite its obvious flaws. She had progressed successfully without any post-graduate study or evaluation, and was happy to participate in the professional development system without questioning its validity to her own pedagogy. It appears that this teacher was content with being part of change in public, but might be less keen to engage in activities that would penetrate her classroom. This could reflect the collective perception of professional development referred to in Chapter 3.

It appears that Teacher 1A, in the absence of any evaluation, had developed her formative years of teaching practice in the isolation previously referred to in this study. Her view of professional development appeared to be one of participation rather than self-reflective enhancement of teaching practice. She might be happy to manifest teaching behaviours that earn public accolades, but seemed less enthusiastic about exposing her weaknesses at an intimate level. Having succeeded in the current environment, Teacher 1A did not appear to be significantly motivated towards change and the opening of her classroom to individual scrutiny. This may explain her emotional responses of fear and suspicion of evaluation, despite her intellectual judgements that it would enhance individual teaching and collective professionalism.

Teacher 1B - *Never evaluated, but not “only” a classroom teacher*

Teacher 1B was a 41-45 year old female permanent full-time classroom teacher who had been teaching for 21-25 years and had been at her present school for less than three years. This teacher had participated in no post- graduate learning relevant to her teaching.

Evaluation

This teacher claimed to have never been evaluated since receiving tenure as a teacher. This was supported by a negative response to frequent evaluation. However, she also claimed to have been evaluated in other career situations and in response to specific promotion needs, and to have acted as an evaluator, perhaps in another school. The remainder of her responses to evaluation were *Unable to Answer*. Given Teacher 1A's age and experience, it is unlikely that her claimed evaluation experiences were many, unless they were as part of a contractual obligation prior to receiving tenure. Her inability to identify the specific reason for evaluation, including for tenure, suggest that this teacher may have confused formal promotion selection with evaluation.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1B had participated in six school/department sponsored, and three self-initiated, professional development days in the past year. She had a very positive attitude to professional development and set her objectives based on perceptions of her own needs. However, Teacher 1B based her selections on the interesting and fun options available rather than more objective criteria.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 1B asserted that professional development had helped her in a number of areas ranging from professional subject knowledge, to personal interaction and communication skills, and assessment and reporting. Primarily because this teacher had not been evaluated, she was unable to identify any connection between professional development and evaluation. She also felt that professional development failed to represent a broad range of activities based on the needs of the individual teacher, and was not responsive to them.

Teacher 1B's response to professional development validation and outcomes was fairly negative. It was merely a short note on the relevant form, and she did not consider that the school made any effort to determine the outcomes of professional development on student learning. Consequently, Teacher 1B did not identify professional development as directed towards organisational goals or change, but rather saw it as something occurring in isolation. Nonetheless, she strongly felt that professional development bound her to a lifelong learning process, and it made her feel part of a learning community.

School Professional Development Practices

School professional development activities included opportunities for reflection on teaching, as well as the standard seminar and course activities, but internal mentoring did not occur. Furthermore, Teacher 1B denied that professional development reflected a broad range of activities based on each teacher's learning needs. However, whole school professional development was seen as generally stimulating and well directed, and Teacher 1B strongly objected to propositions that such events were opportunities to get out of classes, or that they were vehicles for hierarchical self promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Whilst the school encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in different ways, modelled and rewarded good teaching, and appreciated older teaching styles as well as the new, it did not regularly analyse what makes good practice. Teacher 1B did not see her school as a culture sufficiently collaborative to allow free admission of failure, and it failed to mobilise her as an effective agent of change. Cross grade and subject dialogue occurred, but there were also conflicting cliques in the school.

Teacher 1B's professional self image was very positive and she felt that she was open to new ways of teaching and sharing with her colleagues, as well as setting high standards for herself.

She desired that the professional development system be more responsive, strongly sought greater time for collegial cooperation, and hoped for increased freedom to acknowledge her mistakes. The self-perception of this teacher can be described easily by her hand written comment to the *Classroom Teacher Only* category in the position description question. She wrote “don’t like the only”, illustrating a strong sense of professional pride.

Comment on Teacher 1B

This teacher seemed to fit into what might be termed a “standard” profile from the state wide study. She was experienced and probably operated well in class. Whilst appreciating the flaws in the current professional development system, she basically lived with them. Although apparently conscientious and thoughtful about her practice, she did not appear to have taken steps to seek more objective input from colleagues and student consumers, thus relying on her own personal judgement for a substantial career. There is a sense in teacher 1B’s survey that she has not professionally challenged herself in either evaluation or professional development. Teacher 1B also did not wish to more openly discuss her classroom or overcome isolation, despite welcoming change and the opportunity to share classroom difficulties. She appeared safe and content in her current position, and may well not welcome the sort of challenges reflective evaluation might present.

Teacher 1C – *No supervisor, rarely evaluated, and an unknown PD officer*

Teacher 1C was another permanent full time classroom teacher of 41-45 years of age who had been in this school for less than three years, although she had also been teaching for 21-25 years. Teacher 1C had undertaken no post-graduate learning.

Evaluation

She had not been evaluated in the previous four years and was unable to respond to any aspect of evaluation in her current school. However the comment ‘Not at this school’, in response to the question on evaluation in the past four years, suggests some experience in the past.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1C had undertaken less professional development, consisting of two days each of school/department sponsored, and self initiated, activities over the past twelve months. She admitted that her choices of professional development were motivated by options that were interesting, fun, and less difficult, whilst still conforming to her annual training requirements. How the latter were derived remains unclear unless it refers to mandated activities, because this

teacher strongly relied on her own personal perceptions of her needs, which had to be enjoyable in the first instance.

Professional Development Outcomes

This teacher considered that her professional development had enhanced her capabilities in professional knowledge, classroom management, assessment, and instructional techniques. Whilst she agreed with the proposition that professional development was reported up the school system to ensure economy and consistency, her response to a question on review by the professional development officer was a telling 'Do we have one?' From both an organisational and individual point of view, such a response should be a matter of concern, particularly as this teacher who also claimed 'I don't have a supervisor', apparently validated her professional development through a detailed evaluation sheet. In the absence of a both supervisor and a professional development officer, it is difficult to gauge to whom this document might have been submitted.

School Professional Development Practices

The types of professional development in this school included workshops, seminars and lectures, as well as internal mentoring, but failed to include opportunities for reflection on teaching. Notably, no response was made to the proposition regarding professional development providing a broad range of activities based on individual teacher needs. Whole school professional development was seen as stimulating. It was conducted regularly and was seen as a major force for change.

School and Individual Perceptions and Aspirations

Teacher 1C rated her school positively, as actively mobilising teachers to adopt new initiatives in a collaborative culture with open dialogue on pedagogy and best practice. It modelled and rewarded best practice, encouraged parental feedback on teaching standards, and was sufficiently collaborative to enable this teacher to share failure with her peers.

As an individual, this teacher felt that being with students made teaching worthwhile, and she worked to understand them. She set high personal goals and openly shared experiences with her colleagues. Teacher 1C denied always trying new teaching approaches, and expressed some reluctance to embrace changes. Nonetheless, the propositions in the individual aspirations question were agreed with completely. This teacher wanted to feel less isolated, more collegial, and to receive greater acknowledgement in a more open environment where she

could acknowledge mistakes freely. She also wanted formative evaluation of her pedagogy tied to a more responsive professional development system.

Comment on Teacher 1C

Interestingly, Teacher 1C, who was hugely positive on the school and her own pedagogy, and who expressed such positive aspirations, had undertaken no post-graduate study in a career spanning more than twenty years, and had a professional development participation rate lower than some of her peers. This was despite her judgement that the professional development system was neither responsive, nor met her pedagogical, personal, and organisational needs. Furthermore, there is no evidence that she had taken any initiatives to identify personal pedagogical shortcomings, leaving personal satisfaction and easy options as motivators for her professional development selections. In addition, one could expect that such an experienced teacher would seek out the professional development officer for advice and guidance on learning options available.

Teacher 1C clearly had a high opinion of herself as a professional teacher, but her responses in other areas did not convey the impression of independent reflection. Once again, she appeared in her professional development, and indeed in the evaluation area as well, to be reactive and happy to participate where required, but no further. Her lower professional development participation compared to others of double and triple the rate suggests that either this teacher did not require any professional support, or else she may not be identifying her pedagogical needs. The fact that Teacher 1C did not respond to the proposition on self-examination in a process of self-reflection may imply that she was unaware of what such a process means.

Teacher 1D – *Everything is new too* (sic) *me*

Teacher 1D was a 36-40 year old full time contract male teacher in his first year out after completion of a Bachelor of Teaching degree. He admitted: ‘This is my first year post-graduation in my first school so everything is new too [sic] me!’

Evaluation

This teacher had not been evaluated in his short teaching career, so lacked any knowledge of purposes or procedures for evaluation in this school. However, he had been evaluated in other career situations, and was able to make some comment on his responses to evaluation in general.

Teacher 1D felt positively towards evaluation. He saw it as enhancing pedagogy and professionalism, both individually and collectively, and also as a valuable tool for communicating his needs. At the same time, this teacher's personal emotional responses were a combination of defensiveness and apathy, counterbalanced by confidence. His actions after the evaluation were to reflect on his practice, and review his shortfalls to identify remedial actions in consultation with the professional development officer. However, he did try to forget the experience until next time.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Because he was a recent graduate, Teacher 1D had only one day of school sponsored professional development. He welcomed it as a key part of modern teaching practice that allowed him to enhance his skills, but also acknowledged it as an area where he had not yet formed specific opinions. Whilst this teacher set objectives based on his own need, he also took advice from his supervisor. Nonetheless, he acknowledged seeking fun options from the interesting opportunities that appeared each year.

Professional Development Outcomes

The only form of outcome referred to was that Teacher 1D's supervisor objectively discussed the professional development with him to see that it had met his needs and objectives.

School Professional Development Practices

This teacher responded positively to all forms of professional development taking place in his school, although he cannot have experienced other than one or two of them in his limited experience. There was no evidence of any validation so it is probable that after half a year of practice, this teacher's understanding of professional development management in his school remained limited. His response to whole school professional development was that it was a stimulating and well-conducted regular and effective aspect of school life that was a major force for change. Teacher 1D disagreed that whole school professional development was a chance either to avoid classes, or for hierarchy members to promote themselves.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 1D responded very positively to questions about the school and his own teaching, and on his aspirations as a professional teacher. He did not see his school as made up of conflicting cliques, but, rather, as a collegial organisation that modelled good teaching, welcomed differing

styles, and encouraged broad dialogue in a spirit of openness that also accepted mistakes in pursuit of the best teaching.

As an individual, Teacher 1D expressed a lot of enthusiasm for new forms of teaching, trying to understand his students and embracing change. He continued to seek new opportunities to share with his fellow teachers in a free and open collegial environment. This teacher was willing to share mistakes, and sought both formative evaluation and professional development to assist him enhance his pedagogy as a professional. He did not wish to feel less isolated in the classroom, or to receive greater recognition for the good aspects of his teaching.

Comment on Teacher 1D

Teacher 1D's limited time in his new school suggests that he is full of enthusiasm, optimistic, and well disposed to his new school and the profession. In responding that he did not seek lesser classroom isolation, Teacher 1D may be suggesting that he does not feel isolated currently. As a mature adult new to teaching, he might also be seeking success on his own merits, and thus be undergoing socialisation into the "sink or swim" condition of classroom isolation. Despite this, Teacher 1D represented a new teacher who required advice and support as he copes with the demands of adapting his theoretical learning to daily classroom life. He perceived the school, classroom, and act of teaching in a positive light. However, in basing his professional development to a large extent on fun and interest, as opposed to his professional needs as they arise in this first teaching year, Teacher 1D could be losing some valuable learning to the detriment of his immediate professional career.

The single day of school/department sponsored professional development participation in this first year of Teacher 1D's practice also raised questions about induction procedures in this school and beyond. In the absence of evaluation, how was Teacher 1D to know that his approaches and procedures in the classroom were effective and meeting student needs? Furthermore, the school did not appear to be assisting him in identifying developmental issues relevant to new teachers. In not initiating his own professional development, and making fun and easy selections, Teacher 1D might have started to abrogate his own responsibilities in this professional area. Although checking on professional development relevance, this teacher's supervisor did not appear to be countering this possible negative attitudinal trend.

Teacher 1E – *Evaluated for tenure and promotion only*

Teacher 1E was a 41-45 year old male permanent full time teacher with 15-20 years experience who had been at this school for 4-5 years, and occupied a senior management position. Teacher 1E had completed both another graduate diploma and a Masters degree, suggesting a solid experience of post-graduate study over his career.

Evaluation

This teacher had been evaluated in other career situations for promotion. However, he noted that ‘The only formal evaluation I have been involved in is as a beginning teacher or in leadership positions, never as a class room/experienced teacher.’ He had not been evaluated in his time at this school and his consequent response to all questions on evaluation was *Unable to Answer*. Such an acknowledgement by a senior management figure clearly indicated the absence of any procedures in this case study school to evaluate teachers’ pedagogy in any way as suggested in the literature in this study.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1E registered a solid professional development participation rate with ten days of school/department time, and five days of his own time over the past year. His attitude in this area was very positive, registering strong agreement to propositions on professional development representing an invigorating element of modern teaching practice. He solidly rejected it as either a mere work requirement, or a break from the classroom.

This teacher set his objectives in consultation with the professional development staff and his superior. Furthermore, these objectives were integrated with school and faculty goals, and were approved and reconciled by the professional development staff to ensure consistency and economies in the school. Teacher 1E’s individual professional development selections similarly were based on advice from his superior and professional development officer. However, he also sought activities that would be fun and avoid the use of his own time. He strongly rejected any suggestion of finding easy options or seeking to miss as much class time as possible.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development had improved Teacher 1E’s pedagogy in the areas of evaluation, assessment, and reporting, as well as instructional techniques in the classroom. This teacher strongly perceived professional development as a contributor to organisational learning, and a

strong impetus to his own learning. He felt that it did not occur in isolation, but was a positive contributor to the construction of a professional collegial learning environment in the school. Such a clearly positive attitude contrasted with the negative responses on validation, which consisted of a verbal report or a short note on the school's professional development form. There was no follow up to determine the impact of the training on teaching practice or student learning. As expected, the absence of any evaluation of Teacher 1E's teaching generated a negative response on the connection between professional development and evaluation.

School Professional Development Practices

Teacher 1E considered the professional development system in this school to be dynamic and responsive and clearly directed to enhancing pedagogy. He listed the conduct of a broad range of activities based on individual teacher's needs, lectures and workshops, and internal mentoring as part of the school's professional development offerings. Attendance at conferences and courses outside the school were selected for special mention, suggesting these remain a major element of professional development in this school. Opportunities to reflect on teaching was the notable exception.

Whole school events were conducted regularly and seen as a positive contributor to organisational change. This teacher strongly denied that they were fanfare events that took him away from class, and also disagreed with the proposition that whole school professional development events merely promoted the hierarchy.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

This senior management figure in the school had very strong positive opinions about his school. He saw it as a truly collaborative environment that regularly analysed good teaching, and motivated teachers to be active agents for change, whilst recognising their differing teaching styles. Cross-grade and cross-subject dialogue occurred and was supported by parental input.

Teacher 1E's view of the school was supplemented by a very good professional identity. He strongly agreed to the worth of being with students and worked alone and in consultation with colleagues to develop understanding rather than load content. This teacher had high personal expectations and consistently tried new approaches in an attempt to embrace positive change.

The professional aspirations of this teacher were similarly positive. Most strongly, he sought to change along with educational change and to feel free to share his mistakes along with such development. Teacher 1E sought increased collegiality and collaboration, and a greater understanding of new educational initiatives. However, once again, this teacher did not want to feel less isolated in the classroom or have good things in his teaching explicitly acknowledged.

Comments on Teacher 1E

Clearly because of his experience and position, underpinned by a solid base of post-graduate learning, Teacher 1E appeared very confident and committed to both the school and teaching. He certainly seemed to be managing well his own career and professional development participation. A reluctance to seek reduced isolation or for explicit acknowledgement of positive things in his teaching may well be explained by Teacher 1E neither feeling isolated, nor requiring praise. It is probable that he feels he knows what works and is confident in his own judgements within the collective teacher environment, where positives in one's teaching are not trumpeted because of the possible impact on the less successful colleague.

With so many positives, Teacher 1E's identification of the absence of evaluation of teaching practice, and failures in professional development validation and follow up, are notable. Because he is in a leadership position in the school and able thus to influence change, has higher learning, and is apparently self confident, it is interesting that Teacher 1E has not initiated follow up of his own and his colleagues' professional learning, or initiated his own action to evaluate his pedagogy. It is probable that, in Teacher 1E's mind, evaluation is something only done as part of leadership selection, which means that any examination of classroom teaching would require a change in his perspective in the first instance.

Teacher 1F – *Not evaluated at this school and isolated*

Teacher 1F was a permanent full time female in a leadership position. She was 26-30 years of age with 4-5 years teaching experience and had less than three years in this school. She had department head status, but was alone in her subject area. Teacher 1F had undertaken some specialised post-graduate training.

Evaluation

This teacher's evaluation responses conflicted in that she noted that she had not been evaluated in the past four years of her career of the same length, but that she had been evaluated in response to specific promotional needs. She commented: 'Hard to answer evaluation, been at

my school 3 years & had no formal evaluation’, and ‘Also hard as I’m the only one in my subject area.’ Given this teacher’s age, and mainly negative responses to the questions on evaluation, it is probable that some form of evaluation was conducted outside the case study school as a requirement for her appointment. The fact that this may have been in her first year of teaching raises questions on the quality of the selection procedures that would elevate a novice still adjusting to classroom realities.

Whilst the majority of responses were *Unable to Answer*, this teacher noted the use of self-evaluation questionnaires as an input to evaluation in this school. The fact that the initial *Unable to Answer* response was crossed out suggests that a specifically directed thought process generated this answer. Unfortunately, this response was unique, not even included by the evaluated Teacher 1E. If genuine, this reaction may indicate a self-reflection attempt on the part of this teacher who felt isolated, and perhaps unable to confide in, and share with, colleagues. If this is the case, the mechanisms to support and develop this positive pedagogical activity do not exist, so that it appears as an aberration, rather than the foundation for professional enhancement.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1F’s professional development participation consisted of six school/department sponsored, and two personal days in the past year. She strongly saw it as a key part of modern teaching practice, and welcomed it as an invigorating opportunity to refresh her skills. However, she admitted to not having a significant opinion on professional development, whilst trying to undertake activities that were relevant to her teaching. It was also a good chance to get a break from class.

This teacher’s professional development objectives were set each year in line with school and personal goals, and submitted and approved by the professional development officer. Her selections were based on the availability of funds, and advice from the school’s professional development officer, but most strongly were based on the interesting options that appeared each year. Teacher 1F strongly rejected seeking easy and fun options, or avoiding the use of her own time.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 1F had significantly improved her pedagogy in the knowledge of her subject area, evaluation, assessment, and reporting, instructional techniques, and personal communication

skills. Personal interaction skills with parents and colleagues had not been covered, although the isolation experienced by this teacher might have suggested this as a good option.

Whilst Teacher 1F felt that professional development made her feel part of the school community on a journey of life long learning, she acknowledged that the professional development heading on her evaluation form represented only a place where activities were listed. Validation of professional development consisted of either a verbal statement or a short note on the professional development form. Neither the professional development staff nor the school followed up to determine the professional and pedagogical impacts of her learning. As a consequence, whilst this teacher saw professional development as something that contributed to school goals, she also felt that it did not support organisational change or act as an additional impetus to her learning.

School Professional Development Practices

Professional development in this school was made up of visiting lecturers and workshops, and attendance at conferences and courses outside the school. It also included opportunities for reflection on teaching, but excluded internal mentoring. Teacher 1F also felt that professional development in her school did not include a broad range of activities based on individual learning needs.

Whilst whole school professional development was regularly conducted and a major force for change in the school, Teacher 1F generally had a negative view of such events, which she saw as neither stimulating nor well directed. She considered that whole school professional development was mainly boring fanfares that enriched consultants, promoted the hierarchy, and took her away from the real job of teaching.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Despite the negatives in the professional development area, and some sense of isolation, Teacher 1F was generally supportive of her school, which she saw as a collaborative culture that encouraged broad dialogue, and actively mobilised her as an agent of change. It appreciated differing teaching styles and encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in various ways. Nonetheless, Teacher 1F noted that the school neither encouraged parental feedback on teaching standards, nor rewarded good teaching regardless of seniority. In support of her response that there were conflicting cliques, this teacher added the additional comment ‘Some answers conflict as we do work together collaboratively but there are still cliques.’

Teacher 1F appeared to have a good professional self-image, with strongly positive responses to setting high personal expectations, trying new teaching approaches, collegial interaction, and working to understand her students. She also sought to better understand and participate in educational change. Her aspirations were also positive. This teacher desired increased objective collegiality and the ability to share errors as well as successes in her teaching, and for formative evaluation to focus on her pedagogy. The strongest responses were to feel less isolated, and for the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom teaching needs. An additional comment of ‘Good luck with the research...hope it drives some positive changes’, reinforced this respondent’s desire for enhancement of her individual teaching situation.

Teacher 1F Comment

Because Teacher 1F contended she was alone in a specific field, with no supervisor and no evaluation relationship, she appears to have felt unable to share her teaching, even though she had been at the school for three years. School collegiality might exist, but it did not appear to have provided this teacher with the opportunity for intimate pedagogical support. Her dissatisfaction with professional development would appear to stem from it not providing an avenue for redressing this shortfall.

Teacher 1G – *Unsuccessfully evaluated for leadership*

Teacher 1G was a 46-50 year old male permanent full time classroom teacher who had been teaching for 15-20 years, but had been in this school for less than three years. This teacher held a Masters degree directly relevant to his subject area.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation

Teacher 1G had been evaluated for a leadership position in the current year and had received training on evaluation outside the teaching profession. The negative responses in other parts of the survey suggest that the bid for promotion had been unsuccessful.

Inputs to Evaluation

This teacher was unable to answer if self-evaluation questionnaires or examination teaching documentation had been used as part of the inputs for evaluation. Teacher 1G disagreed with most forms of input, suggesting he felt that his peers and students had not been consulted, he was not observed in the classroom, and a professional diary was not called for. The only

element of the adapted Danielson (1996) list agreed to was professional development. Consequently, Teacher 1G felt that no aspects of his classroom practice were addressed in the evaluation process.

Management of Evaluation

Whilst he expressed confidence in his evaluator's teaching skills, and agreed that personality issues did not intrude, Teacher 1G expressed strong doubts about the reconciliation of inputs and redress processes. He also felt that the full range of his pedagogy had not been covered, and that issues that concerned him in teaching or about the school were glossed over. Teacher 1G consequently lacked any trust in the evaluation system.

The trend of these responses continued into other questions on evaluation management. Teacher 1G felt that evaluation at his school judged personalities and not skills, and had no impact on the enhancement of student learning. The process was not open to staff input, failed to affect his teaching practices in a positive way, and was more directed to reinforcing power relationships. Ultimately, evaluation was owned by the administration and not teachers, who were treated as employees in a bureaucratic procedure directed towards compliance. Teacher 1G was left feeling less than a member of the professional community of the school. As a result, his attitude to evaluation as currently practised was that it was a hierarchical reinforcement tool that had nothing to do with teaching. It benefited neither the teachers nor students, and failed to enhance professionalism or collegiality. Teacher 1G could not answer if the evaluation process had benefited the school.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

As might be expected from his other answers, Teacher 1G's strongest emotional responses were suspicion and bewilderment, followed by concern and resentment. Confidence, optimism, and enthusiasm were all marked as *Disagree*.

This teacher's actions after the evaluation remained professional, although tinged with his disappointment. There was strong agreement to propositions on reviewing shortfalls for corrective action, personal reflection on teaching practice, setting goals for the next reporting period, and working hard to achieve a better outcome. However, there was a similar level of remembering the negatives, adopting a low profile, and adjusting work levels to match the perceived level of appreciation. Teacher 1G also admitted that he would change the way he taught to satisfy his supervisor. Whilst he did not complain to his peers, this teacher felt less

commitment to the school's objectives, and was reluctant to pursue further promotion opportunities.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1G had completed eight days of self initiated, as opposed to four school/department sponsored, professional development days. He strongly felt that it was a key part of modern teaching practice, and he welcomed professional development as an opportunity to refresh his ideas. However, Teacher 1G appeared to have no specific opinion on professional development per se, whilst seeking activities that would benefit his teaching rather than just to meet promotion requirements.

This teacher primarily set his professional development objectives based on his own perceptions, but acknowledged this was within faculty-derived goals that were submitted for approval by the professional development officer. He did not see professional development objectives as being reported up the system to ensure consistency and economy within the school. Teacher 1G's professional development selections were based exclusively on what interesting options arose each year. He neither reviewed his annual training requirements, nor did he take advice from his supervisor or the professional development officer. However, at the same time, this teacher strongly disagreed with seeking fun and easy options that would allow him to miss classes, or meet his training requirement with minimal effort.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 1G's professional development had improved his professional knowledge, instructional techniques in the classroom, and personal communication skills. This was validated to the school through a detailed evaluation sheet. His supervisor discussed his professional development to see that it fulfilled his needs and objectives. This approach contributed to a feeling that professional development was not an isolated event, but was an obvious contributor to organisational change. However, neither the professional development staff, nor the school, sought to determine Teacher 1G's learning outcomes and the impact on his classroom teaching. He consequently did not experience feeling of being on a lifelong journey of learning as part of the school as an educational community.

Significantly, despite having identified professional development as the single mandated element of his evaluation, Teacher 1G felt that his evaluations failed to examine his professional development participation and its impact on his teaching. Furthermore, in

response to the proposition that the professional development heading on the evaluation was just a space where his activities were listed, this teacher annotated a *Don't Know* response. This leaves the actual consideration of professional development in this teacher's evaluation in some doubt.

School Professional Development Practices

School professional development consisted of the full range of activities listed in the survey, including internal mentoring and opportunities for reflection on teaching. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, and was a major force for change. This teacher disagreed with them being fanfare events which took him away from the real work of teaching. He also felt very strongly that they were not just good opportunities to get out of class. However, Teacher 1G felt strongly that whole school professional development provided opportunities for hierarchical self-promotion.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 1G maintained a positive view of his school as a clique free collaborative culture that encouraged dialogue and allowed him to share failure as well as success. It accepted differing teaching styles and encouraged him to adopt new initiatives in the classroom. However, this teacher did not see himself as mobilized as an active agent of change, and doubted that the school modelled and rewarded teaching regardless of seniority. Furthermore, he noted *Don't Know* to questions on the encouragement of parental feedback on teaching standards, and regular analysis of what is good teaching practice.

As an individual, Teacher 1G strongly felt that he was a reflective, open, and collaborative practitioner who set high personal expectations, and worked hard to understand his students rather than just load them with content. Whilst he sometimes doubted educational changes, he was keen to seek greater opportunities to discuss and feel part of such changes.

This teacher strongly sought formative evaluation of his teaching to be separated from organisational considerations, and for the professional development to be more responsive to his classroom needs. He very much wanted the enhancement of collegiality and communication, and to be free to acknowledge mistakes in teaching and seek assistance to rectify them. Interestingly, Teacher 1G did not wish to feel less isolated in the classroom, or for the good things in his teaching to be explicitly acknowledged.

Comment on Teacher 1G

There was a sense of resentment in Teacher 1G's survey at having been unsuccessful in his leadership aspirations. Whilst it appears more in the evaluation section of the survey, it may also manifest in conflicting professional development responses. If the learning this teacher undertook was not effectively validated, then his efforts may appear merely as participation data, and of little direct benefit to his ambitions. His feelings that professional development failed to make him feel either part of the learning community, or that he was on a lifelong journey of learning, may have been based on this shortfall, regardless of any positives that might flow from whole school professional development events. Furthermore, if Teacher 1G felt let down by the professional development system, this would also explain his strong feeling that whole school events were directed to hierarchical self-promotion.

As an experienced teacher with post graduate qualifications and what appeared to be a strong commitment to teaching quality, Teacher 1G may be heading for disappointment, and eventually withdrawal, as defined in stage theory. The management system appears to have failed him, and certainly he would identify the evaluation process as a factor in the bad experience. There was also a sense in this teacher's survey response that he is a confident individual, and perhaps secure in the quality of his pedagogy that he saw as inadequately addressed in the evaluation. As such, Teacher 1G might be a potential asset to any system of reflective professional evaluation of pedagogy, but only if it can deliver tangible positive outcomes.

Teacher 1H – *Evaluation is not owned by teachers*

Teacher 1H was a 46-50 year old full time and permanent Advanced Skills Teacher 3 (AST3) with 21-25 years of experience. She had been at this school for 11-15 years. She had undertaken no post-graduate learning.

Evaluation

This teacher claimed to have been evaluated frequently, but this was only in response to promotion to leadership and the AST3 grade. This evaluation had not occurred in the past four years. She had not received training in evaluation, and did not have a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school

Inputs to Evaluation

Inputs for evaluation were listed as self-evaluation questionnaires, peer input, classroom observation, and the examination of teaching documentation. Half of the Danielson (1996) derived list of evaluation elements was covered including knowledge of content and students, the establishment of a culture of learning, management of student behaviour, self reflection on teaching, professional development, and contribution to the school and professional community. The omission of knowledge of resources, selection of instructional goals, and design of coherent instruction suggests that pedagogy was not fully covered. Teacher duties appear to have also been incomplete, with the exclusion of maintenance of records, and communication with parents.

Management of Evaluation

Teacher 1H was confident that her evaluator was trained and that the inputs were reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective. However, the evaluation process was seen as limited. Personality issues intruded, differences in assessments were not examined in details, and her concerns with her teaching and school procedures were glossed over. The procedures for redress were also unclear and ambiguous. This led teacher 1H to feel that her evaluator was not as good a practitioner as herself, and undermined her trust in the process.

This teacher was negative about evaluation at her school. She saw it as a bureaucratic power function that was used by the hierarchy to enforce compliance among employees. It failed to enhance individual or collective pedagogy, and had little effect on improving student outcomes. Finally, Teacher 1H saw evaluation as owned by the administration, closed to staff input, and unclear in the area of redress procedures. As a consequence, evaluation had nothing to do with teaching, and benefited the school instead of the teachers and students. On a collective basis, teacher professionalism and organisational commitment were not improved.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

The emotional responses of Teacher 1H to the evaluation were suspicion, fear, concern, defensiveness, and apathy. Following the evaluation, whilst she reviewed any shortfalls in a process of self-reflection, this teacher remembered the negatives, and assumed a low profile whilst focussing on the negatives. She was, however, also moved to reflect on her practice. Teacher 1H disagreed with all other propositions. She took no positive steps, such as setting goals, or discussing training requirements with the professional development officer, but also did not complain to peers, or change her teaching to keep the supervisor happy. There was a

feeling in the responses that Teacher 1H may have withdrawn into herself in an isolation response.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1H had participated in six school/department sponsored and three self initiated days of professional development. She welcomed professional development as an invigorating key part of modern teaching practice. Whilst she did not see professional development as a mechanical requirement of teaching, this teacher did concurrently feel that it was something done to, rather than for, her, possibly as a response to school directed activities.

Professional development objectives were laid out for staff in accordance with school objectives. These were worked down to faculty level, with teachers submitting their bids for approval by the school professional development officer. Her professional development selections were based on what interesting options arose each year, advice from the professional development officer, and the amount of relief money available. Teacher 1H sought to avoid the use of her own time, but denied trying to avoid classes or seeking more enjoyable and easy options.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development had improved this teacher's pedagogy primarily in the areas of professional knowledge, and assessment and reporting. This was reported back to the school through a verbal report, or a short note on the school's professional development form.

Whilst Teacher 1H considered that professional development made her feel she was on a journey of continual learning within an educational community, and that it contributed to meeting school goals, there was no evidence that the school validated her outcomes. This teacher's supervisor did not discuss her professional development to see that it met her needs, and neither the school nor the professional development officer examined the impact of the professional development on her teaching. The evaluations similarly failed to examine how the Teacher 1H's pedagogy had changed or improved in response to her professional learning.

School Professional Development Practices

Professional development in this school consisted of a broad range of activities based on each teacher's learning needs, and was made up of seminars and workshops, as well as conferences

and seminars. Teacher 1H denied that there were opportunities for internal mentoring and self-reflection, and also rejected attendance at courses outside the school.

She was unable to decide if the school professional development system was efficient and responsive or not, but accepted that it presented a mix of training that met her pedagogical needs in accordance with identified needs in the evaluation. At the same time, this teacher did not consider the professional development system was responsive to her individual needs, or that it motivated her to be a life long learner. Whole school events were regularly conducted, stimulating, and well directed. However, Teacher 1H still considered that they were hierarchical self-promotion fanfare events that kept her from the real work of teaching.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Whilst she saw her school as encouraging teachers to demonstrate their worth in various ways, and supporting cross grade and subject dialogue, this teacher was generally negative about her school. She considered the school was clique ridden and was not sufficiently collaborative for her to share failures as well as successes. It did not analyse or reward good teaching practice, and did not appreciate the positive aspects of older teaching styles as well as new. Consequently, Teacher 1H was not mobilised as an effective agent of change and was not encouraged to adopt new initiatives in the classroom.

Teacher 1H had a positive self image, seeing herself as setting high personal expectations, which she examined in regular self reflection and discussed openly with colleagues. She found teaching students worthwhile and worked to understand them. This teacher was not always open to change, and doubted the validity of some of the educational changes she was asked to implement. She, nonetheless, was willing to better understand, and be part of, such change.

This teacher's aspirations were generally positive as well. She wished formative evaluation of her teaching to be separated from her institutional evaluation, and for the professional development system to be more responsive. In addition to developing a better attitude to change, Teacher 1H wished to be less isolated and more openly collegial, and to have the good aspects of her teaching recognised. Notably, she was reluctant to acknowledge and share mistakes, either in normal classroom teaching or in the implementation of educational change.

Comments on Teacher 1H

Teacher 1H appeared to feel threatened both by the evaluation process directed to her promotion, and more recently by curricular change. As a teacher, it appeared that she tried hard in the classroom but was isolated and unused to any process where she would have to expose her weaknesses, even if it was in a process designed to improve her performance as a teacher. Consequently, she appeared conservative and reluctant to embrace change, which would destabilize her even further. Whilst this teacher might have expressed positive desires to shed isolation and work more collegially to understand the changes she was being asked to implement, any evaluation process aimed in this direction would have to be exceptionally reassuring and supportive of this teacher's positive contribution to the school.

The attitude of Teacher 1H to professional development appeared to be rather passive. She was able to identify the shortfalls in the current system, but seemed to be taking no steps to overcome these problems for her own benefit. Combined with the evaluation responses, and her attitude to the school as a whole, Teacher 1H may have been somewhat withdrawn and isolated. She was conforming to institutional requirements, rather than responding to the independent needs of her pedagogy. Her difficulties with understanding change may stem from viewing them as imposed, and from not exerting professional efforts to understand what she was being asked to do. In this sense, Teacher 1H did not appear professional in real terms.

Teacher 1I – *A strong supporter of the current system*

Teacher 1I was a permanently employed female who did not state her age, but had been teaching between 21-25 years at this school and was a department head. She had completed no post-graduate learning.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation

This teacher stated that she had been evaluated frequently, in response to specific promotion needs and in other career situations, and had received specific professional development on the evaluation process. Such evaluations had been for teaching practice and for her advancement to Advanced Skills Teacher (AST3). However, this teacher had not been evaluated within the past four years. Teacher 1I made a specific comment: 'I have experienced 2 formal appraisals in the last few years (less than 5 years) and have conducted appraisals for others. In recent times the format has become more of a conversation with less emphasis on a holistic approach relevant to changing situations. I believe they are a solid means of recognition and advancing

teaching'. This may be the case, but this teacher admitted that she did not have a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her current school.

Inputs to Evaluation

Peer input and teaching portfolio were the only two inputs identified by this teacher. Only five of the twenty elements in the Danielson (1996) derived list were identified as mandatory in the evaluations: knowledge of content and pedagogy, establishment of a culture of learning, self-reflection on teaching, contribution to school and professional community, and professional development. The omission of significant elements, such as design of coherent instruction, and knowledge of students, among others, raises questions about the depth or extent of the teaching evaluation.

Management of Evaluation

Teacher II expressed a high level of confidence in both the training and pedagogical skills of her evaluator, and felt that the inputs were examined in detail and reconciled to ensure a balanced perspective. She also felt that personality issues did not intrude. Despite these initial positive responses, Teacher II also expressed doubts that the full range of her teaching skills had been covered, and felt that issues about her teaching had been glossed over. These matters, and the fact that procedures for redress were unclear, left her with a feeling of distrust in the evaluation process.

These inconsistencies continued in other questions, and were not helped by this respondent not answering all questions. She considered that evaluation positively affected the teaching practices of both herself and the other teachers in this school, and made her feel like a professional member of the school community. She denied that evaluation allowed her superiors to enforce compliance. Evaluation benefited her alone, enhanced the professionalism of teaching in the school, and provided a valuable means for communication between teachers and those above. However, it did not help this teacher plan her future, or make her feel more a part of the organisation.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher II's attitude to the evaluation was listed as a single response, *confident*. Following the evaluation, she felt renewed and positive, personally reflected on her practice, and reviewed her shortfalls to identify corrective action. She experienced increased commitment to the school's objectives and adjusted her work level accordingly. Negative responses, such as complaining to

peers, and trying to forget it until next time were all denied or listed as *Unable to Answer*, suggesting that Teacher 11 had not experienced a bad evaluation. Significantly, this teacher also was unable to answer the proposition about discussing her training requirements with the professional development officer, an action that would seem to be a natural flow-on from any issues raised in the evaluation.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 11 had attended five school/department sponsored professional development days only. Whilst it was an invigorating opportunity that is part of modern teaching practice, Teacher 11 did not welcome it with enthusiasm, stating that she just did it without any specific opinion on the matter. Nonetheless, she felt ownership of professional development, disagreeing that it was something done to her. This teacher's strongest motivational response was that professional development provided a good chance to get a break from class.

Professional development objectives were set by both the school and the individual. Faculty goals were structured within the school framework, and Teacher 11's supervisor worked to support her objectives based on evaluation outcomes. She then used this supervisor's advice in her professional development selections. Other selection motivations were the appearance of interesting options, and finding something that was likely to be fun. This teacher denied seeking the easiest options, avoiding the use of her own time, or missing the maximum number of classes.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 11's professional development had improved her professional subject knowledge, and classroom instruction and management techniques. These were the subject of a comprehensive written report alone, the only teacher to claim such a validation process in this school. In the area of outcomes, this teacher did not see professional development occurring in isolation and it contributed to her life long learning as part of the school educational community. The professional development heading on the evaluation form did more than list her activities, and the school actively sought to determine the impact of her experiences on student learning outcomes. Interestingly, these responses were partially contradicted when Teacher 11 noted that the professional development staff did not follow up and validate her learning after each event, and there was some doubt if the evaluations clearly examined the impact of her professional development (this was suggested by a circled *Agree* with an arrow pointing to the *Disagree* column).

School Professional Development Practices

Teacher 1I saw professional development activities in this school as representing a comprehensive range of activities that met individual needs, with attendance at conferences and external courses as major events. Internal mentoring, and opportunities for reflection, were included.

This teacher viewed her school's professional development systems as efficient, responsive, well managed and dynamic, and clearly directed to meet the full range of teacher needs. This made her feel a life long learner continually developing her practice. However, she did not see it as clearly connected to the evaluation system or responding to identified pedagogical shortfalls. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted and a force for change, and not made up of fanfare events. Nonetheless, there was an intimation of boredom and that whole school events were not always stimulating or well directed. Such events also were opportunities for hierarchy members to promote themselves.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 1I was very positive about her school. It was truly collaborative with dialogue across grades and subjects, encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in various ways, and respected differing teaching styles. It did not analyse regularly what made good practice, but it modelled good teaching, and actively mobilised teachers to adopt new initiatives.

As an individual, Teacher 1I had a very strong self-image. She set high expectations of herself, was self-reflective, was always trying new teaching approaches, and tried to embrace all change despite some concerns. In the aspirations area, this teacher strongly desired formative evaluation of her teaching to be separate from institutional appraisals, good things in her teaching to be acknowledged, and to feel less isolated in the classroom. She also sought greater collegiality with her peers to both improve her teaching practiced, and to enable her to share mistakes in a process of professional learning. Notably, Teacher 1I did not wish the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom teaching needs.

Comments on Teacher 1I

Teacher 1I filled out the survey in a bold black marker, which compared to other surveys conveyed an image of a bold personality and perhaps a lot of personal front. The responses appeared to be in a similar vein, with a feeling in the survey that some answers were what this teacher thought ought to be said, rather than what she really felt inside. An alternative

explanation is that Teacher 1I has been successful and was committed sufficiently to the school as to have internalised organisational needs as her own. Notably, Teacher 1I omitted some challenging questions, and, despite all of her positive statements, she did not appear to be taking active personal steps towards her own individual development as a professional teacher, as verified by no individually initiated professional development days. Teacher 1I appeared content to just participate in centrally organised professional development and the evaluation process which she perceived as a ‘...solid means of recognition and advancing teaching’. Certainly, the system appears to have worked more in her favour than other teachers in the school.

Teacher 1J - *Frequently evaluated for leadership*

Teacher 1J was a permanent full time female teacher of 46-50 years of age, who had spent her whole teaching career of 21-25 years at this school, and was currently in a department/faculty head leadership position. She had completed leadership institute training.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation

This teacher stated that she had been evaluated frequently, including in the past four years, and felt that she had a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school. Whilst she claimed that such evaluation had been both for leadership positions and other career situations, leadership was the only category that was clearly identified as a purpose.

Inputs to Evaluation

Most forms of input were utilised, with professional diary and teaching portfolio supplementing self-evaluation questionnaires, peer input, and classroom observation. The notable exception was student evaluation questionnaires. Teacher 1J also identified almost all of the Danielson (1996) modified list as mandated evaluation elements, excepting only organisation of physical space, and communication with families. This suggested that Teacher 1J had the most comprehensive inputs of the evaluated teachers in this school.

Management of Evaluation

This teacher’s general attitude was very positive and she had complete trust in the evaluation process. She expressed confidence in her evaluator’s capabilities, and in the procedures, where the full range of her pedagogy was covered without intrusion of personality issues. However, Teacher 1J admitted that the procedures for redress were unclear and ambiguous, and that not all inputs were accurately reflected in the report and interview. She also did not answer the

question on examination of differences in assessments, suggesting that she could still retain some concerns about the details of the evaluation procedures.

The positive tone continued in the broader questions on evaluation in her school. This teacher saw evaluation as affecting both her individual and collective teaching practice, and positively contributing to school objectives. The process was open to staff input, and was neither threatening nor a compliance tool. However, reminiscent of the minor doubts in the previous section, Teacher 1J denied that the evaluation process had been reviewed for effectiveness and equity, and she considered it as owned by the administration, rather than teachers. This teacher strongly felt that evaluation changed teaching practices for the better, and benefited the whole school community. Whilst it helped her plan her future, the evaluation was not a means of communication upwards, and did not make her feel more a part of the organisation.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 1J's emotional response to evaluation was primarily confidence, optimism, and enthusiasm, tinged with defensiveness. Following the evaluation she felt renewed and positive, and experienced increased her commitment to school objectives, She reflected on her personal practice, and discussed training requirements with the professional development officer. Nonetheless, this teacher remembered the negatives, did not change her way of teaching or work harder to impress the supervisor, and did not set goals for the future.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1J was active in professional development with ten days of school/department sponsored, and seven self initiated days. Whilst she considered professional development to be an invigorating element of modern teaching practice, this teacher had no specific opinions on the matter, and also admitted it was a good chance to get a break from class. Professional development objectives were based on her own individual perceptions as well as being set at school and faculty level. Whilst there was no reconciliation of these objectives to ensure consistency and economy, individual objectives were submitted and approved by the professional development officer. Teacher 1J's professional development selections were based not on a review of her annual training requirements, but on advice from her superior and the professional development officer, and on what interesting options arose each year. She strongly denied seeking the easiest fun options to miss maximum classes.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development improved this teacher's pedagogy in her subject area, instructional techniques in the classroom, interaction with parents and staff, and evaluation, assessment, and reporting. These were validated by both a short note on the school's professional development form, and detailed evaluation sheets. Her supervisor objectively discussed her professional development to ensure that it met her needs, and her evaluations clearly examined the impact of her learning on her teaching. This made Teacher 1J feel part of the educational community on a journey of life long learning, and it reinforced her feeling part of ongoing organisational change in accordance with school goals. However, this teacher noted that the professional development staff did not follow up each training event to determine the impact on her teaching. Furthermore, the strongest opinion in this section was a negative response to the school actively seeking to determine the impact of her professional development on student learning outcomes. Clearly, whilst the school might have followed up professional development through the evaluation process, it did not do so regularly, or thoroughly.

School Professional Development Practices

Professional development activities in the school were made up of a broad range of activities based on each teacher's needs. These were lectures, seminars, external courses, and internal mentoring. However, presentations by visiting speakers, and opportunities for personal reflection did not occur. Teacher 1J saw school professional development as efficient and responsive to teachers' needs, and made up of an appropriate mix of training that suited her pedagogical, personal, and organisational needs. It made her feel that her practice was improving constantly, and that school quality was increasing as a result. Notably, this teacher did not see professional development as clearly connected to the evaluation system and responding to pedagogical shortfalls.

Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, and identified as stimulating and well directed, although it did detract from the real job of teaching. This teacher denied that whole school events were fanfares that promoted the hierarchy.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 1J strongly felt that her school was collaborative and modelled and rewarded good teaching. It analysed good practice, encouraged dialogue, and mobilized teachers as agents of change by encouraging them to adopt initiatives in the classroom. Nonetheless, there were conflicting cliques, and parental feedback on teaching standards was not encouraged.

This teacher had a very positive self image. She felt she had high personal expectations, was reflective, and was constantly trying new approaches to ensure student understanding. She was collaborative and collegial and worked to embrace all changes she was asked to implement. Teacher 1J strongly desired more time to work collegially with peers, to have the good aspects of her teaching acknowledged, and to share mistakes with her colleagues in pursuit of improved pedagogy. Conversely, she did not wish to feel less isolated, for the formative evaluation of her teaching to be separated from her institutional evaluations, or for the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom needs.

Comment on Teacher 1J

Teacher 1J's very positive view might stem from her being a winner under the current system. Not only has she been evaluated successfully for a leadership position, but also selected for attendance at a leadership institute. Despite her positive support for school structures and procedures, Teacher 1J appeared to accept them not extending to the classroom. Student questionnaires were not used in the evaluation, and the professional development system did not penetrate so far as to validate the impact of her training on student learning. In not wishing to reduce isolation or for the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom needs, this teacher may be accepting a continuation of this situation. Her classroom pedagogy appears not to have been questioned and she may be happy to keep it that way.

Teacher 1K – *A lot of contradictory responses*

Teacher 1K was a 61-65 year old permanent part time female classroom teacher who had been teaching for 21-25 years, of which 15-20 years had been in this school. She had completed no post-graduate learning.

Frequency & Purpose of Evaluation

Teacher 1K noted that she had been evaluated for teaching practice, and claimed to have a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in her school. She had not been evaluated within the past four years and denied frequent formal evaluation experiences. This teacher had not received specific professional development on the evaluation process or evaluative techniques.

Inputs to Evaluation

Teacher 1K identified self-evaluation questionnaires, peer input, and professional diaries and teaching portfolios as inputs to the evaluation. However, she responded *Unable to Answer* to

the entire Danielson (1996) list. This is particularly interesting as she was the only respondent in this school to claim evaluation for teaching practice.

Management of Evaluation

This teacher's responses on evaluation management were very positive with strong agreement that her evaluator was as good a practitioner as herself, that the various inputs were balanced and reconciled, and that personality issues did not intrude. Coverage of the full range of her pedagogy left this teacher full of trust and confidence in the evaluation system. She was unable to respond on the existence of clear and unambiguous redress procedures.

Evaluation in Teacher 1K's school was open to staff input, affected teaching outcomes in a positive way, and enhanced teaching practice so that teachers felt they were members of the professional community of the school. It was not a bureaucratic process, and judged teachers professional work. However, this teacher was unable to answer propositions on whether evaluation was used to enforce compliance, or if it had been evaluated for effectiveness and equity. She also could not comment on the ownership of evaluation.

This teacher saw the evaluation process as benefiting the whole school community, enhancing pedagogy and professionalism, and making her feel more a part of the organisation. It did not reinforce the hierarchy, but rather enhanced communication upwards and helped her plan her future. Teacher 1K was unable to comment if the evaluation process changed teaching practices for the better.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 1K's emotional reactions were stated as confidence, concern, and optimism. Almost all of her post-evaluation responses were positive. She reflected on her practice to review shortfalls, and felt renewed and increasingly committed to the school. She did not focus on the negatives or complain to her peers. This teacher was unable to answer if she set goals for the next reporting period, or whether she discussed her training requirements with the professional development officer.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 1K had participated in six school/department sponsored professional development days only. She welcomed it with enthusiasm as an invigorating and key part of modern

practice, but did not have a specific opinion on professional development. This teacher strongly denied that it was a good chance to get a break from class, or just an award requirement.

Professional development objectives were set both individually and collectively at school and faculty level, and these were reconciled for economy and consistency. Whilst Teacher 1K's professional development objectives were submitted for approval by the professional development officer, her supervisor did not work with her to set them based on needs stemming from her previous evaluation. Thereafter this teacher's professional development selections were based in advice from the professional development, based on what interesting options came up each year. Teacher 1K also sought activities that might be fun, although she strongly denied seeking those that would cause her to miss maximum classes.

Professional Development Outcomes

Professional development in the past year had improved Teacher 1K's professional subject knowledge, instructional techniques, and evaluation, assessment, and reporting skills. These were reported on a short note on the school's professional development form only. Neither the supervisor, the professional development officer, nor the school followed up this teacher's professional development to determine the impact on her teaching and student learning. Her evaluations also clearly did not examine her professional development outcomes. Despite this, Teacher 1K did not consider that the professional development heading on her evaluation form merely listed activities. She also considered that professional development was an obvious contributor to organisational change, and made her feel a continuing learner within an educational community.

School Professional Development Practices

Activities in the school were based on each teacher's learning needs, and included the full range of courses, seminars, and workshops. However, there were neither internal mentoring, nor opportunities for self-reflection.

Teacher 1K strongly disagreed that professional development in her school was a token gesture. It was efficient, effective, and responsive to teachers' needs, and included a clear connection to requirements identified in evaluations. However, this teacher contradicted her responses by noting professional development as not responsive to her needs, and not containing a mix of training to meet her personal, pedagogical, and organisational needs. She also denied that professional development was a key input to the evaluation system so that she

could see how she was developing as a professional. Whole school professional development was strongly supported as a regular and stimulating force for change.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

This teacher viewed her school as a truly collaborative culture, that encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in differing ways, mobilised them as agents of change, and left them free to acknowledge failure as well as success. Her strongest views were that the school was not made up of cliques, but encouraged broad dialogue across all levels. Nonetheless, Teacher 1K did not see her school as regularly analysing, modelling, or rewarding good teaching, and it did not encourage parental feedback on teaching standards.

Teacher 1K perceived herself as a reflective teacher with high personal expectations, and one who enjoyed the students and worked to develop their understanding. Whilst she did not doubt the validity of educational change, she did not really want to be part of it, and she did not regularly try new teaching approaches. This teacher sought opportunities to be more collegial and share success as well as errors, and to better understand and be a part of changes. She wished formative evaluation of her teaching to be separate from institutional assessments, and for the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom needs. However, Teacher 1K did not wish to feel less isolated, and did not want to more openly discuss classroom teaching with her colleagues.

Comments on Teacher 1K

It is surprising that Teacher 1K could generate such strong positive feelings about evaluation when she had been evaluated only infrequently, and not in the past four years. Even if it was five years before, such supportive reactions conflict with a complete lack of knowledge of the detail of the inputs, certainly from one who claims a strong knowledge of the evaluation process. Because this teacher claimed her evaluation was for teaching practice, some coverage of the fundamentals of pedagogy, and professional development requirements would be expected. The absence of both raises questions about the comprehensiveness of the process.

Because of her age and the stage of her professional career, Teacher 1K appeared to be a professional development consumer who was oriented towards retirement rather than opening her classroom to evaluative practices. Her support of professional development would seem to be as part of the collective rather than as an individual, and her reluctance to feel less isolated was probably due to her ingrained perception of teaching as a closed act that she has not been

asked to reveal. Consequently Teacher 1K's willingness to share and acknowledge mistakes may only be at the level of controlled collegial discussion where admissions are second hand and guarded, rather than honest revelations and critical reflections on classroom practice.

The contradictions in Teacher 1K's responses also left the researcher feeling that, at least in some cases, she was responding with what she thought would be the right answers. As an older teacher with a long career at this school, and still obviously supportive of it, established loyalty may have clashed with propositions that appeared critical of it.

Discussion of Teacher Surveys

Evaluation

Teacher surveys from School 1 provided no evidence of a culture of evaluation and self-reflection on teaching practice. Despite a couple of teachers indicating evaluation for teaching practice, the minimal number of positive responses to this purpose, as compared to the larger number of responses for leadership selection, suggests that evaluation in this school was primarily an advancement tool rather than one directed towards the enhancement of pedagogy. This would certainly explain the responses of recent arrivals who lacked knowledge of the evaluation system, because they would not have yet applied for leadership roles or re-categorisation in this school. Teacher 1B was one such new arrival, but she also had not been evaluated in the previous twenty years of her career. Furthermore, even though evaluation was directed to leadership selection, there were those such as Teacher 1A, a departmental head, with absolutely no evaluation history. As this was also her only school, perhaps Teacher 1A had been rewarded for waiting, as suggested by Ramsey (2000, p.85).

The absence of any evaluation of teachers new to the school - those who had been there less than three years (Teachers 1B, 1C, 1D, 1F) raises interesting issues of teaching standards following appointment. It would appear that, having been chosen for the job, teachers in this school are allowed to go their own way without verification of the selection process or the quality of their classroom performance. In the case of the more established practitioners (1B and 1C), time served and referee reports appear to have been the prime determinants of competency. Meanwhile, the less experienced appear to qualify by virtue of qualifications and interview alone. These results support broader survey findings of classroom isolation and perhaps abandonment, once a measure of competence is assumed, be it experience in another school or as little as graduation from a teaching course. The school makes no effort to verify its choices or determine if there are areas requiring improvement in the new environment.

What is of major concern, particularly as the evaluations conducted were primarily advancement directed appraisals, was both the inconsistency of inputs, and the claimed ignorance by some respondents of the data collection procedures. Teacher 1J reflected a comprehensive range of inputs, but noted that not all of these were reflected in the report and interview, which raises questions as to their application in the evaluation. Meanwhile, Teacher 1G was unable to identify the inputs and felt that he had been judged on the basis of personality rather than professionalism. Teacher 1H identified a number of inputs including questionnaires, peer input and observation. However, these did not accord with those suggested by Teacher 1I who, although she had not been evaluated in the past four years, was the only one to have prepared a professional portfolio. Teacher 1I also indicated that the format of her evaluation had moved to 'more of a conversation', which she viewed as a solid recognition of her skills. The adoption of the conversation approach might appear less threatening, but could also further obscure the process and make it seem more subjective. Certainly this was the perception of Teacher 1G who might have felt that he had been excluded from leadership by a vague evaluation system that was not objectively and equally directed at pedagogy, and may not have even be required in some cases to achieve advancement. Similar concerns that personality issues intruded were expressed by the more successful Teacher 1H, whose input saves Teacher 1G from appearing a solitary, bitter, and resentful individual.

Where classroom observation occurred, it appears to have been part of the promotion process alone and, as such cannot be ascribed any validity because of the purpose of leadership suitability assessment, rather than enhancement of pedagogy. The two aims are not necessarily compatible. Indeed, if observation was tied to advancement alone then it will not have been sufficiently frequent as to give a real profile of teaching, and would help to explain the low level of being observed responses in the broader survey in Chapter 3. Furthermore, it is unlikely that it would generate the right type or quantity of feedback to have any real influence on teaching performance in the classroom.

The responses of the four teachers who had some experience of evaluation in this school in the past four to five years, were revealing. Teacher 1G, in the first instance, was resentful and suspicious. Even if he did reflect on his performance and set goals, he would likely view any future evaluation with suspicion, ensuring that he is not open about his teaching. Teacher 1H, despite her success, was similarly suspicious and defensive, and admitted to having no ownership of the bureaucratic process which failed to penetrate her practice. Whilst Teacher 1J did not see evaluation as a tool of the bureaucracy, she nonetheless lacked any ownership and

did not change her teaching or work harder. Of all the respondents, Teacher 1J appeared to be the one most seeking positives in the evaluation process. The only unreserved response was from Teacher 1I who was purely *confident*.

The evaluation process in this school could not claim to have enhanced teacher performance. Even as a promotion tool, its application appeared inconsistent, and open to suspicion and rehearsed responses. Where it was applied, there appeared significant discrepancies in the inputs, conduct, and outputs, sufficiently so that most teachers lacked confidence in the process. Few of the teachers had any experience of evaluation in this school, and certainly there was no direction towards enhancing pedagogy. What was particularly significant was that Teacher 1D in his first year expressed some positive response to evaluation although he had no knowledge of its existence in the school. Despite some apprehensions, he saw evaluation as positively enhancing pedagogy and professionalism. Unfortunately, there was little outlook for these positive attitudes to be realised or built upon as he continued his “sink or swim” induction into teaching in this school.

Professional Development

In the absence of any evaluation, the most common basis for professional development selections was seeing what interesting options appeared, and finding something that might be fun, particularly amongst those respondents who were not evaluated. For those respondents who had been evaluated, Teacher 1H saw professional development as something done to her, Teacher 1I just got on and did it, whilst accepting professional development was a good break from the students, and 1J also enjoyed the break from class, whilst basing her choices on perceptions of her own needs. The only teacher who appeared to have a professional attitude was Teacher 1E, who was in a leadership position and had completed a Masters degree. However, even he admitted that he sought fun options that would avoid use of his time. The other Masters graduate, Teacher 1G, admitted to awaiting interesting options, but balanced this with a strong appreciation of his own needs. Clearly the absence of reflective evaluation in this school hindered the positive development of positive professional development motivation and the enhancement of pedagogy.

The adherence to school or departmental directed objectives is a function of training that teachers should expect to perform as part of their employment. However, in the absence of coordination and a mechanism to gauge its effectiveness, the value of such training is problematical. As to the improvement of teaching as a professional responsibility, one could

expect to see this in self-initiated professional development participation figures. Whilst the figures ranged from two to seven days for the active members, two teachers had no self-initiated days, Teachers 1I and 1K. The former claimed to have a strong understanding of the evaluation system but had difficulty agreeing to propositions connecting it with professional development. Teacher 1K, meanwhile, provided a range of confusing responses that made her knowledge of the system doubtful.

Assessment of the effectiveness of the training or learning, namely follow-up and validation within the professional development process, was identified as a consistent shortfall in almost all of these survey responses. Teacher 1C submitted a detailed evaluation of her professional development but was unaware of the existence of a professional development officer in the school, so the destination of the follow-up becomes problematical. Teacher 1G also submitted a detailed report, but this was not followed up. The absence of systematic validation exposed flaws both organisationally, in that the school was unable to verify that its funds and time had been well spent, and individually, in that there was no process to see if the professional development had translated into improved teaching and student learning. The short note on the professional development form appeared to be little more than a token gesture to verify participation rather than training outcomes. This was particularly the case where teachers in this school admitted that they did not see the professional development as meeting their needs or else that it was more fanfare and hierarchical self-promotion. Furthermore, because this school was heavily involved in the implementation of a new curricular framework that required teachers to plan and teach differently, the absence of the validation process raises doubts as to whether teachers had effectively been prepared for classroom implementation of this change in the following year. In fact, most teachers within this school asserted the opposite, that they did not wish to feel less isolated or to openly discuss their classrooms.

Despite the above, the professional development staff was judged by their fellow teachers to be doing a reasonable job, apart from Teacher 1C who had yet to identify them. Most of the respondents felt that whole school professional development was well organised and directed, although there was some concern at the fanfare and hierarchical self-promotion that occurred. Consequently, it appears that the professional development staff was delivering the school's collective training agenda, although this was not translating into meeting individual professional learning needs. The teachers' concern at the shortfalls reflected this dysfunction.

The attitude of teachers to their school is also significant. Most felt that they worked in a positive and collaborative institution that respected their professionalism. Individuals were positively motivated and saw themselves as open to new teaching approaches. Both of these perspectives underscore an organisation with a positive morale factor, and unity in the objectives of teaching. The issue with evaluation and most effective professional development did not seem to be one of intent, but rather understanding and structural reorientation to ensure that the affective support was underpinned by greater teacher efficiency and capability which was constantly being renewed. For this to occur, evaluation practices would need to move beyond leadership selection procedures, and teachers would have to take increasing responsibility for their own learning.

The absence of evaluation data and more personal interaction with the teachers limits the judgements that can be made from stage theory. However, the surveys provide some broad indications of the types of respondents in this school. Teachers 1A, 1B, 1C, and 1J all appeared comfortable in their current situations, and met the requirements of their job, but did little more. Teacher 1I was in a similar position, but in her survey response appears to have defended her school and perhaps given the answers that she thought were expected. Teacher 1D remained new and confused. Teachers 1F and 1H were both isolated, the former more physically and organisationally, and the latter in the classic teacher sense where she felt potentially threatened by evaluation. Teacher 1E in his leadership position was the most confident and ambitious. However, he also was aware of shortfalls that he had not rectified; perhaps he has been more attuned to his own ambitions rather than the pedagogical needs of his colleagues. Teacher 1G was the most frustrated, with a post-graduate qualification and ambitious to get ahead, but within a system where the evaluation processes and requirements for advancement were unclear. Lastly, Teacher 1K was heading for retirement and was disengaging.

Examination of this case study school reveals the differing capabilities and needs of the teachers. The static group needed to be moved out of their reverie, particularly at a time of curricular change. The strengths and enthusiasm of Teacher 1G needed to be harnessed to the benefit of the students and school. Teacher 1K required support so that she could provide effective and relevant teaching until her career conclusion. With an evaluation system that was intermittent and directed to promotion, and a professional development structure that failed to identify outcomes and further learning needs, it does not appear that the potential of all of these teachers was being fully realised.

Student Focus Group Discussion

Have you ever conducted an evaluation of a teacher?

The students in Case Study School 1 (Appendix 5) could identify only one teacher who evaluated his work through student feedback after project work. Whilst the results of this class survey were not shared with the students, they did notice subsequent classes incorporated more of the 'fun stuff'. Aside from this one instance, the only evaluations students completed were those of student teachers at the end of their practicum. The concept of ongoing and cooperative evaluation of teaching took some time to explain to the focus group as such open interaction was perceived as quite foreign. However, there was eventual agreement by some students in the group, with one saying 'I think that's a good thing because most of the time you have an opinion but you never really get a chance to actually say it'.

What do you consider are the characteristics of a good teacher?

In identifying the characteristics of a good teacher, these students noted that they are teachers who:

- let you learn in different ways
- [have] a bit of personality. I mean there's some good teachers out there that teach...they're smart, but they're just stiff
- aren't like too demanding and intimidating and engage the students in a more friendly way
- [are] someone who you can relate to a bit better.

The characteristics of a teacher seen as not good were:

- always grumpy
- one that yells
- explains everything quickly and you can't take it all in at once
- Someone who give you no, like, rewards
- just cram stuff into you...and don't give you time to think...just expect you to know everything
- can't communicate...they know what they're saying but can't tell you how to do it
- don't give enough time and rush through certain areas
- just always make you write notes and never explain anything
- have bad personal hygiene

- it's like his mission is to get through the year. Like there's no sort of thing...he just has to get the work done and then that's it; he doesn't really care about anyone. He just has to do it.

Students may be respectful of a particular teacher's subject knowledge and accept that he does manage to impart learning. However, methodology difficulties remain:

- he knows how to teach but he's not good at it
- it's just the way he goes about it that we don't like
- he's a smart man but his methods aren't the greatest.

Such agreement on a particular teacher's methods is often based on students comparing their reactions and performance to determine that the problem is not just with them: 'Eventually you hear that the whole class thinks it too and you won't be the only one.' This does not mean that students are "ganging up" on a teacher, but, rather, that they achieve a consensus on difficulties they are experiencing with their learning, based on the teacher's performance.

Thoughts about teaching were not limited to short comments. Some students recognised those who taught for understanding or were sympathetic to students learning styles and capabilities:

Some teachers have a really weird way of making you feel like you're not working but you seem to be able to take in all this information and you just seem to be able to remember it and not have to like go back through your notes or anything. I don't know what that is, but some people can just make you have fun and work at the same time.

Another student was aware of, but couldn't explain the complexity of the teaching/learning act that came together to work for him:

One of my teachers at another school, he was a very good teacher and his characteristic was only just being patient and I don't know how he did it but he managed to keep the whole class focussed, and just keeping the class focussed made everyone learn a lot quicker, but I'm not sure how he did that.

Clearly, students are able to appreciate classroom situations where complex positive factors come together and dominate to ensure learning for understanding. Consequently, when they point to good teachers, it is likely to be on broader grounds than personal popularity or

excessive leniency with regard to work. Judgements on teacher effectiveness frequently are based on student success:

Like you don't really have to say much and anything like that, but if your work or product you've at the end of the class has come out really well or really bad it's pretty much a reflection on how the teacher was teaching you.

In other words, students are more likely to be positively oriented to teachers who help them learn and achieve success, with popularity consequent from this. One focus group member put it very succinctly: 'A teacher that teaches everything and doesn't give you a chance to think, is just as bad as a teacher who's like too lenient and doesn't make you think at all.'

Just as with other professional practitioners, the customers will orient towards those seen as more effective. Unfortunately, students are not free consumers: 'we just have to put up with it, whether we like it or not. We don't so much have a say in what we learn.' Nonetheless, this does not mean that, in the absence of being consulted about teaching, students are not communicating their feelings about both the good and bad aspects of the classes they sit in. Some just 'go up to them in class and say "I don't like you!" or "I do like you!" or something like that.' Occasionally they call out 'Oh, this is so boring!' Alternatively, 'no one has to say that it's boring, it's just that everyone is sitting there with their heads on their tables and just being fidgety and not listening.' Unresolved issues may end up as a confrontation with either the student getting into trouble for impertinence or the teacher becoming offended and possibly losing confidence.

Earlier this year in my Maths class we had an incident with a teacher where sort of got into a bit of a yelling match and he took that to heart and it sort of put him off for about I don't know a month. But after that he got back to where we decided to ease off on him because it really did put him out...like he really did get offended by it and took it really personally.

Such confrontations or rude statements flow from both the absence of opportunity to convey their expectations or views to their teachers and a lack of power in the classroom:

- because just in case they're the kind of teacher that's not like that; they just don't want to be offended, might be trying to protect themselves
- They'd probably just get really angry and yell and shout

- if you tell a teacher that they yell a lot, they'll probably take it personally, kinda stick up for themselves and come back in the class and say "The only reason why I yell at you is because you keep doing this and that." So I don't reckon that would really help.
- because they've come from...back in the day when you just wouldn't talk back and it's a lot of those teachers who have the fear, and you don't say things to because they're not used to it and usually can't handle it... it's like personal attack
- my Maths teacher is always pretty grumpy and, like, people in the class are even too scared to ask to go to the toilet and stuff, because he gets grumpy at them. Like he's not the kind of person you'd ask or like tell them that he smells or anything like that. You wouldn't.
- Some teachers are just like that particularistic...they're just so set in their ways that there's nothing there that you can do that'll ever change them. Because they've been teaching like that for so long that they've gotten used to it...the classes taking it.

What is the response of the school, other teachers, and parents?

Attempts to change class might represent an outcome of student inability to convey expectations and alter teacher behaviour, although students referred also to the pursuing of friendship groups with the school capitulating to parental demands. However, poor experiences of older siblings with a teacher also can generate a request. Students in School 1 were somewhat resigned to the fact that 'not everyone can swap out of the class' where a teacher is seen as universally poor. However, they were conscious that any decision to move classes had to be based on the right motivation, and 'if they're just moving because they don't want to do work then that's not fair on the other students'. Furthermore, 'if the problem is with the student and the student keeps changing so that the problem doesn't get fixed, then it'll just be worse off for them in the long run.' Interestingly, in response to a question about parental awareness of teacher differences, this survey group's responses were reasonably weak, illustrating that our children's school days remain relatively opaque once parent help is no longer welcome in the class room.

Within a tight organisation such as a school and the development of affective bonds between teachers and students, the strengths and weaknesses of teachers can become the subject of informal dialogues. One student knew a teacher 'who's one of my favourite teachers and he

says stuff about another teachers ways of teaching, and what his personality's like, and stuff like that, and he's open to me.' Such knowledge may not be the result of informal affective comments alone, but can actually be from representations by students for change to those in positions of responsibility such as Home Room teachers or tutors.

Any teacher's opinions about another's practice appeared more likely to be sourced in student comments and anecdotes or complaints due to the isolation of the class room. Aside from student teachers, the only observation that students in School 1 could identify was where senior teachers entered classes to deal with class control or behaviour issues. This proved to be a pointless exercise because the class changed in light of the additional person.

It usually changes the situation when another adult walks into the room, because the teacher's not fully focussed on the front, and if people like...say, if it's a sort of intimidating person sitting up the back, they usually change their behaviour.

This supports the broader statistical findings of teacher mutual observation being a rare thing. However, it also reduces the probability of any mutual observation events aimed at pedagogy. Furthermore, it supports previous findings that occasional observation as practised in current appraisal systems provides no real indication of either teaching skills or the actual classroom environment.

If a teacher made the effort...would you help?

Despite what they perceived as teacher reluctance, the students in School 1 were interested in some formal evaluation system, both because 'that'd be a lot better than just getting to the point where students have to yell at teachers and scream', and because of their concern that 'every time we try to tell teacher something they think that we're being rude. And we're not most of the time.' Notably, they were quite sensitive to teachers' feelings, both suggesting confidentiality 'so it wouldn't upset the teachers too much personally', and identified a need to 'make sure the students were like not just saying it because they like the teachers or dislike the teachers.' The response to teachers honestly attempting to rectify problems in their practice was generally supportive with statements like 'I think you'd try to make things better, at least make the effort to make things better', and, 'I'd give the teacher a hand along if they needed new ideas or something.' The motivation was not completely altruistic because the students saw they had something to gain as well:

If you've told the teacher that you have a problem or that they're not doing something right, you're going to want them to make it better. You're going to want to help them to fix it because that'll make things better for you and get rid of your problem.

Explain what you understand by the term 'professional development'?

The students criticised professional development motivations, 'It's just like a reason for them to get away and put another thing on their resume', and outcomes, 'they stand all like up themselves because they get to go to some professional development, but in the end it doesn't help them.' When asked if they had ever noticed a change in classroom practice after a teacher returned from professional development, the response was negative:

When they do try and do something new, I don't think they fully understand it and they can't communicate it properly. And it's just coming straight out of the textbook...so it doesn't really work.

Students referred to parental irritation at professional development days at the start of the year following holidays: 'My Dad always says like bags out teachers and he says like "That they really need a holiday now just after they've had like seven weeks!"' Others questioned the validity of professional development:

Well my Auntie, she's like a mature age student, and she's like been open to the real world and stuff, and she says that when they do this professional development stuff it really annoys her because the people who haven't been out in the workforce except for teaching, they get really excited over minor things. And she says that, like, they just talk about really silly little issues when there's bigger problems at hand, and she thinks it's a big waste of time for people that haven't been exposed to the big issues.

Despite these initial negatives, students acknowledged that teachers needed to continue to learn their work: 'they need that development just to keep them sharp and fresh and knowing what they're doing, like they might forget certain things.' Furthermore, students and parents might also be more receptive if they were better informed about professional development objectives and outcomes, providing that some change eventuated: 'if a teacher came back to school and actually showed us what they learned was good, then it'd be cool because they'd have learned stuff', and 'You can't be over qualified. There's no such thing as over qualified so it's only good if you have more things you know.'

Students had difficulty with ineffective application of professional development learning in classroom situations. There was some discussion about an integrated learning excursion to Canberra where teacher lack of understanding about a task compounded onto the students, causing inconsistencies and confusion:

- we were supposed to do this huge project on it for the new Essential Learnings and it ended up not getting marked at all...We were basically told this huge new way of learning and this is the way we're all going to learn in the future sort of thing and I didn't get mine back or anything.
- it's like they told us we had to do this great big journal thing that no one ever did. And they said that they were gonna give us time to do, and they didn't give us time to do it. Like they set due dates but still no one's handed it in.
- I don't think teachers really knew what they were doing like how to plan before we went away. So I was pretty disappointed in the teachers.

The situation was not all grim as one student, who had been on the same trip, acknowledged that teachers had moved on from what was an initial state of confusion:

I think that last year when we went on that trip the school wasn't really sure....they were learning how to teach us, and we were trying to learn, so everyone was a bit confused. But this year I've noticed it's getting better and this whole gaining an understanding of it is really good.

Regardless of the response to that particular event, the students as a whole demonstrated little knowledge of what their teachers were doing in professional development, and parents generally appeared to be maintaining negative opinions on what they saw as time wasting events rather than teacher learning that is directed to student outcomes. Some general understanding was drawn out on what professional development might be, but at no time was a student able to present a positive anecdote of a teacher publicly acknowledging and demonstrating learning outcomes. Even one specific teacher coming back renewed with enthusiasm was misinterpreted because the students were not informed:

in primary school, like the whole school went away for a student free day and they came back and there was like just this one teacher, like they

weren't my teacher, but they came back and they were so sure of themselves like they knew everything and they were so much better because they spent this whole day learning so they were just like more I'm so good and all that.

Documentation

The documentation on evaluation and professional development from School 1 was limited, being extracts from the staff handbook. This identified a process of teacher appraisal to occur in teachers' second year of practice and thereafter each five years. The purpose of the program was:

to provide professional and personal development for teachers so that the learning enterprise of the school, individual performance, job satisfaction and career opportunities are all enhanced.

The appraisal sought to provide feedback and address difficulties, as well as identify professional development needs. However, this particular instruction did not proceed beyond generalities and lacked any indications of framework, methodology, or detailed procedures. It also did not direct where such information was to be found.

The area of professional learning essentially directed teachers to the appropriate forms. Completion of the *Professional Learning Review* form was required 'as a form of accountability, and to satisfy the requirements of on-going Teacher Registration.' The benefits to pedagogy and reflective teaching appear to have been assumed, and improved learning in the classroom stemming from effective professional development was ignored. The form itself was an A4 page with sections on content, key learning outcomes, and intended application. After signature by the Principal, the form was sent to file and there appeared to be no procedure for subsequent review.

School 1 Conclusions

The appraisal system referred to in the School 1 staff handbook was clearly not in operation as teachers with over two years service had not been evaluated. In letting this system lapse, the administration was sending a message to teachers that the examination of pedagogy was not a school agenda. Rather, it intimated that all teachers in the school are equivalent in competence and that there was thus no need to focus on the remediation and continual improvement of classroom practice. More significantly, it conveyed to teachers that they were indeed isolated in the classroom. However, one cannot just blame the organisation. Student input confirmed that

the teachers themselves had not initiated their own self-evaluation practices, and student consultation was an isolated event.

The impact of this shortfall was that there appeared to be no dialogue about learning between the students and teachers in the classroom. The pupils denied such input, reverted to misbehaviour, or occasional outright confrontation with those teachers whom they perceived as below standard or unsympathetic to their needs. The students' comments suggest that, despite talk about new methods of learning in the classroom through top-down curricular reform, the adversarial classroom was alive and well, with teachers attempting to force content into students in an environment of control rather than constructed learning. The absence of both reflective evaluation and dialogue with students not only constrained the effectiveness of current teaching but also hindered the implementation of curricular reform towards enhanced learning outcomes. Cynically, the classroom door shuts and the changes are left outside either to decay or be supported through lip service. The consequence is the type of cynicism manifested by some young students at this school.

The following judgements can be made from the results in this school matched against the design elements for effective evaluation in Chapter 2:

- (1) The purposes of evaluation were unclear, as the statement in the staff handbook did not accord with what appeared to be the reality of an appraisal procedure that was primarily directed at promotion selection, and, occasionally, the awarding of tenure.
- (2) There was no evidence that evaluation in this school encouraged teachers to improve their practice.
- (3) Although there was no evidence of the actual procedures applied, Teacher 1G certainly felt that his evaluation was neither objective, nor work directed. It appears that there was potential for personal judgements and bias.
- (4) Notwithstanding Teacher 1G's feelings, other teachers who had experienced evaluation in this school expressed feelings of trust and confidence in the system. This suggests that the management of the school had made efforts to be non-threatening in the intermittent application of the appraisal process in place at the time.

- (5) Evaluation in this school was purely summative, particularly as there was no mention of any purpose other than tenure and promotion. Formative evaluation for improvement of pedagogy was not in place.
- (6) The appraisal process in this school appeared to be owned, applied, and maintained by school management, and was applied to employees, rather than as part of an evaluation of knowledge and duties of professional teachers.
- (7) Teacher evidence illustrated that the evaluation was isolated, intermittent, and not part of a school wide program of quality assurance.
- (8) The purpose of the appraisal system in School 1 referred to career and organisational objectives primarily. The absence of learning centred comments from teachers, the inconsistent application of the appraisal, and no observation of data collection or outcomes by students, suggested that learning was not the aim of the evaluation.
- (9) The objectives and application of evaluation did not encourage self-reflection, and this was illustrated in a number of teachers responding that they did not seek to reduce isolation and increase collegial interaction.

The absence of consistent evaluation and an effective validation procedure for professional development meant that teachers who had not taken responsibility for their ongoing professional renewal were able to select interesting and fun items over truly beneficial learning, provided they were able to submit some justification on a form. Whole school professional development might be well organised, but it was delivered well into an environment where teachers were regarded as professionally equivalent. Even so, there was no evidence of a valid determination of collective needs, or follow-up to determine either assimilation or effective application of the learning. Meanwhile, the students and their parents - two thirds of the school community - failed to see professional development outcomes translate into more effective teaching and learning.

The following judgments can be made from the data against the design elements for effective professional development outlined in Chapter 3:

- (1) Professional development managers could not gauge the stages of teacher development because there existed no systematic method to collect the data to make such a

judgement, or to help teachers appreciate their career stage. Teachers themselves did not seem to be considering their needs from this perspective, basing professional development choices more on enjoyment.

- (2) Student failure to observe manifestation of change and experimentation in the classroom and an absence of dialogue, coupled with interest and enjoyment as primary motivations for professional development selection, suggests that professional development was not something embedded in the daily life of the school.
- (3) Professional development appeared not to have enhanced reflective autonomy amongst these teachers. Reluctance by some teachers to forego isolation, or openly discuss classroom teaching and share mistakes, suggests that the collegiality in this school was not professional and pedagogical, and did not open the way for professional development focussed on real teaching needs.
- (4) Not only did the students fail to identify positive changes in the classroom flowing from professional development, the existence of cynicism amongst both students and their parents about the professional development and teacher motivation made doubtful the assumed outcome of professional development events.
- (5) There was no effective validation process for professional development in this school. Whilst some planning process may have taken place, the absence of effective evaluation and validation opens to question the basis for such planning. The comments by some teachers that whole school learning was made up of fanfare events that promoted the hierarchy suggests that there were problems in both professional development organisation and communications.
- (6) If school professional development planning and validation was flawed and teachers based their own choices on what interesting options appeared, or on personal enjoyment, then professional development in this school could not be a unified and continual process involving all focusing on student learning as the ultimate objective.

Positive and collaborative attitudes and relationships in schools, including this one, are to be welcomed. However, in the case of teachers in School 1, such qualities did not appear to be one of truly professional intellectual collaboration, but rather analogous to a group of mutually

supportive process workers. In the absence of self-reflective evaluation on teaching practice and professional development aimed at enhancing teaching, and a strong and mutually supportive relationship between both, the outlook for improved pedagogy to meet changing demands in a rapidly changing society is open to serious question. With classrooms isolated and parents excluded, those outside are unlikely to know the realities of the classroom, and it is not in the interests of either teachers or the administration to reveal them.