

Chapter 8

Case Study School 3

Introduction

Case Study School 3 provided three teacher surveys, a focus group discussion, and access to documentation.

Teacher Surveys

Teacher 3A - *Confused and something is missing*

Teacher 3A was a 41-45 year old female permanent part time teacher who had been teaching for 21-25 years, of which 6-10 years had been at this school. She had no post-graduate qualifications, but had advanced to the position of Advanced Skills Teacher 1 (AST1).

Evaluation

Whilst this teacher answered that she had been evaluated for tenure, teaching practice, and her AST1 categorisation, she chose the *Unable to answer* response for all of the questions on evaluation. This suggests that she either had made an error in the question on the types of evaluation, failed to understand or respond to any of the evaluation elements, or else interpreted an interview in these cases as representing evaluation, which in form and content would be profoundly inadequate from the perspective of this study. Given the generally emotive response of most people to evaluation and its exposure of their teaching to, in some cases unwanted, scrutiny, the latter reason would seem the most likely for this teacher's answers on evaluation. Whatever the motivation for her responses, they proved of no value for this aspect of the research.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 3A had attended two days of school/department sponsored professional development only. She found it an invigorating opportunity to refresh her ideas, but she neither welcomed professional development as an opportunity to enhance her skills, nor saw it as a key part of modern practice. Nonetheless, she did not feel manipulated by others in professional development, and did not consider it an opportunity to get out of class.

This teacher did not set her own professional development objectives, based either on evaluation or perceptions of her own personal needs, or submit the same to the professional development officer. Rather, professional development objectives were derived essentially by

the faculty, and were based on promulgated school goals. However, these were not reconciled with school objectives to ensure economy and consistency. Teacher 3A's professional development selections were based on what she was told to do, the amount of money available, and finding something that was likely to be enjoyable.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 3A had improved her professional knowledge of her subject area, and classroom instructional techniques in her two professional development days. These were validated solely by a verbal report to the professional development officer or faculty. Not only did Teacher 3A's supervisor not objectively discuss the professional development to see that it met her needs, there was a complete absence of school, professional development officer, or evaluation procedures to check the application of this teacher's learning in her practice and its impact on student outcomes. As a consequence, Teacher 3A had a diminished sense of being part of a community in a process of lifelong learning. In contrast to these responses, she denied strongly that the professional development heading on her evaluation form was just a place to list activities, and felt that professional development was an obvious contributor to organisational change.

School Professional Development Practices

School professional development activities included external conferences and courses, and visiting speakers and workshops. However, there were no opportunities for individual mentoring or reflection, and this teacher strongly felt that professional development failed to provide a range of activities based on teachers' individual needs. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, and was seen as generally boring. However, it was acknowledged as a force for change, rather than just an opportunity for hierarchical self-promotion. Teacher 3A strongly denied that whole school events were most importantly a day away from class.

This teacher strongly denied that professional development was a token gesture, yet also strongly saw the professional development system as very inefficient and unresponsive. It was neither well managed and dynamic, nor did it make Teacher 3A feel like a life long learner, because it was totally unresponsive to her individual needs. Furthermore, professional development failed to be a key input into an evaluation system to assist her in monitoring her individual professional progress

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

The attitude of Teacher 3A to her school was generally positive. She strongly felt that it encouraged teachers to demonstrate their worth in a collaborative culture where failure could be shared as well as success. The staff was cohesive, and the school regularly analysed what was good teaching, and acknowledged different teaching styles. However, the school did not reward good teaching regardless of seniority, and it was not utilising this teacher actively as an agent of change. Parental feedback on teaching standards was also not encouraged.

Teacher 3A saw herself as having high professional standards, and as trying to understand the students, whom she very much enjoyed teaching. She perceived herself as setting high personal expectations within a personal reflective framework, and trying to adopt new teaching approaches. Whilst she doubted the validity of educational changes she was being asked to introduce, this teacher was, nonetheless, open to discussing and feeling a greater part of such change. Teacher 3A most strongly aspired toward greater opportunities to work collegially with fellow teachers. She wished for formative pedagogical evaluation to be separated from organisational appraisal and for the professional development system to be more responsive to her classroom needs. Additionally, this teacher sought to better share the positive aspects of teaching as well as failures in a process of ongoing pedagogical improvement. Noticeably, she did not wish to feel less isolated in the classroom.

Comments on Teacher 3A

Teacher 3A's responses suggest that she was aware of something missing in her professional life as a teacher, although she had not taken steps to rectify the situation, manifested by no self-initiated professional development or post-graduate training, even though she strongly denied that use of own time was a factor in her professional development selections. She had positive feelings about her school and herself as a teacher. However, her view of the professional development system as inefficient and unresponsive, the absence of opportunities for staff mentoring or reflection, and her most powerful desire to have time to work collegially with her fellow teachers focussed on pedagogy, strongly suggest that this teacher is seeking the type of concentrated professional focus on teaching that is absent from the current professional development system. Nonetheless, Teacher 3A does not appear to have identified or initiated the steps to make this happen, despite her view that the organisational environment is indeed very collaborative and collegial. This suggests that the collegiality that she observed, whilst probably more than contrived, was still not sufficiently open for teachers to share the fine

details of their classroom experience. Indeed, Teacher 3A's reluctance to feel less isolated in the classroom may reflect similar self-protective behaviours.

Teacher 3A probably was responding to feelings of being part of a workforce, rather than a true professional. As such, she does not appear to be independent, but in some difficulty as the system that should provide for her needs was not doing so. Despite her self-image, this teacher did not appear to be sufficiently reflective as to be a true professional. She was, rather, an *employee* and thus meeting work obligations, as opposed to driving them in the pursuit of better educational outcomes. An additional benefit for this study of Teacher 3A is that she confirms again that her AST1 position, which was to be for advanced teaching, appears to have been awarded based on longevity and without any detailed examination of teaching performance.

Teacher 3B - *Evaluated and a winner*

Teacher 3B was a 46-50 year old male deputy principal who had been teaching for 21-24 years, 15-20 years of those at this school. He did not complete the question on post-graduate learning.

Evaluation

This teacher had experienced evaluation for leadership positions only. Such evaluation had occurred within the last four years, but not within the current year. He had received professional development on the evaluation process and had acted in the position of evaluator. This teacher also claimed a strong knowledge of the role of evaluation in the school, one of the few teachers in the whole survey group to do so.

Inputs to Evaluation

Peer input and the examination of teaching documentation were the only inputs utilised to gather information for Teacher 3B's evaluation. These covered almost the whole list derived from Danielson (1996) with the exception of Self-reflection on Teaching, Communication with Families, and Contribution to School & Professional Community.

Management of Evaluation

Teacher 3B had very positive feelings towards evaluation, expressing strong confidence in the process, his evaluator, and redress procedures. The process covered the full range of his pedagogy or teaching skills, and reconciled the inputs to ensure balance, consistency, and fairness. This left Teacher 3B with a feeling of complete trust in his evaluations.

This teacher denied that evaluation was used as part of a bureaucratic process to enforce hierarchical compliance. It supported school objectives, and affected positively both the individual and collective teaching practices at this school. Evaluation focussed on the skills of professionals rather than employees and had been reviewed and validated for effectiveness and equity. Teacher 3A saw the evaluation process as benefiting the whole school. It improved teaching practices, and acted as a valuable conduit for pedagogical improvement and enhanced personal futures. As a consequence, Teacher 3B felt more bound to the organisation and its objectives.

Individual Responses to Evaluation

Teacher 3B's personal response to the evaluation process was confident, with powerful feelings of optimism and enthusiasm. He felt no suspicion, anger or resentment. After his evaluation, this teacher actively reviewed any shortfalls, reflected on his practice, and set goals for the next reporting period, the training needs of which he discussed with the professional development officer. Teacher 3A felt renewed, positive, enthusiastic for future promotion opportunities, and was driven to work harder by a greater commitment to organisational goals.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 3B had undertaken six days of school/department sponsored, and four days of self initiated professional development over the previous year. His attitude to professional development was strongly positive; it was a major part of modern practice and was powerfully invigorating so that he welcomed it with enthusiasm. This teacher admitted that he had control of his professional development choices that he steered towards promotion. A good chance to get a break from class was solidly denied. The faculty primarily set his objectives, but these and his individual objectives were established under the schools collective goals, and were reconciled to achieve consistency and economy. Individual professional development objectives were submitted and approved by the professional development officer.

Teacher 3B's professional development selections were based on advice from his supervisor and the professional development officer as well as a review of his annual training requirements. There was strong denial of motivations to avoid use of own time, find least strenuous options, and miss maximum classes.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 3B's professional development over the past year improved his professional knowledge of subject area, classroom management and instructional techniques, and enhanced his understanding of evaluation, assessment, and reporting. Whilst his supervisor objectively discussed the professional development to see that it met his needs, the professional development officer did not follow up after each training event to check that this teacher had applied his new skills and knowledge. Conversely, the school actively sought to determine the impact of professional development, perhaps through the evaluation, which did much more than list activities. Consequently, Teacher 3B was left with a feeling of being a continual learner within the school educational community.

School Professional Development Practices

Not only was school professional development efficient, responsive to teachers' needs, and clearly connected to the evaluations system, it covered all activities including internal mentoring and reflection on teaching. The mix of professional development suited all of the teachers' needs, was clearly designed to enhance pedagogy, and made teachers feel like life long learners. There was a clear connection to the pedagogical needs identified in Teacher 3B's evaluation.

Whole school professional development was regularly conducted and a major force for change. It did not take teachers away from class, and was not an opportunity for hierarchical self promotion. It was most certainly not just a day away from class.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

As may be expected after these previous responses, Teacher 3B had a very positive outlook on his school which he saw as strongly supportive of cross-curricular dialogue, change, and teaching initiatives. It also modelled good reaching, appreciated varied teaching styles, and analysed and supported good teaching practice. This teacher saw himself as open to change, to discussing his teaching with colleagues and to trying new teaching approaches. He never doubted the validity of educational change and set high personal expectations based on a regular process of self reflection.

In his aspirations, Teacher 3B sought to enhance teacher dialogue, collegiality, and the open acknowledgement of both errors as well as the positive aspects of individual teaching.

Interestingly, this teacher was strongly against reducing classroom isolation, and also saw no need for professional development to be more responsive to his classroom teaching needs.

Comments on Teacher 3B

This very affirmative result clearly illustrates the positive responses that can be generated when teachers feel that an evaluation system is there to help them develop and extend their capabilities. Not only does the individual gain from enhanced perceptions of relevance, but also the school is able to benefit from the dynamism generated by positive focus in both organisational and pedagogical terms. However, as pointed out by this respondent, his evaluations had been promotion driven, and, given his position, obviously had been successful. The absence of Teaching Practice as a motivation for the evaluation, exclusion of any input methods directly related to classroom teaching, and also the omission of Self-reflection on Teaching from the Danielson (1996) list, clearly illustrate that the evaluations in question had not been directed to Teacher 3B's classroom performance. It is probable that the knowledge, assessment, and communication techniques referred to in the evaluation were more to do with professional leadership and administrative skill rather than classroom teaching per se.

Quite clearly Teacher 3B was very happy with the status quo. He had benefited from the promotion directed evaluation system and felt that most things were going very well in the current environment. However, it must be noted that organisational theory places him within the upper echelons of the bureaucracy, the perceptions of which differ from those of the ordinary classroom teacher. Indeed, things look so attractive for Teacher 3B that he stands out from almost all the other teacher survey responses. However, there was a gap in the absence of any evaluation of his teaching practice, and thus no objective basis for selection of appropriate professional development based on his needs. Furthermore, in the absence of the professional development staff following up on his classroom teaching, there existed no objective manner of verifying that professional development has influenced his pedagogy in the place where it counts most, the classroom. On this basis, it was perhaps inappropriate for him to have not sought a more responsive professional development system. Furthermore, a strong unwillingness to feel less isolated in the classroom intimates that Teacher 3B may have felt secure, but still wanted the door to remain closed on his teaching.

Teacher 3C - *Rarely evaluated and saving money*

Teacher 3C was a 56-60 year old permanent full time male who had been teaching for 26-30 years, 6-10 years in this school. He was a department head/year group coordinator at acting

Advanced Skills Teacher 3 (AST3) level. This teacher had completed no post-graduate learning.

Evaluation

The responses of Teacher 3C on evaluation were slightly confusing in that he claimed that he had never been evaluated since receiving tenure, but then agreed that he had been evaluated in response to a specific promotion need. If such an evaluation did occur, then it was not in the previous four years and this respondent was unable to identify any of the content of, or his responses to, the evaluation process, answering *Unable to Answer* in all cases. It can be argued that Teacher 3C was identifying some evaluation of him in the very broadest, rather than detailed and formalised sense as part of his selection for his leadership roles. However, in the absence of any structure, he could not identify the criteria or outcomes of the same, other than his enhanced status. Teacher 3C added an additional comment that ‘The Evaluation process must be used for developmental purposes and not as an added demand/stress contributor’.

Professional Development Motivation & Selection

Teacher 3C had completed only four days of professional development in the past year. These were all school/ department sponsored, and improved his pedagogy in all areas other than evaluation and assessment. He explained his low participation rate as ‘This is due to impending retirement. I do not wish to utilise PD resources which would better benefit colleagues.’

Teacher 3C was very positively oriented to professional development and welcomed it with strong enthusiasm as well as acknowledging it as a key part of modern practice. He strongly denied that professional development was something done to him, and did not steer his professional development to promotion.

Professional development objectives each year were established as a combination of personal needs and school and faculty derived objectives. These were reported up the system to ensure consistency and economy. Teacher 3C responded strongly in the negative to his supervisor working with him to set professional development objectives based on his previous evaluation, illustrating clearly that such a connection with evaluation of pedagogy is unlikely. This teacher based his selections on the range of interesting options available, advice from his supervisor and the professional development officer, and the amount of relief money available. Teacher 3C strongly denied seeking the easiest options that would help him miss the most classes.

Professional Development Outcomes

Teacher 3C's professional development significantly improved his instructional techniques in the classroom. Other areas that were upgraded included his professional knowledge of his subject area, classroom management, and communication skills. A verbal report to the professional development officer or faculty was the only feedback method, with strong denial of any comprehensive or detailed report.

This teacher's supervisor discussed his professional development to see that it met his needs and personal objectives. Such professional development did not occur in isolation and it very much made him feel a continuing learner within an educational community. However, this teacher strongly disagreed with any proposition that the professional development staff or school followed up on the impact of professional development on his teaching or student learning. The question on the professional development section of the evaluation form merely listing activities was left unanswered.

School Professional Development Practices

This teacher denied strongly that professional development in his school was a token gesture. He saw it as an efficient and responsive process that responded to all his needs, and enhanced school pedagogy so that he felt a life long learner engaged in continually improving his practice. However, he admitted that there was no connection to the evaluation system so that he could identify shortfalls and monitor his own professional enhancement.

The professional development in Teacher 3C's school was of all types other than internal mentoring based on staff specialities. The broad range of activities based on each teacher's learning needs also included opportunities for reflection on teaching. Whole school professional development was regularly conducted, and was stimulating and well directed so that it was a major force for change in the school. Any intimation of whole school professional development representing fanfare events, or hierarchical self-promotion, was roundly denied.

School & Individual Perceptions & Aspirations

Teacher 3C felt good about both the school and himself as a teacher. The school was seen as a collaborative culture, appreciative of differing teaching styles, encouraging of dialogue and the adoption of new initiatives, and supportive of the maintenance of good teaching standards. It

regularly analysed and modelled good teaching, so that teachers felt encouraged to demonstrate their worth in different ways, and were mobilized as active agents of change.

As an individual, this teacher perceived himself as reflective, with high self-expectations, and open to change and new approaches. He worked to understand his students, and was open to both educational change and dialogue on pedagogy with his peers. In his aspirations, Teacher 3C was very supportive of most of the propositions on reduced isolation, enhanced collegiality, openness to acknowledgement of both successes and failures in implementing change, and the separation of formative evaluation of his pedagogy from institutional appraisal. Interestingly, Teacher 3C did not wish the professional development system to be more responsive to his classroom teaching needs.

Comments on Teacher 3C

From his survey responses, Teacher 3C did not appear to have adopted a withdrawal attitude prior to retirement, but had maintained a very positive attitude to both his teaching and the school. His period of service clearly illustrated the absence of any formalised process of evaluation of pedagogy over a long period in Tasmanian education. Whilst he may view the professional development system in a very positive light generally, Teacher 3C's responses raise once again the question of how his needs were derived. Teacher 3C relied on personal perceptions, but did not review his training requirements. The professional development system in his case neither required a considered report on the training, nor followed up its impact on his teaching or student learning.

There is a suggestion in Teacher 3C's responses that the professional development he referred to in most of his responses was collective and public training, rather than intimate learning focussed on classroom practice, which he admitted had never been subject to scrutiny. Whilst his self-perceptions remain positive, and in the absence of any evaluation of classroom pedagogy, Teacher 3C is unlikely to seek an enhancement of professional development. As pointed out previously in this study, it is hard to be objective about ourselves, and Teacher 3C may in fact be doing a good teaching job from his perspective, as he identified no mechanisms to input the perceptions or advice of others. At the very least, as this teacher departs the profession one cannot point to what he has done well in his career, because there appears to have been no process of examining and tracking his professional pedagogical progress.

Discussion of Teacher Surveys

It was unfortunate that there was a lower rate of returns from this case study school, as they provided only a limited perception of teacher attitudes and perceptions. It is also interesting that such a low involvement rate should flow from a school that all three respondents considered to be collaborative and interested in what makes good teaching. It may well be that those who failed to participate have a different view, although this is supposition only. Despite this limitation, the respondents differentiated three layers of teachers in the school, principal level, leadership, and senior teacher, and these provide some insights useful for the study.

There was clearly no process or culture of evaluation of pedagogy in this school, with the only evidence of evaluation being for promotion or verification of the work of senior managers. Teacher 3B was the most positive about a process which had established him into the executive team. As a member of the formal level of the school, his current evaluations probably would be directed not to classroom performance, but to his fulfilment of bureaucratic management functions. Neither of the other respondents was evaluated on a regular basis, despite both having teaching careers of over twenty years, and more than six years experience at this particular school. Teacher 3A appears to have achieved her AST1 level through serving her time. Teacher 3C, who may have had some evaluation experience, but could not define it, probably came to his leadership position by interview rather than any systematic evaluation of his pedagogical skills. Certainly, none of the three admitted to the type of reflective evaluation directed at enhancing pedagogy that is suggested in this study.

All three respondents concurred with the lack of validation of professional development and the assessment of its impact on teaching or student outcomes. Thus, regardless of how cooperative and supportive the professional development system might appear to be in this school, it obviously lacked the framework to advise teachers on their needs, because it failed to measure outcomes of previous learning, and thus establish the ongoing training requirement. Whilst evaluation would be the best ongoing process for this, and to secure the support of individuals in their own professional journey, the absence of any follow-up to professional development clearly devalued the importance of the learning. Similarly, no supervisory interest in the professional development requirements of Teachers 3A and 3C, yields a clear institutional intimation that personal training requirements or development plans do not need to be considered in making professional development selections.

There was a big difference in the perception of school professional development between the female Teacher 3A and the other two. The divergence in the management and responsiveness of professional development to individual needs and the worth of whole school learning is significant. What must be noted is that Teacher 3A was a well-established teacher also, and clearly felt there was a gap in the system, despite her generally positive outlook in the school itself. Either the gap was one of perception alone, or else the professional development system was not meeting teachers' needs equally. If the former, then it is significant how Teacher 3A had not initiated action to rectify the perceived flaw for herself, either through self-evaluative techniques or a personal professional development program.

Another common factor was that all three answered in the negative on one classroom aspect of the future desires question. Teachers 3B and 3C did not wish the professional development system to be more responsive to their classroom needs. Meanwhile Teacher 3A did not wish to feel less isolated, despite her strong wish to work collegially with peers more frequently. It is suggested that this illustrates the isolation factor where the males who are more confident feel in control, whilst the female who expressed some dissatisfaction with the status quo may have felt insecure and less willing to open her classroom door to others.

Responses to professional development essentially reflected the levels of personal satisfaction experienced by the participants. Teacher 3B, secure and comfortable in his managerial position saw the system as working well, with objectives worked out and professional development undertaken to meet his personal training needs. Teacher 3A saw the professional development structure as unresponsive and inefficient, and Teacher 3C was satisfied with professional development and unaware of its failings. It is significant that there was a divergence in opinions on the management and responsiveness of professional development to individual needs, and the worth of whole school events. Teacher 3A was after all a well-established teacher who clearly felt there was a gap in the system, despite her generally positive outlook in the school itself. Either the gap is one of perception alone, or else the professional development system was not meeting teachers' needs equally. If the former, then it is significant how she had not instituted action to rectify the perceived flaw for herself, either in initiating self-evaluative techniques or a personal professional development program. If the latter, then the professional development structure cannot have been meeting the needs of teachers or students, and thus must be rated a failure. At the very least Teacher 3A was not benefiting from the resources Teacher 3C was apparently saving prior to retirement.

The few responses from this school yielded one advantage in that highlighting the perceptual differences that flow from professional development ownership. The executive level Teacher 3B was satisfied and pleased with the system and saw it as efficient and responsive, because it was owned by the organisation. Whatever objectives are in place, they were, at least, visible to him. Teacher 3A, meanwhile, as a lower level teacher, felt no ownership of the professional development agenda and the process was opaque to her. The professional development structure thus becomes disenfranchising and isolating, instead of the reverse. Consequently, Teacher 3A was able to argue that the professional development system was something outside herself and letting her down, instead of seeing it as a professional element of pedagogy that she truly owns. This is due not only to the absence of a reflective evaluation process for pedagogy, but also the current professional development ownership situation works against evaluation by moving the focus away from individual pedagogy where it belongs.

Career stage theory also illustrates the differences in the needs of each teacher, something that is hidden in the absence of evaluation. Teacher 3B was clearly directed to further promotion success. Teacher 3A was in mid-career and required support to revitalise her teaching, whilst Teacher 3C needed to be encouraged to maintain his standards in the interest of student learning, rather than dribbling into retirement. These needs are reflected in their professional development selections with the senior person going through much more analysis of his needs. The other two based their selections more on what they were advised, or told, to do and the amount of money available. With such motivations, the returns are unlikely to be highly beneficial.

The benefits of professional development were undermined also by the absence of systematic validation to determine the impact on classroom teaching. There was no detailed evaluation of professional development undertaken as well as no follow-up to assess the impact on teaching or student outcomes. Thus, regardless of how cooperative and supportive the professional development system might appear to be in this school, it clearly lacked the framework to advise teachers on their needs, because it failed to measure outcomes of previous learning and thus establish an objective training requirement. Whilst evaluation would be the best ongoing process for this and ensure the support of individuals on their professional journey, the absence of any follow-up to professional development clearly devalues the importance of the training. In the absence of any supervisory interest in the requirements of Teachers 3A and 3C, even organisationally, the message is sent that personal annual training requirements do not need to

be considered in making professional development selections, and that participation is all that is required in whole staff training events.

Student Focus Group Discussion

Have you ever conducted an evaluation of a teacher?

Whilst there were few responses from teachers in School 3, the students, conversely, were open and enthusiastic to share their views (Appendix 7). The only teacher evaluation these students identified was of some primary school teachers. There was no evidence of evaluation of their high school teachers. This supports the proposition that evaluation appears to be directed purely towards promotion or the performance of senior duties, rather than classroom pedagogy.

Have you been in a classroom where a more senior person comes in to watch?

On the rare occasions when observation occurred, it was to deal with classroom difficulties with the observer being a senior teacher, such as a grade leader or Vice Principal:

- Yeah, we've done that once in one of our...classes, but that was because the teacher wasn't able to handle some of our students.
- We had our grade time teacher come into drama, because I think we had some complaints about the class and how we were acting. She had to, like, come in to just watch us and make sure we were all good.
- Yeah because we're getting worse in our class right now, and our grade time teacher comes around sometimes and just looks on us.

Consequently, the message that was transmitted to the students in this school was that observation is a control mechanism. In most cases the observer had no real impression of the true class situation because of student behaviours changing in response to the more powerful additional presence in the classroom:

D-e-ends on how many people see them come in. If the class takes a while to notice they're there, then, like, they'll probably get a reasonable gist of what's going on. If the class knows they're coming in, like, knock on the door and come in, then the class generally settles down and changes what they're doing to sort of what they think that senior person would want.

In fact, the students tended to cooperate to defuse the situation and deflect criticism, or else generalise it so that no-one could be identified as the trouble maker: 'Everyone tells their

friends to be good.’ However, ultimately, the students reverted to their normal behaviour patterns.

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

School 3 students saw a good teacher as:

- Able to control the class, like one of my home group teachers...my home group teacher, she’s able to control our class, and she’s able to project her voice and all that...get our attention which is all good...gain the respect of us.
- They’re not usually the teachers you see shouting and yelling at the students. All the teachers that are good and can control the class don’t do that...they’re more quiet. They don’t talk as loud so people have to, you know, hear. And they joke around with the class, and are more friendly.
- Someone that can relate to students, and, literally, just have a good time with students, not be so strict, and, like, they have to be kind of strict, like, keep the class under control, but also have fun at the same time, like, really kind of just...get along with students.
- I think a good teacher is one who is not so wound up in what they teach you. Like you can talk about anything, instead of just work the subject they teach.

What is notable is that none of these students immediately mentioned teachers helping them learn, or developing their thinking skills, or other cognitive outcomes. Rather, for this group, good teachers seemed to be efficient and friendly controllers. One wonders how much real learning contact there is between students and teachers as people if such are the primary value determinants of good teaching in students’ eyes. The last comment is illuminating as this particular student - Student 5 - was seeking teacher ideas and views about broader matters than just content. If the agenda was mere distraction, then it is unlikely that such a comment would surface unprompted in such a discussion; the diversion would be for the classroom. Students appear to want to express their views and opinions to people who are relevant to them, and respond in a real way, rather than as functionaries: ‘All the students think the better teachers are the ones that are funny and talk to them properly.’ A sense of humour was seen as a key component for this contact.

Following on from these views, students in School 3 did not appear to value easier teachers over stricter ones. Rather they wanted to learn from openly and friendly adults, who engaged them both intellectually and as people:

- usually I like the ones you actually learn things with...that are open and friendly
- you need to be strict, but you don't need to be strict strict, like, you don't need to be so...strict!
- Yeah. I think it's better if you have a teacher that you can talk to, and a strict teacher, because some of the strict teachers you learn from, and, yeah, its easier to talk to nicer teachers but...
- I think that the stricter ones are good, but, sometimes, they get so strict they sort of don't listen to other...the kids view about their teaching methods, so they're never gonna like change sort of thing.
- I think really that is generally true that the stricter teachers, the teachers that make you learn stuff, are the ones that are determined bad, and the ones that are determined good are the ones that are generally like lax on the discipline and that kind of stuff. But it doesn't... like, it's not always like that. Like, sometimes there is, like, stricter teachers that are still nice.
- Yeah, but we have a Science teacher and, like, she's really strict, but she's, like, really fun as well...you can talk to her about stuff as well, but, like, she'll have a date and you have to get the work done by that, but you can also have some fun in class, and stuff as well. But, like, she'll give you a date for the work.

Such statements are contrary to the unsubstantiated views of some teachers that student evaluation, or allowing students to identify their best teacher, turns into a mere popularity contest, with students gravitating to easier and less disciplinarian teachers. Rather, what students appeared to value in School 3 was a teacher who can exert enough control to maintain learning and also have some fun in the class, avoiding the descent into either chaos or excessive control behaviours. Given the option, these students would seek out teachers who teach effectively, help them learn, are interested in students as people and engage in dialogue with them on that basis. Whilst age may be a factor in facilitating such contact, it was not mentioned by the focus group as essential. It was more a case of listening to student views to enhance learning:

Like, if they listen to you and you give them bad... or say something bad to them, like, you're not doing this right or something, they will take it and work with it and it comes out better, because they're doing stuff more for you, and, so, you're more put into working better.

Initially, few students admitted to having opportunities to tell teachers when they were being successful and helping them learn effectively.

Teachers need to make it interesting for students, because if you don't have any interest in, like, what they're trying to teach you, then you're not going to learn from it, and I've never had the chance to tell the teacher anything like that.

It was only later in the discussion that Students 7 and 11 admitted to telling their Maths teachers that they were learning better because of appropriate pedagogy. Others in this focus group were quick to find excuses that would prevent them expressing their feelings or opinions:

- I'd probably get in trouble and be told to sit back down or something...Um, at sometime, if you get to know them better. Yeah. I think first you should get to know them better, not just on first impressions...because, sometimes, teachers can either get worse or get better.
- It's hard to...because, like, they can do that, and if they listen to you it's good...If, like, you don't really like the teacher, and you give out some bad information, it might not necessarily be right.
- No, because, sometimes, they take offence, and give you all that shut up or something.

Whilst commenting on the performance of student teachers remains largely the preserve of their supervisors, class members occasionally were given the chance to express an opinion during the practicum:

- sometimes a student teacher will ask you like "Are we going well?" and you just say "Oh yeah!", and tell them what they're doing wrong and right...Yes, if you tell them you've got to be a little harder or something, then they are. They listen to what you're saying.
- Student teachers are easier to talk to, because, yeah, they're younger, they sort of want to learn, like, they want to know your opinion on

other teachers sort of teaching methods and stuff, because they want to know what's good and what's not. But, I don't know, they never really ask you straight out.

Youth appeared a factor in the favour of student teachers interacting with school students. However, one member of the focus group, Student 4, was concerned less about the teaching than ensuring that the student teachers not leave with a bad impression of the school if class members failed to talk to them. Nonetheless, the willingness to listen to students was seen as a characteristic of good teaching, and the focus group saw this as a positive element of student teachers. It is interesting how the student teachers either fail to appreciate the significance of this communication with students, or else forego it after their graduation.

Unsuccessful teaching generated both off-task behaviours and more active student misbehaviour:

- You just...don't do the work I suppose. That's sort of what I've been doing when I'm not interested anymore, I just don't do the work.
- If it's working, you work much better, and you're more quiet. But if its not working, that's when you start talking, and you don't care what the teacher says.
- in primary school, one of our LOTE teachers, we made him cry because he wasn't like able to control us, and we didn't mean to make him cry...We weren't being naughty or anything, but that's sort of our way of giving them the message. If they don't ask us we'll play up a little bit so they'll know.

The development of larger group misbehaviour issues was not by chance. Students both looked at others and put the current situation into context:

If you have been learning, and you have been, like, doing work, and you're interested in it, and then all of a sudden you, like, either your grades start to drop, or they get higher, or, like, and you know you've not changed at all, like, you know that you're not doing anything drastically different, then you sort of get the idea that "I don't think it's me, it's gotta be something else", and you, like, look at how the class is acting, and how the teacher's acting, and try to work out, like, cross things off the list until you find one thing that is probably the reason.

The only problem in this last statement by Student 4 was that, if a teacher was successfully engaging the group, then there should be no sudden deterioration in the class in the absence of some external factor. However, it is valuable in illustrating how some students analyse their learning environment. Furthermore, it supports the response of other focus groups in this study that classroom misbehaviour can often represent student attempts to convey that a particular teaching approach is not working. The problem is not one of discipline, but pedagogy, and the disempowered students having no vehicle to express their feelings about their learning, the supposed reason for the class existing. Students acknowledge this lack of power where they perceive clear injustice being visited upon their fellows by teachers:

- We've got a student in our class that's always picked on in Art. Yeah, it's really not fair on her, because she doesn't do anything, but the teacher just kind of finds a reason for her to get into trouble. She was relocated into where our grade time teacher was, and there was no real reason for her to be relocated, because the teacher really dislikes her.
- We have a certain student in our class that gets picked on a lot by teachers. I don't know if it's because the teachers tell all the other teachers about her, but she could come some classes she doesn't like as good...and teachers pick on her a lot. I don't know, either for the sake of it or because she...um...the teachers have built her a reputation.

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

There was no evidence of students being able to move out of classes where a teacher was perceived as being below standard. There were administrative difficulties:

You know, it's not like if you don't like a class, it's a bit hard to change just for that, like, subject. If you're having trouble with SOSE, you can't really just change for SOSE, you'd have to change into a different, like, home group. It's not sort of really done.

In most cases, students had to deal with the limitation of less competent or liked teachers, and try to make the best of a bad thing:

- We had a teacher that none of us liked much, and we got her again this year, so we were all like not happy, so we tried to sort of not be.

- if you're dreading a teacher, you might still learn from it, if you're willing to put some work in.

Otherwise, it remained a case of hoping for better luck in the future:

I've taken steps to make sure that I don't get into a certain teacher's class next year, hopefully, because I've asked whether I could be moved from this year, but it wasn't very long ago, and they said "You've only got a short time at school left, like in that class so don't worry about this year, but I'll take steps to make sure you're not in her...in that teachers class next year." So, fingers crossed, that works.

Quite clearly the factory system of schooling means that students are condemned to be in classes with some teachers that they know are at the very least not good for their learning, by a school system where teachers fail to adequately monitor their performance or take adequate cognisance of the opinions of the group of people with whom they are supposed to work intimately. From this perspective, it is not surprising that classroom discipline issues engender teacher stress. In the very worst instance, an inadequate practitioner can be isolated in a classroom delivering an inadequate product to those who are aware of its failings, and forced to participate against their will in an activity that they know will not benefit them:

- Well that teacher, she always, like, insults you, like, she always, like, embarrasses you in front of the rest of the class saying like "You, like, got a D on like your last test and blah, blah, blah...if you keep going this way, you're going to get another D". And she goes, like, really mean, like, one of our friends she was, like, mean at her so much, because she just couldn't understand how she was explaining it, and she almost started crying and stuff.
- because they don't like her, they won't do what she tells them to do because, yeah, that makes them feel better, like, defying her and stuff.
- That certain teacher is probably a really good teacher for people in college level. We're pretty sure she was a college teacher, and she would be much more suited to working than trying to work with our grade, because it's...she doesn't explain it enough when we're just learning it.
- We have a teacher that is, like, she'll explain something, like, what they were saying, and someone won't get it, and she'll explain it the

same way, and then sometimes you'll work it out like find an easier way, and she'll make you have to do it the hard way and everything, and it'll make it a lot harder for you to work it out when you can just do it the easier way.

Teachers were aware of the differences between them with a whole range of responses. Some cautioned the students: 'They'll just say like. "Maybe you shouldn't say that behind her back. Say it to her face" kind of thing.' Others allowed the students to express their opinions, perhaps because they realised the inadequacies of their colleague, or, alternatively, were glad that the criticism wasn't being levelled against them: 'I've talked to teachers about other teachers...I don't think they really care because they can tell. They know that some teachers aren't liked as much as others.' The most nefarious outcome was the suggestion that both students and parents should be satisfied with poor standards, and that, somehow, this is its own learning experience:

There was a situation where I complained about the teacher we were talking about before, and my mother complained to a friend of hers who happened to be another teacher at the school in the same subject, and all he could say was "Some teachers are better than others!" That was his answer to it.

It would be interesting if one were to make the same comment about his mechanic or personal physician to this particular teacher. Parental awareness of the differences between teachers was gradual, and might progress from child to child, or bad experience to bad experience. In the first instance, they might not respond to their child's complaints until they meet the teacher or have some experience of their own upon which to base an opinion:

Our usual Maths teacher was sick for a week, so we had this other Maths teacher which we don't have, but she works at the school. And I told my parents that she was a bit mean, and they didn't pay much notice, but then me and Mum were walking one day and Mum bumped into her, and then we went home I was, like, "That's it!", and then she started taking much more notice of what I said about her.

The knowledge can then be carried over to help the subsequent children:

My sister used to go here too, so Mum knows, like, what teachers are good and what teachers are bad, and I know there's just one teacher that if I ever

got, because my sister had such a hard time with her, that my Mum would bring me out of that class.

However, there appeared to remain some reluctance to actively intervene:

My sister and brother, that are both older than me, went through this school, and Mum knows exactly which teachers she'd like me to go in, but she never really thinks about asking me to go into different classes or anything.

This may not be because parents are unwilling, but rather arise from a feeling of powerlessness in the face of the bureaucracy. Both Student 8 and Student 4 mentioned that their parents were aware of a problem with teachers, but nothing could be done because the teacher in question was a permanent employee. To these parents, and probably many others, permanency in employment thus conveys impunity to the redress of any professional failures. By extension, if the school and the educational system do nothing to redress what are shortfalls obvious to both students and parents, then no amount of public expressions of ministerial or principal confidence are going to make the parents feel that their child is getting the best education.

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

The School 3 students unanimously welcomed the opportunity to participate in evaluation for very good reasons:

- I reckon it would be a good idea, because they'd know what they were doing wrong, and something like that.
- we could show them where they're going wrong and how we're learning. And how it's best for them to teach us and stuff like that.
- When we're in grade times, sometimes, we usually complain about some teachers, so I think that's a good idea to tell them instead of telling our grade time teacher.

However, there was evidence of some hesitation about helping teachers rectify their pedagogy. Students 1 and 2 felt they couldn't vouch for the participation of some of their peers: 'Some students would and some students wouldn't.' Student 11 was suspicious whether some established teachers would admit the need to improve their teaching practice:

I don't think any teachers would ever admit...you know, especially older teachers, like, "I've been doing this for so many years and other people have learned from me so...", no one ever sort of realised that they're bad.

Whilst Student 8 sought some evidence of effort to change on the part of teachers, he was correct in identifying a significant role for students as part of the classroom equation required to enhance pedagogy:

If they told us they were, like, making an effort, like, if they told us, like, "I realise that this is wrong and I'm trying to fix it"...if they told us that, and we took more notice, it probably would help them to become better teachers. But, if they don't tell us, and, like, try and improve it on their own, then I don't think it's going to make much difference.

There were few other responses, possibly because the concept of joint relationship of mutual learning is beyond the experience of many of these students, who have come into the school system and been trained to accept control, rather than cooperative interaction, as a fundamental part of their experience. Clearly some re-education would be necessary to unlearn the past before any participation in supporting teacher reflective practice could be expected.

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

The focus group was aware that teachers went off on professional development to '...do special courses to increase their learning.' However, they identified few significant changes in teaching as a result:

- If any of our teachers have gone on any of these...I haven't noticed. I didn't know about it. So, I don't think it's made much of a difference.
- you may notice a difference in the methods they use to teach you with, but other than that, you won't notice it for definite sort of thing.
- You don't really notice any difference in them. The only reason why I sometimes notice is that my Mum might have gone to those things as well, because she's a teacher.
- We used to have a really good primary school teacher in Grade 5 and 6 and she went to the courses, and she'd come back, and all she'd have is a few different little things and nothing that helped us that much.

The students agreed that there would be advantages in teachers making their professional development objectives explicit to both students and parents:

- That would be like a really good idea, because if they said “I’ve just learned how to...write this on the board so you can see it better”, and, like, if they told you they were doing that then, and, like I dunno, they told you they were doing that, and, like, they forgot it once, you could say “Oh! Aren’t you meant to be doing it the other way?” But “Oh yeah, yeah!” And it wouldn’t help only you. It would help, like, students that they’ll teach in the future.
- Yeah. I reckon that would be good, because then, if the courses weren’t working, you could sort of tell them, and they wouldn’t be doing the course for no reason sort of thing.

Student 11 felt that, if pupils knew what training was available, then they would be able to advise and support teachers whom they saw as deficient in any areas. Similarly, Student 12 urged teachers to look to the students as a source of learning in a more shared relationship, instead of attending theoretical courses: ‘I think teachers need to talk to the class like more about what they should be doing. Instead of trying to learn something, they should be trying to learn from the students as well.’ In what appears as a remarkable piece of insight, Student 8 suggested that more open discussions on teacher professional development would benefit students by promoting a dialogue about teaching and learning that was retroactive as well as progressive:

I think it’s a good idea if you knew, like, what the teacher was learning, and, because then you could, like, benefit from in the classroom, because, if you knew that they were, like, getting better, like, having discussions and stuff, you’d be able to have more discussions about what you were learning and stuff when they weren’t good at that before.

Student 4 proposed good counsel for teachers who might feel threatened in engaging with students, or were reluctant to accept suggestions of training to overcome pedagogical shortfalls:

Teachers really shouldn’t feel that “everyone’s picking on me”, and, like, “all telling me to do this course”. They should think about it and step back a bit...”OK! Maybe I have been doing it wrong.” And, like, they can go and take the course...and they don’t have to put like in what they’ve learned afterwards. They don’t have to say “OK! I have to do this now. Or

I can do this with a bit of the stuff I did before”, and stuff like that. Yeah. It’d be really good for them. They don’t, like, have to do it all, even just, like, a little change would help the class.

Another student simply stated that teachers should not ‘get down about it, because it’s helping them.’

The students in School 3 wanted to have relationships with teachers based on cooperation rather than control. They did not want to be in a teacher versus student, or adult versus child environment. They felt that teachers were still learning, the same as them, and that a positive, open, and interactive relationship was more likely to serve everyone’s best needs:

- I think if the teachers weren’t, like, thinking, like, I’m the teacher so they can’t, like, tell me what I have to do, so if they had more of an understanding, like, we’re all, like, equal, sometimes it’s be, like, easier to tell the teachers what you think...like, what you thought they were doing wrong.
- I think really what we need to do is, like, talk to the teachers more and have better relationships with the teachers, because I think that’ll solve a lot of problems just from talking.
- As I was saying before, I think teachers just have to realise they’re making a mistake, learn from it, and just realise that they’re still learning as well, just like the students.

Documentation

The documentation provided by School 3 consisted of the School Plan, the Teacher’s Guide, and a professional development form. None of the documentation mentioned evaluation or appraisal of teacher pedagogy or performance, and certainly did not refer to any reflective evaluative processes directed to enhance classroom performance and teacher learning. As seen by the students, and revealed in the limited teacher survey responses, there was no established culture of evaluation of classroom teaching practice. Evaluation in this school appeared to be directed to managerial level promotion and performance management, and was thus beyond the level of classroom teachers and everyday school management of learning.

There was substantially more on professional development in both the School Plan and the Teacher’s Guide. The former listed within the objectives for 2004:

- Continued Development of a Highly Effective Teaching and Learning Program through school based and external Professional Learning Programs
- Update IPLPs (Individual Professional Learning Programs) to encompass Essential Learnings and new Partnership Agreement Targets.

Curriculum Development Priorities within the Plan listed:

- Whole staff professional learning in Teaching for Understanding
- IPLPs – Revisit Term 2.
- All staff to modify/develop an achievable, realistic learning individual professional learning plan in consultation with a senior staff member
- Based on personal needs and interests but linked to school priorities
- ICT (Information Communication Technology) will be an important component.

Of the 23 programs budgeted to meet the school’s objectives for that year, nine were listed as having no professional development requirements. A further nine were listed as having two days, and three having a one day learning support requirement. The remaining two program areas had higher requirements. Most of the requirements were either stated in very broad terms or were submitted in anticipation of demands under program objectives.

The school partnership agreement noted that, as part of a school review, parents rated the quality of teaching 7% below the median of other schools. The targets set as a consequence of this review were:

- Teachers and parents will report that the quality of teaching is of a high standard and overall results...will exceed the State average.
- Teachers when surveyed will report that provision for professional growth and the use of time and resources is above the sector average.

The Teacher’s Guide for School 3 noted that ‘Professional learning is central to the organisational development of the school and the provision of quality teaching and learning.’

This had three strands:

- To ensure that the goals and purposes of the school are well understood by all members of staff.

- To assist each member of staff to be familiar with, and have knowledge of, wider issues within the system and how those issues affect the curriculum and its delivery within this school.
- individual teachers are encouraged and supported to pursue their personal and professional development as teachers and educators. That development may be through the acquisition of knowledge, skills and techniques associated with their areas of teaching experience and/or interest, or it may be through courses of study to improve their qualifications of (sic) their chances of promotion.

The Teachers' Guide then stated that

As part of any evaluation process, the principle should be endorsed of having every person who is involved in any professional development activity or programme (at school, system, or individual level), from classroom teacher to Principal, report back to an appropriate forum. Such a principle is essential for the good communication and openness of planning typical of effective schools.

The professional development form listed the details of the activity, including a description and the purpose of the training, but included neither a reflection of this principle, nor any review or reporting provisions.

The statements in the documentation in this school all sounded very positive and, indeed, were likely to demonstrate to higher authorities that the school was directed towards improvement and the enhancement of student outcomes. However, nowhere did the documentation reflect evaluation and improvement of classroom performance. The categories of staff learning were listed as:

General Staff Meetings,

Subjects Meetings,

Grade Meetings,

Priority Groups,

Whole Staff Professional Learning Evenings/Sessions,

External professional learning sessions accessed through relief either from the school budget or from other sources, and

Individual Professional Learning Plans (IPLP).

Whilst classroom learning related to improvement of actual teaching performance might have been within the IPLP, none of which were made available for perusal and may have been left to individual discretion, the survey respondents did not mention the existence of such plans, and the students saw no evidence of them being put into practice. Consequently, even if they did exist, their efficacy must be open to some question. Furthermore, the absence of any monitoring function or supporting validation, and certainly the absence of any evaluation upon which to base learning needs in the first instance, makes the value of such IPLP questionable. The inclusion of various forms of staff meeting as accredited professional development also raises concern about the value of the time reported by teachers in this school. It certainly supports the concern by Ramsey that the employer's priorities dominate teacher's individual needs and are seen as sufficient by the teachers (Ramsey 2000, p.83).

The School Plan did not identify the mechanisms by which the enhancement of teaching standards would raise this school above the state average. Certainly, the student and teacher responses illuminated the absence of an evaluation process that could both inform the learning required to lift standards, and manifest the increased quality outcomes in student learning and understanding. It would seem that the mere identification of school objectives and attribution of some professional development days was considered sufficient. However, the process is undermined by the disconnect between teachers and students, and the absence of validation mechanisms for professional development other than time or dollar consumption, despite the positive statement aimed at sharing learning. If student learning and understanding are the ultimate beneficiaries of good teaching, then it behoves the school and teachers to identify such teaching, and focus efforts on directing individual teachers towards that end. Since each teacher is different in personality, life stage, and teaching style, it is necessary to determine what each needs to move the school and student learning forward. This is not evident in the School 3 documentation that appeared positive, but, in the opinion of this research, lacked the means to direct the various objectives into the classrooms.

School 3 Conclusions

The limited responses to surveys in School 3 were disappointing for this research, but may have been revealing in itself. The absence of a culture of systematic reflection on teaching and learning, and the predominance of a control culture rather than interaction was unlikely to encourage teachers to participate in a study that focussed on individual pedagogy. The intimation, from both the lack of responses and other evidence, is that teachers in this school

behave more as functionaries or wage earners, rather than independent professional practitioners. The documentation is aimed not at the parents or students, but at the superiors, and is thus couched in the language necessary for bureaucratic approval. Programs are laid out to achieve ambitious targets, but the classroom methodologies to achieve them are absent, because the purpose has already been served by the document itself. The processes to translate them into practice appear not to exist.

The students in this school, meanwhile, represented the most energetic, interested, and dynamic focus group of all. Their responses demonstrated a desire to interact and learn from the teachers as people rather than as process workers, who in some cases seemed uninterested in the impact of their craft on the young people with whom they spent each working day. Indeed, the consideration of the students for teacher sensitivity seems to have exceeded the converse significantly. The students, at least, were willing to consider what was required to help them learn better. However, the mechanisms to help teachers appreciate this were absent, and the professional development that was meant to enhance teacher ability to deliver learning did not appear to be directed to where it was needed, and its effectiveness was not monitored. Despite this study taking place at the introduction of a new curriculum process that was meant to enhance student outcomes by greater interaction and emphases on thinking and learning, the environment in School 3 did not appear to have been attuned to meet the new demands. As was illustrated in earlier chapters of this study, for new learning to happen, teaching has to change. For teaching to change, teachers have to know what they are doing, what they can do better, what to do to remedy shortfalls, whether any training was successful, and be willing to experiment and develop new pedagogies in the classroom. There was no evidence that such a process was in place in School 3 at the time of this study, or that steps were being taken to implement them in anticipation of new curricular demands.

There was insufficient information for judgements based on the design elements for evaluation in Chapter 2. However the fact that the only evaluation of teachers was the administrative review of the senior Teacher 3B's performance, and the absence of any student perception or participation, suggests that there was no extant evaluation of pedagogy occurring in this school. Therefore, questions on objectives, school wide quality assurance, formative processes, and the encouragement of reflective practices become redundant. At the same time, it also raises the question of how these important matters are dealt with in this school.

The following judgements can be made from the results in this school matched against the design elements for effective professional development in Chapter 3:

- (1) In the absence of any evaluative mechanism, Teacher 3A's needs certainly were being neglected, and Teacher 3C was able to excuse his participation in professional development by seeing it as less relevant.
- (2) Professional development was neither embedded in daily practice nor resulted in changes in the classroom, because students did not see any evidence of changes in teaching, and because the factors motivating at least two of these teachers were finding interesting options and available funds.
- (3) Both Teacher 3A and Teacher 3C denied any validation of professional development outcomes. Whilst Teacher 3C agreed that there were reflection opportunities, Teacher 3A denied reflection and saw the professional development system as failing to meet her needs. There was no way for the school to respond to this difference in perceptions and needs in the absence of any validation mechanism.
- (4) Teacher 3B, as a school leader, appears to have been satisfied with his own professional progress. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, he is a winner under the present system. It appears unlikely that, as a senior manager in this school, he is aware of the difference between his responses and those of his colleagues. As such, he cannot be in a position to support their pedagogical needs effectively, because the method of doing so does not exist. In not transferring the positives of his own evaluation experience to his colleagues, Teacher 3B attests clearly to the processes in place serving bureaucratic rather than pedagogical needs. The basis for supporting and enhancing teaching practice does not exist, in either the areas of evaluation or professional development.