

Intelligent Accountability Evaluation of New Zealand Primary School Principals' Formal Appraisal Processes

KERRY EARL RINEHART

Faculty of Education, University of Waikato, NZ

Email: kerry.earl@waikato.ac.nz

ABSTRACT: Internationally there is interest in decentralising education and in the quality of school principals. In this article, Terry Crooks' (2007) seven principles for intelligent accountability are applied to formal appraisal of primary school principals in the context of New Zealand's self-managing schools. These principles are used to explore the dimensions and tensions associated with the process and principals' experience of appraisal. Qualitative methods generated evidence, from three interviews with six principals over an 18-month period. Principals approved of their work being appraised for professional (and school) development. The strengths, according to Crooks' intelligent accountability criteria, were principal involvement and feedback. The weaknesses were flexibility of monitoring and developing deep learning. Enhancement of trust depended on the appraiser and on the recognition of the limitations of appraisal indicators. Outcomes of this study have implications for appraisal policy and principal preparation programs.

Introduction

Internationally there is increasing interest in decentralised education systems. Research has recognised that decentralisation and self-managing schools' systems raise both official and local expectations of principals' work (Gronn, 2003; Pont, Nusche & Moorman, 2008; Wylie, 2012). New Zealand's self-management policy for schools and subsequent amendments to the Education Act increased and diversified the responsibilities of school principals. Broad societal and government expectations of all school principals (employees in the public/state sector) are reflected in official documents – such as leadership frameworks and professional standards. Such documents are used by various entities in the design of principal appraisal to evaluate effectiveness. When principal, teacher and school quality issues are raised, appraisal of principals' work is an area that receives policy and research attention.

Implementation of any appraisal policy across principals and schools presents a number of potential issues:

1. The number of criteria identified and used in professional standards for principals and related evaluation instruments;
2. The lack of alignment of criteria across different documents;
3. The inconsistency of implementation;
4. The inconsistency in interpretations and judgements, the weighting of criteria, and an understanding of what are priorities by principals and those who appraise them;

5. The nature and influence of the relationship between appraiser and principal including power relations, conflicting values, and levels of communication;
6. The contextual nature of principal work, including the complexity of schools as organizations and educational policy priorities. (Earl Rinehart, 2017, p. 118)

There are, essentially, three broad features needed to judge someone's work: a clear understanding of role, attention to individual needs, and attention to local context (Radinger 2014; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1991). One way of defining a principal's role is to look to professional standards for principals, and a way to give attention to individual and local needs is to talk to principals about how they experience being judged. Each of these three features is potentially problematic in policy and the practice of appraisal of school principals.

The research aim of this project was to focus on principals' experiences of appraisal and being judged in their work. This study examined the purposes, implementation, and outcomes of mandated formal appraisal processes in New Zealand (rural) primary school contexts. The research approach for this study was 'contemporary pragmatism', drawing on John Dewey's (2011) theoretical propositions through a contemporary (critical and post-structural) lens. The research questions reported here are: 1) How do New Zealand rural primary school principals experience formal appraisal requirements and practice? and 2) How does this appraisal of these principals' work stand up when evaluated against Terry Crooks' (2007) criteria of *intelligent accountability*? Firstly, the New Zealand educational context and case of principal appraisal is described; secondly, Crooks' criteria for intelligent accountability are discussed in relation to evidence from this study; and, finally, the strengths and weaknesses of New Zealand's appraisal of school principals' work relevant for consideration in other contexts are highlighted.

Research Design

An interpretive contemporary pragmatist research approach requires consideration of the history of the situation, attention to language of experience and deliberation with concern for the future (Earl Rinehart, 2017). Six New Zealand principals working in rural primary school contexts were interviewed three times over an 18-month period. Three women and three men participants, Dana, Doug, Mickey, Nate, Ruby, and Sydney (pseudonyms), agreed to be part of this study. Ethical approval was gained from the University of Waikato Faculty of Education Ethics committee (2013).

Interview audio recordings and transcripts from the 18 interviews provided the core evidence. Other material included field notes, policy documents, publicly-available information about the schools, and any copies of appraisal reports principals supplied for review. Evidence both gathered and generated was analysed using abductive methods (Brinkmann, 2014).

New Zealand Context

The New Zealand government introduced a decentralised education system of self-managing schools in 1989¹. Under this system many responsibilities for education provision in schools (administration, staffing and professional development, maintenance and resourcing) shifted from a centralised Department of Education, regional Education Boards and school inspectors to a Ministry of Education, school boards of trustees, and the staff of individual schools (Crooks, 2003). This system, referred to as *Tomorrow's Schools*, was 'implemented faster'

¹ The 1988 government White Paper *Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand* based on a Taskforce Report (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988).

and the changes ‘have gone further than anywhere else in the world’ (Lauder & Hughes, 1999, p. 36). These reforms have been described as both ‘extreme’ (Wylie, 2012) and ‘highly autonomous’ (Morris, 2014; Wylie & Bonne, 2014).

The central tenet of *Tomorrow’s Schools*’ reform was school governance by local school boards as a means of increasing parental interest in their children’s schools and making schools more responsive and accountable to parents and the community (Smyth, 2011; Wylie, 2012). One of the identified issues with centralised control was the recruitment of school staff. Until 1989, Education Boards had prioritised seniority and their inspector’s grading in appointing principals to vacancies. Alcorn (2011) critiqued those years: ‘The issue of “fit” between an applicant and the school community was not always accorded [a] high priority’ (p. 127). Through the local board of trustees, a school community would be able to hire the school principal, determine a ‘local curriculum’ and be involved in school decisions particular to their concerns (Wylie, 2012). Members of the new primary school boards of trustees were particularly keen to have more control over property, equipment and staffing (Wylie, 2012). In this way, local – even individual – expectations were added to the growing list of broader political and social expectations of school principals.

Boards of trustees employ their school principal but the Ministry sets salary rates and pays principals in the public/state education sector. The Ministry also determines principal work responsibilities through regulation, guidelines and standards. Thus, principals in New Zealand’s self-managing schools have two simultaneous lines of authority – in essence two bosses – concerning their work: the Ministry of Education and the school’s board of trustees.

The new Ministry of Education (MoE) promptly initiated planning and reporting requirements and guidelines for schools to operationalise new government policy (Alcorn, 2011; Wylie, 2012). The Ministry regularly revises the National Education Guidelines (NEGs) which are education goals and curriculum policy, and National Standards policy, and National Administration Guidelines (NAGs), which ‘set out statements of desirable principles of conduct’ (TKI, para. 1)² that school boards with principals and teaching staff are required to demonstrate. This legislation and the Education Review Office (ERO), as a monitoring body also founded in 1989, strengthens central over local control (Codd, McAlpine & Poskitt, 1995; Crooks, 2003). An OECD report spells it out: ‘analysis of practice has shown that in increasingly decentralised and accountability-driven environments school leaders take on a broader set of tasks’ (Pont, Nusche & Moorman, 2008, p. 61). This is true in New Zealand’s case. Principals’ work includes greater regulatory and compliance responsibilities under ‘self-managing’ school reforms.

Education policy from central government is implemented and monitored over all settings, with compliance requirements being the same for all schools no matter their size or location (Dunning, 1993; Miller, 2015). At the same time, every school (as a community) and the communities in which schools operate, are different. All schools are geographically situated but they are also dynamic and evolving. School-specific differentiating factors may include student background, community type, school history, organisational structure and school culture, teacher experience and competence, fiscal resources, material conditions, and school size (Corbett & White, 2014; Thrupp, 1999, 2012). The significance of local influences on principals’ work has increased as they respond to this diversity (e.g. Alcorn, 2011; Collins, 2004; Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009), while centralised accountability requirements (aiming for consistency) continue to be developed. There is little or no attention in the

² Te Kete Ipurangi website (TKI) Glossary, National Administration Guidelines, para. 1 available at <http://assessment.tki.org.nz/Glossary/National-Administration-Guidelines-NAGs>. Retrieved 24th Nov., 2018). See also <http://www.education.govt.nz/our-work/legislation/negs/> and <http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/legislation/nags/>.

literature on how to take into account the complexity and constraints of local conditions in the appraisal of principal work.

Official Expectations of School Principals

Societal expectations of school principals are reflected in official documents as well as in unwritten localised expectations of school communities. Leadership frameworks (and more recently professional standards) are seen internationally as the basis for the design of principal appraisal, by which is meant 'to evaluate effectiveness' (Clifford & Ross, 2011; Ingvarson et al., 2006; Pont, Nusche & Moorman, 2008). Pont and colleagues (2008) suggested that it is school leadership frameworks that 'can help provide guidance on the main characteristics, tasks and responsibilities of effective school leaders' (p. 10). Internationally, there are a great many of these frameworks prepared on behalf of organisations, and at state and national levels.

Efforts to capture all aspects of principalship in leadership frameworks have revealed how extensive and complex a principal's work is. Assessing every aspect of principals' work would be unmanageable and impractical. Crooks (2003) wrote on this point:

In our [school] accountability systems, a broader sampling issue becomes prominent. Usually, these systems select certain indicators as the important ones to be focused on ... but now we have important judgements and decisions being made with the weight entirely placed on these ... areas, taking no account of performance in other areas. ... The results can be highly misleading. (p. 5)

The weight any criteria may carry in principal appraisal, as only a sample of the many aspects of principalship, can be disproportionate to the significance of that aspect in the overall work.

Criteria for principal appraisal are a major focus in research and reviews. In the United Kingdom (UK), Bolden et al.'s (2003) review of leadership frameworks used found that there was little clarity across different sets of standards and frameworks. They concluded that whilst a prescriptive approach has its strengths, it leads to a particularly-individualistic notion of leadership and a relatively-prescribed approach to leadership development. In the United States, Catano & Stronge (2007), who were concerned with developing greater consistency across US state systems, found there is variation across what is meant to be evaluated: ability, actions or the outcomes of principals' work. Neither greater consistency nor greater fairness for principals has stemmed from this research attention. The prescription of standards, development of standardised online assessment tools as a repository for evidence, and systems with one group of appraisers that can be 'trained' (and meant primarily to support efficiency and consistency) has, contrarily, made appraisal more work.

The nature and extent of the criteria in frameworks and standards documents have been universally questioned: 'the complexity and lack of clarity surrounding the role of a principal makes the formulation of appropriate performance assessment a daunting task' (Catano & Stronge, 2007, p. 382). Catano and Stronge (2007) wrote, 'since clear agreement on what encompasses the role of a school principal is lacking, the task of principal evaluation becomes a challenging enterprise' (p. 383). Pont, Nusche and Moorman (2008, p. 62), drawing on Ingvarson et al.'s (2006) review, stated, 'if too prescriptive and detailed, [leadership frameworks] can contribute to increasing intensification of the school leader's role and *discourage* practitioners' [emphasis added]. The signal from these authors is that principals' attitude to their work is linked to the quantity and level of prescription of work requirements. Identifying a set of appropriate and significant criteria for appraisal of principals is problematic. Are principals valued for who they are, for what they do, or credited with outcomes they have directly achieved or influenced?

Appraisal of Primary Principals in New Zealand

In 1997, it became a requirement in New Zealand for school boards of trustees to conduct an annual appraisal of principals. This appraisal officially has two purposes: accountability and development. Accountability in this situation means the school board attests to the individual's competence and to their satisfaction regarding the work of the school principal in a report to the Ministry of Education. Development refers to the improvement of teaching and learning at the school *and* the principal's professional development. Both boards and principals have access to the New Zealand School Trustees Association (NZSTA)³ guidelines on principal appraisal (published 2005, 2008, and 2009). These guidelines state: 'performance review is about taking an organization (the school) and the individual (the principal) forward through setting objectives and establishing indicators by which those objectives will be measured' (2008, p. 6).

Researchers (Cardno, 1999; Eddy, Cardno & Chai, 2008) have claimed that without an understanding of the differing purposes of formative judgements of development needs – *looking forward* – and accountability as summative judgements of performance – *looking back* – appraisal systems are unlikely to serve either purpose well. In contrast, no concerns were expressed by the principals in this study about complying with the Ministry accountability requirement. However, they reported looking for a report with actionable suggestions to enhance their professional growth and/or school development. For example, Nate said:

... maybe the Ministry [of Education] do [look at it as compliance], and maybe many boards of trustees see it as a compliance issue but I'd like to think that it's going to be useful for my personal development and the development of our school. Otherwise it would be a waste of time, a waste of money. ... As a leader, there's got to be something for me to work on. ... Whether it's around my professional leadership or journey, or whether it's in the school systems and procedures. If it's not useful it becomes simple compliance.

Under the level of guidelines at the time, principal appraisal was judged by these principals to be meeting the Ministry requirement for both accountability *and* principal development.

School boards have multiple roles in ensuring the quality of their school principal. They recruit this person from candidates who apply for the position and serve as the legal employer(s) of the school principal and the board chair may undertake the role of appraiser. The school principal is also 'a member of the board, its chief executive, and its key advisor' (ERO, 2014, p. 6). The board is responsible, according to the Primary Principals' collective agreement⁴ (e.g. Section 4.1.1 & 4.1.2), for appraisal carried out against the indicators in a 'performance agreement'. A Performance Agreement is developed between the board and the principal (Piggot-Irvine, 2003) and includes a principal's annual goals. Members of the board, who are also parents, may be surveyed for feedback during the appraisal process. It is the board that approves any resourcing, such as funding required for the principal's professional development. The board signs off the appraisal report.

The appraiser(s)

How successful or effective a principal is perceived to be depends on the interpretation and judgement of the appraiser. In New Zealand, a principal's appraiser can be their school's

³ For information on the New Zealand School Trustees Association (NZSTA) see its website <<http://www.nzsta.org.nz/about>>.

⁴ Primary Principals' Collective Agreement 17 May 2016 – 16 May 2018: <<https://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/School/Collective-Employment-Agreements/Primary-Principals-Collective-Agreement/Primary-Principals-Collective-Agreement-2016-2018.pdf>>.

board of trustees' chairperson, a principal from another school, or a private sector educational consultant. The six principals in this study largely relied on recommendations from professional colleagues and used their professional judgement when making a recommendation to their school board about who should be their appraiser for the current year and why they sought to work with this person. All of these principals noted that this 'through-the-grapevine' process seemed rather random. In all six cases, boards trusted these principals and their recommendations were approved.

The criteria or indicators

Appraisal requires reference points or criteria in order that evidence can be weighed, strengths and weaknesses identified, and evaluative decisions made. In New Zealand the *Professional Standards for Primary Principals* (Primary Principals' Collective Agreement, Schedule 2) was introduced in 1998 (Wylie, 2012, pp.102-103). The four 'areas of practice' are:

- Provide professional leadership that focuses the school *culture* on enhancing learning and teaching;
- *Pedagogy*: Create a learning environment in which there is an expectation that all students will experience success in learning;
- Develop and use management *systems* to support and enhance student learning;
- *Partnerships and networks*: Strengthen communication and relationships to enhance student learning. (Primary Principals' Collective Agreement, Schedule 2, p. 2)

These are to 'provide a baseline for assessing satisfactory performance within each area of practice' (p. 1).

Under each area of practice in this document are a number of standards (ranging from four to eight). The language of the standards are verbs: develop and implement, promote, maintain, operate, manage, administer, use, model, demonstrate, exhibit, ensure, analyse, prioritise, work with, actively foster and interact. For example, one of the standards under the section 'Systems' is 'exhibit leadership that results in the effective day-to-day operation of the school' (p. 2). Another standard under the same practice area reads: 'Effectively manage and administer finance, property, and health and safety systems' (p. 2). There is a total of 26 standards. The nature of evidence needed to demonstrate satisfactory performance is not outlined. The quality of evidence influences the quality of decisions that can be made on the basis of that evidence.

Appraisal as Intelligent Accountability

If appraisal design matters, then evaluating appraisal itself also matters. Inspired by Onora O'Neill's (2002) BBC Reith Lectures on trust – and drawing on other literature about human learning and behaviour, and assessment for accountability – Crooks (2003) developed six criteria of *intelligent accountability*. In 2007, he added a seventh. These are summarised below. Intelligent accountability works to:

1. Enhance trust
2. Involve those being assessed
3. Foster deep learning
4. Account for limitations
5. Provide effective feedback
6. Increase and support motivation
7. Ensure flexible and responsive monitoring

Next, Crooks' (2003, 2007) criteria are used to review existing appraisal for New Zealand primary school principals. Crooks is well-known in educational assessment and his criteria or principles focus on the consequences of process and outcomes for those who are being assessed.

According to Crooks (2003), the preservation and *enhancement of trust* is the first principle of intelligent accountability:

... a prime consideration ... should be the extent to which [processes] foster or undermine trust: between teachers and students, between teachers and administrators, between educators and key education agencies, between educators and politicians, and between educators, parents of school students, and the wider community. (p. 3)

Effective appraisal policy and enactment, then, is a balance between the risks of complete trust and constraints of little or no trust. A balance is in the level of control sought by appraisal administrators, and the concomitant agency of those whose work is being appraised. Those who investigate and make evaluative judgements (such as appraisers) support or threaten trust in the participants' perceptions of credibility and fairness.

Crooks' (2007) second principle of intelligent accountability – *involve those being assessed* – states that the person whose work is being evaluated 'must own the issues that they are trying to address' (p. 4). Crooks explains that intelligent accountability design 'involves participants in the process, offering them a strong sense of professional responsibility and initiative' (p. 3). In the case of appraisal of school principals, the principal, as the person whose work is being assessed and evaluated, needs to be involved.

The third principle of intelligent accountability, according to Crooks, should *foster deep and worthwhile learning* rather than short-term and/or easier-to-measure indicators: Process and outcomes of intelligent accountability will encourage 'deep, worthwhile responses rather than surface window dressing' (2007, p. 4). There is a recognition that '[d]eep learning takes time and focus, and is undermined by overemphasis on short-term goals' (2007, p. 4). Annual appraisal processes, with associated goals for that year, may constrain the type of learning and development goals negotiated by school principals with their school boards.

Crooks' fourth principle – *account for limitations* – requires that accountability processes 'should recognise and attempt to compensate for the severe limitations of our ability to capture educational quality in performance indicators' (2003, p. 5). Any criteria or standards used will struggle to be broad enough to be manageable or prescriptive enough to be completely accurate without also describing that performance in very general or very fragmented terms. In what ways does what can be 'counted' represent the complexity of the work of school leaders and be weighed appropriately to present an evaluative statement or report of the quality of this work? The recognition of the situational and temporal nature of appraisal judgments also involves the 'expertise' of the person who undertakes to make that judgement and their involvement in the situation.

The fifth principle of intelligent accountability requires accountability to provide 'well-founded and effective feedback that promotes insight into performance and supports good decision-making about what should be celebrated and what should be changed, and how it should be changed' (2007, p. 6). Thus, feedback may serve as a form of appreciation as well as an identification of weaknesses or needs. For Crooks (2007):

Effective feedback strikes a balance between acknowledging strengths and identifying areas of weakness or growth needs. Too much criticism prevents the person or group receiving it from responding constructively to it, both because of the difficulty of choosing which of the many aspects criticized to focus on, and because of the emotional response to severe criticism that often inhibits useful action. (p. 7)

Quality appraisal feedback, then, includes acknowledgment of a principal's strengths with some targeted 'feedforward' or next steps. In this way the risk of an individual being overwhelmed with aspects they need to address is recognised and, instead, support is provided for constructive action in a principal's response.

Crooks' sixth principle – *increase and support motivation* – also relates to how accountability influences the motivation of the person being judged. He elaborates: 'the majority of participants are more enthusiastic and motivated in their work (or at least not less enthusiastic and less motivated)' as a result of accountability processes and outcomes (2007, p. 7). Accountability, done intelligently, can be motivating:

[A]ll accountability processes should be monitored for their impact on the continuing motivation of the key participants. A key factor influencing that motivation is the extent to which the accountability process is perceived to be working towards positive outcomes and helpful to the participants, rather than [as] a weapon to enforce institutional or system requirements. (2007, p. 7)

Crooks' *motivation* is an expression of enthusiasm and commitment. Clifford and Ross's (2011) literature review framed 'motivation' as support: 'performance evaluation can be a powerful way to support the continuous growth and development of principals as instructional leaders' (p. 3). Another interpretation, however, is that Clifford and Ross mean appraisal is a powerful way to *compel* the continuous growth and development of principals. These authors also acknowledge that principal evaluation systems are a means to *ensure* support for government education agendas. The setting of goals on which principals will be judged redirects principal work towards meeting these goals. Appraisal goals that focus on the current agenda of governing authorities can be expected to 'motivate' principals to prioritise this agenda in their work. More recently Radinger (2014) asserts, 'evaluation of school leaders allows education authorities to *ensure* all schools are led by capable and *motivated* school leaders' [emphasis added] (p. 387). He suggests here a combination of evaluation of capability with motivation. Radinger (2014) claimed, 'appraisal, if well implemented, can then help school leaders to focus on the tasks that *matter most* [emphasis added] and reinforce core objectives of schools: teaching and learning' (p. 387). He did not elaborate on what 'matters most'. What matters most is dependent on *to whom it matters*. It can be hard to distinguish in this literature between claims of motivation for improvement and motivation for compliance. Are appraisal processes found to be motivating for school principals, and if so, motivating in what ways?

Crooks' seventh principle/criterion – *ensure flexible and responsive monitoring* – suggests that accountability that is intelligent would see that past outcomes influence the regularity and specificity of appraisal processes. This last principle brings us back to the enhancement of trust, the first principle. The frequency of such accountability events could be allowed to depend on the outcomes – quality and standards – of past appraisals if those who seek this accounting would trust that the person being assessed maintains the same level of commitment and motivation between appraisal events.

Next, evidence from the transcripts of interviews with New Zealand primary school principals is used against the reference points of Crooks' seven principles for intelligent accountability.

Findings: Appraisal Policy in Practice

Enhancement of trust

In this study, trust as an aspect of appraisal was revealed through shared experience and understanding, respect and support for principals' work. It included a credible process and principal-appraiser interaction.

In all cases, these principals were looking for someone with an understanding about principalship and a degree of familiarity with school operations. Ruby commented: ‘They don’t necessarily have to have been a principal, but they probably will have been’. These principals preferred that their appraiser had knowledge of the nature of similar schools and communities. They also looked for congruence between their and their appraisers’ beliefs about many aspects of education. Doug spoke of the need for an appraiser to have similar views of the purposes of education and schools as an organisation or community: ‘I think they need to be – it’s hard to describe – words like “child centred” and “learning focused”. I’m not too interested in “movers and shakers” and “marketers” and all of that side of it’.

Trust is supported and enhanced by a mutuality of respect. The principals were not looking for imposed solutions. Ruby thought that it was also important for the appraiser not to present solutions based on what they might do:

I want them to understand the context. What I don’t appreciate is people making judgements about you in your leadership based on their own beliefs and values. It’s knowing the context. There are things in that particular school I wouldn’t do in this school – it doesn’t matter. For them, and their context, it’s where they are heading. It’s great; they’re doing a stunning job. It’s nothing bad or wrong – it’s just different.

Even with common aims, policy issues, and current concerns, ‘work’ was seen as different for each primary school principal. Mickey said even ‘if they have a similar problem, what works for that one is not necessarily going to work for the other’. These principals expected understanding of variable contexts and support from an appraisal process.

The principals in this study saw how an appraisal process that their board finds credible will support members’ confidence and trust in the principal’s work. They all said some form of this comment:

It also comes back to the board that employed me. They want to know that I’m doing a good job. If I didn’t have an appraisal, how would they know that I’m doing a good job and what areas [I should] develop or work on?

Opportunities to talk with a trusted someone was a key element in appraiser-principal interactions. Nate also talked about valuing someone he can trust:

The role of principal can be quite an isolated role. Particularly in a small school, you don’t have a management team that you can sit down and chew the fat with, you have to be very careful about who you talk to and what you say, sometimes even to people that you think you should be able to trust. I think to have an external person that you can have some of those learning conversations with, is really important.

Other professionals within the specific school context were not necessarily viewed by these principals as confidential ‘sounding boards’ for open discussion of, particularly, sensitive issues. A contracted external was generally counted by these principals as a person they could trust.

Principal involvement

The six principals all felt they were fully involved in the formal appraisal of their work. Principals do the work of finding a suitable appraiser and put forward a proposal to their school boards regarding who would be their appraiser for that year. They felt they could determine their own goals through negotiation, and also, through negotiation and board approval, modify their annual appraisal plan. The principals in this study meet with their appraiser a number of times during the year, and review a draft of the report before it is tabled for the school board.

The identification of goals was influenced by feedback from parents through surveys conducted by the appraiser and next-step comments in the previous year's appraisal report. We might expect that different principals in their specific school settings would have idiosyncratic goals; however, goals were also influenced by Ministry policy and the ERO school review. There was significant alignment with the school's strategic plan (the school Charter). This was a relatively recent change ('probably one of the biggest changes made a year or two ago,' said Doug). Performance goals for these principals were focused on school development more than individual professional learning needs. Most principals in this study saw this alignment as wise and thought it worked efficiently.

Doug designed his own appraisal report template according to the evidence that, from past experience, he determines the ERO looks for during school reviews. The ERO also influences boards regarding school development priorities (ERO, 2014). The school board's influence on performance agreements and professional goals – despite it technically being an employer – is overshadowed by the ERO's influence through school review and publicly available reports. Thus, there was tighter control of appraisal of principal work than the Ministry-mandated annual requirement suggests. Mickey, however, identified that it did not make sense if a principal's appraisal goals were simply work tasks. For her, appraisal was more than monitoring how well a principal does her or his job.

All six principals in this study understood that ERO school reviews are *not* intended to officially appraise the principal as an individual, and yet all said that the resulting ERO reports were operating as appraisals of principal work. The smaller the school the more this was understood to be so.

The information and judgements contained in publicly-available reports of the ERO school reviews significantly influence the environment of principal work, the work of other school staff, the tenor of public opinion, the nature of media reporting, and regulatory sanction(s). Consequences of a poor review may include an increase in Ministry surveillance and interference regarding administration, curriculum and general school operations. An ERO school report impacts on levels of trust between the school and the school community and influences school and principal reputations with impact on student enrolment and the ability of the school to attract teachers and private resources.

Such consequences impact on the agency and the authority of school leaders. As Sydney said, 'the school gets the credit when things are great and the principal gets the blame when things go wrong'. The ERO reports are taken very seriously. The Ministry could argue there is room for addressing local concerns and individual principal's professional needs under self-management. However, without any obvious encouragement or support for variation based on 'own' school and principal development needs across different schools, and their attempts to work efficiently, the principals in this study were electing for more standardisation in goals resulting in a degree of conformity considered by principals as both reasonable and voluntary.

Foster deep learning

At the time of this study, the use of the *Professional Standards for Primary Principals*, with its 26 criteria in four 'areas of practice' as criteria in their appraisal was treated as routine by these principals. They had no concerns about these criteria as a sample, or as indicators, and they had no expectations of being appraised on *all* aspects of their work.

According to Crooks' third principle of *intelligent accountability*, the selection of goals for specific attention should be on 'deep and worthwhile' learning rather than short-term and/or easier to measure indicators. Thus, there is also the question of the suitability of having annual development goals as a facet of principal evaluation. These six New Zealand principals said that due to the size of a development project, interruptions in the school year and changes (such as in reporting requirements, staffing, or policy), it was natural that in some years a

performance goal could roll over into following years. Principals suggested that it was also mutually understood between boards and principals that some developments take longer than a year. In addition, changes can relieve pressure to address particular needs. In Doug's case, one particular family shifted away and that lessened, if not dissolved, any immediate urgency to increase staff cultural knowledge, which had been one of his goals. Thus, it would seem that these principals recognised the limitations to specific indicators of goal achievement as a measure of principal quality.

Compensate for the limitations of specific indicators in judging quality

Appraisers, judging from the generalised statements in the reports, also recognised the limitations of specific indicators as representing the whole of principals' work, and manageability in terms of evidence, weighting, and overall evaluation. To communicate the incomplete nature of the appraisal process in judging principal work to the school board, one appraiser even provided a disclaimer in the report: 'Disclaimer: This report concerns the performance of the principal as defined in her job description and performance agreement. Although related to compliance and accountability, this report should not be regarded as a complete analysis of such matters'.

Nature of feedback

All six New Zealand primary school principals seek and value a range of opinions on their work as part of the appraisal process. One principal commented:

I think it's really important in our role to have community feedback, teacher feedback and student feedback because how else do I really get to hear? That process enables those people to perhaps really say what they really think. And they need to have that opportunity if I hold this role; I've got to know. (Ruby)

It was peer and consultant appraisers who sought the opinions of school community members. They interview different individuals and groups. Doug described the process:

The way it normally works is the appraiser will come and I'll do the rounds. I'll sit on the front desk for the school receptionist and she'll come and have a talk to my appraiser. Perhaps next I'll go into the senior classroom and teach in there and then that teacher will come down here and have a session and that basically takes a day to go through that.

A text-based parent survey (online or in hard copy) might also be sent out, with responses collated and interpreted by these appraisers. The principals hope what they do well, and, through their influence, what the school is doing well, is noted during an appraisal.

Appraisal is seen as a useful opportunity to take stock of the impact of changes. Dana talked of the changes in schools that may go unnoticed without the kind of attention that occurs within an appraisal process:

I think – especially as a teaching principal or even as a principal – you don't actually get that feedback any other way. It's business as usual and you just get on and do what you need to do. Because you're there every single day, you're not aware at times of things you've done or the changes that you've made and the impact[s] that they – hopefully positive impact – have actually made.

It was important for all six principals that school developments with a positive influence on teaching and learning are recognised and acknowledged as part of their appraisal process.

As an indication of a principal being seen as successful in his or her work, the appraisal report prompted little response at the school board level for participants in this study. Some principals commented that members of the board expressed little interest in the details of the report so long as it was good: this was the expected outcome. This was a 'disappointment'.

I've been disappointed overall with the board's involvement in my appraisal. I feel that I don't get the acknowledgement and I feel let down by that. Look – board members are people who are, in my experience, really busy in their own lives and work. The school's running along well. The principal has had an appraisal. It's obviously gone well – great, what's the fuss? I haven't made a fuss. I just think if it wasn't going well, the board would be in there wouldn't they – so why can't I have the good feedback? (Ruby)

These principals commented that they were not looking for 'all positives' or 'a gloss over lightly' in their appraisal. Still it was evident that principals appreciated positive feedback. Although the appraisal report would put in writing some affirmative statements, it would also identify professional development needs (areas for improvement).

Funding support for future principal professional development is seen as a form of acknowledgement from the board but little positive recognition for principals as a result of a satisfactory appraisal was reported, while all principals in this study expressed a sense of ongoing and collective school improvement.

Increase and support motivation

Not just the relationship with the board, but also the nature of the relationship between principal and appraiser, had an impact on how principals felt. Ruby said:

There is quite an emotional relationship between you and your appraiser. When you feel like you're let down, that has that emotional impact in a way, if you let it. In saying that, you can't just work with anybody. I can't just ring an agency and say, 'Send me an appraiser'. That wouldn't work for me. (Ruby)

Principals also wanted to be challenged. Dana spoke of the importance of positive critical questioning:

Are they challenging you and being critical and bringing in new ideas and getting you to think about things in a different way? If you've got a neighbouring principal or a fellow principal, how critical or challenging might their ideas be?

These principals said that formal appraisal, as a requirement, was 'not motivating', suggesting that such appraisal was not itself a driver for their improvement. Perhaps the principals also meant that appraisal was 'not motivating' in the sense that they did not get their 'energy' for professional growth and for their work from this process aside from the trusted interaction with their appraiser and any useful feedback.

The flexibility and responsiveness of appraisal monitoring

Crooks' seventh criterion – *ensure flexible and responsive monitoring* – means that the system would respond to and modify the intensity of monitoring according to suspected or evident 'quality' or issues in, in this case, a principal's work. The flexibility of appraisal in New Zealand is more an unofficial aspect of process based on when a principal starts a new appointment (it is not typical to have an appraisal in a part year) or the school has an ERO review (a workload issue). Instead of responding to past success or past concerns by altering the frequency of principal appraisal, there is the expectation in policy that appraisal be undertaken annually.

Discussion

Crooks' criteria for intelligent accountability design relate to both means and ends, processes and outcomes. Trust, motivation and feedback are aspects of process (in interaction) as well as

outcomes. The involvement of those whose work is being judged, recognising the limitations in the capture of educational quality in performance indicators, and being responsive to past success or concerns are aspects of process design. If deep learning is the desired aim/outcome, then this also influences decisions about process design. Design and the enactment of appraisal as a form of accountability can be evaluated.

Viewed against principles for intelligent accountability, enhancement of trust, provision of feedback and support for motivation in the NZ appraisal processes score highly. Evidence from this study also suggests that the appraisal of primary school principals in New Zealand schools scores well on 'involvement of principals', according to Crooks' second principle for intelligent accountability.

The most overt demonstration of trust was between principal and appraiser. It was clear that the opportunity for confidential conversation through face-to-face interaction with a trusted appraiser was seen as the most useful aspect of an appraisal process by these principals. Understanding, trust, a desire to be challenged, and professional confidence were valued characteristics of the principal-appraiser interaction.

For the principals in this study, trust as a core aspect of appraisal is consistent with the findings of other studies such as Parylo, Zepeda and Bengtson (2012):

Principals reported that when their evaluation was formative in nature and involved opportunities to collaborate, have open dialogue, and engage in reflective practice throughout the evaluation process, they were able to address and improve areas of concern. Moreover, our participants shared that the developmental nature of their evaluation supported their growth as professionals. (p. 234)

In these interactions, principals were not being looked to for something – an answer, a decision, an action, or advice and guidance, to carry responsibility or be accountable (even to take the blame) – in that moment. As van Manen (2002) said of young people, 'being seen is more than being acknowledged' (p. 29) ... 'It means being confirmed as existing, as being a unique person' (p. 31). In these conversations with appraisers, instead of recognition as 'the fixer of everything' (Dana), the principal would be recognised as a human being. Trust therefore, is not only an outcome or a consequence of appraisal but also a necessary part of an effective appraisal process.

If one of the primary goals of appraisal is to help individuals improve in their practice of school leadership, then a formative dimension to principal appraisal is necessary (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1990). This has been understood and advocated for some time (see Radinger, 2014). Friedman (2002) found that 'principals report that they have few sources of trusted feedback on their practice and commonly feel isolated from colleagues due to the rigor of their position' (p. 2). Ayers (2012) commented:

... professionals in education know the essential role of feedback for learners ... we find ourselves in the paradoxical situation where the school environment is feedback-rich for the kids and feedback-poor for the adults. (p. 6)

The kind of feedback needed to support ongoing professional growth is not yet a significant feature of principals' and teachers' experience in education.

Feedback is valued highly by the principals in this study. The effectiveness of an appraiser, in their view, depends primarily on their ability to provide useful insights and suggestions. Without feedback, these principals consider formal appraisal largely a waste of time. It was the formative process of principal-appraiser interaction that provided most feedback and support. This feedback included suggestions, ideas and identification of opportunities, and recognition of the positive impact of past changes. It was the feedback and advice through conversations with their appraiser that supported motivation for these principals. What was noticeable was the lack of recognition or 'celebration' from the school board as an employer of the principal when appraisal outcomes were very good.

School development, rather than a principal's deep learning, was apparently the aim of appraisals, although during an appraisal year agreed-upon performance goals could be modified or deferred if it was recognised that change would require more time. That some goals take more than one year to achieve is one aspect that may signal *deep learning* is recognised as a worthwhile outcome. The measure of worth may rely on whether the goal is a personal/professional one for developing principal quality or more an aspect of overall school development.

The stated aim of appraisal of principals' work is to ensure that individuals in this position are effective and successful. A focus only on goals that could be achieved annually would contradict Crooks' fourth principle that it 'should recognise and attempt to compensate for the severe limitations of our ability to capture educational quality in performance indicators' (2003, p. 3). Drummond (2012), a UK researcher in children's education, gives a succinct description of any form of assessment: 'assessment is essentially provisional, partial, tentative, exploratory and, inevitably, incomplete' (p. 14). Crooks (2003) reminds us that effectiveness and success in education is 'extraordinarily difficult to judge' (p. 12). Consideration of what is expected of principals, what they do in day-to-day work, and the outcomes of their influence all colour judgements of the 'effectiveness and success' of principals. Appraisal for accountability purposes can therefore be high stakes for the individual principal. Potential uses of appraisal information may also raise the stakes for a school board and any contracted appraiser, thus influencing their work. In this way, the potential for risks in accountability may ripple beyond principals to touch other individuals and groups.

These principals and their appraisers understood the limitations of the *Professional Standards for Principals'* indicators in summing up their effectiveness or success. They accepted these standards as partial, practical, and interpreted broadly according to principals' school and community work contexts. They understood that the nature of evidence and detailed evaluative attention in the appraisal report would be based on their annual performance goals.

The Ministry of Education (and the ERO) played a significant role in the judgement of principals' work, largely outside the actual appraisal process. In Ayers' (2012) view, a person's 'boss' has a responsibility to undertake that employee's performance appraisal. Ayers said, 'the boss alone has a) accountability for this person's contribution to the organization's success and b) a comprehensive overall understanding of the person's role within the organization' (p. 12). It is arguable whether representatives of either the school board or the Ministry of Education would be able to meet the second of Ayers' criteria. It is unlikely that a Ministry of Education representative would have enough local knowledge to be able to make the judgements required.

The dual line of authority in New Zealand school principals' two bosses plays out specifically in any survey process involved in gathering evidence. Ayers (2012) objected to parents' opinions being used as evidence in summative judgements but was in favour of opinions being sought to help identify a principal's professional development needs. He writes, 'feedback for development and feedback on performance have relatively little in common' (p. 3) and indicates that those who provide feedback need to understand 'well enough' the work responsibilities of a principal. Another concern is the susceptibility of such a process to the negative opinions of a few individuals (Davis & Hensley, 1999).

A 'successful' appraisal report, using Crooks' seventh principle – flexibility – could result in a decrease of the frequency of summative appraisal. That is, evidence of individual performance could provide the basis for increased trust of school principals on a case-by-case basis. O'Neill (2013) argues for trust in systems of educational accountability that reinstate 'intelligent judgment about where to place and where to refuse trust' (p. 10). If such a

judgement were made on the basis of evidence of an individual principal's performance, formative purposes could still be maintained and the supportive interaction involving an informed and trusted 'supervisor' provided through a different program. A helpful focus for principal preparation programs might be principal awareness of how support within interaction with a trusted colleague, peer or appraiser can develop their professional judgement and help maintain resilience.

Accountability processes risk distorting or damaging the performance of the very actions or tasks that accountability is supposed to improve (O'Neill, 2013). Crooks (2007) suggested that intelligent accountability recognises that evaluative processes take resources that impact on the time and effort to do the actual day-to-day work. He warns of the risks when criteria are fundamentally based on ease of measurement and aimed at greater control: 'the new culture of accountability provides incentives for arbitrary and unprofessional choices' (p. 4). In 1916, Dewey made a similar observation:

The control afforded by the customs and regulations of others may be short-sighted. It may accomplish its immediate effect, but at the expense of throwing the subsequent action of the person off balance. A threat may, for example, prevent a person from doing something to which he is naturally inclined by arousing a fear of disagreeable consequences if he persists. (2011 [1916], p. 18)

High levels of external control may result in the individual's cessation of independent decision making and use of initiative.

Control and trust act in opposition to each other in relationships. Gergen (2009) suggested: 'Most rituals of evaluation are born of distance and distrust. They inform a person that he or she is not fully acceptable, and that continued scrutiny is necessary' (p. 341). Insecurity undermines wellbeing. Kouzes and Posner (2007) suggest that highly-controlling behaviours ('inspecting, correcting, checking up' p. 291) have 'low credibility'. Yukl and Lepsinger (2005), with a business focus, identified that 'efforts to improve efficiency can degrade human resources and relations' (p. 366). People, under high surveillance accountability systems, come to feel undervalued, with significant negative consequences resulting in the undermining of the intended aims of those same efficiency efforts. Crooks (2007) emphasises the importance of support: 'judgement without help is a poor accountability model' (p. 6). The best case for appraisal policy would be to retain principal-appraiser interaction throughout a principal-directed appraisal process. Increased central Ministry control would also be antithetical to the idea of the promotion of self-managing schools in New Zealand.

Summary and Recommendations

Appraisal design matters because the process influences principals' ability (time and effort) to do their job. Too, appraisal processes and outcomes may undermine or enhance principals' commitment. In the examined literature on appraisal, there are ongoing efforts for clearer criteria and greater consistency in appraisal processes. On the basis of this study, there is little justification for education research to spend more time and effort on determining and refining criteria on which to judge school principals.

The principals in this study were not concerned about the criteria used in appraisal and they did not comment on the evidence used to make evaluative judgements about their work other than to suggest that a variety be used (survey, observations, conversation, and documented records). More detailed criteria or performance indicators may also increase pressure for more evidence, more regular or repeated appraisal events, and practice reviews. Demands for more evidence will likely mean a further reduction in the variation in performance goals across principals and, logically, less attention to local and individual needs.

What largely preoccupied the principals in this study were the levels of understanding an appraiser brought to the process and the nature of the interaction between principal and appraiser. The professional support generated from trusted conversations in an appraisal process was significant for participants. Thus, from principals' points of view, principal appraisal policy should include awareness of the interaction between appraiser and principal as a form of support, and prioritise principal-appraiser interaction. Principal preparation could also highlight how the opportunity for face-to-face meetings with a trusted, informed, understanding and confidential person has long-term benefits for principals' professional judgement, self-knowledge, resilience and ongoing professional growth.

Acknowledgement

My sincere thanks to Professor Emeritus Terry Crooks for giving me access to the only other source he has for *intelligent accountability*, the text for his Inaugural Professorial Lecture (2007). I am delighted to be able to use his work for evaluating this form of education accountability, principal appraisal.

References

- ALCORN, N. (2011) Meat in the sandwich: The impact of changing policy contexts and local management of schools on principals' work in New Zealand 1989-2009, *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 8(2), pp. 122-140.
- AYERS, M. (2012, 22nd May) *Essay on the Evaluation of School Principals*. Retrieved 4th August 2012, from: <<https://www.scribd.com/document/164689413/Essay-on-the-Evaluation-of-School-Principals>>.
- BOLDEN, R., GOSLING, J., MARTURNAO, A. & DENNISON, P. (2003) *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks* (Exeter, UK: University of Exeter: Centre for Leadership Studies).
- BRINKMANN, S. (2014) Doing without data, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), pp. 720-725.
- CARDNO, C. (1999) Appraisal policy and implementation issues for New Zealand schools, *The International Journal of Educational Administration*, 13(2), pp. 87-97.
- CATANO, N. & STRONGE, J. H. (2007) What do we expect of school principals? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(4), pp. 379-399. doi:10.1080/13603120701381782
- CLIFFORD, M. & ROSS, S. (2011) *Designing Principal Evaluation Systems: Research to guide decision-making. An executive summary for National Association of Elementary School Principals* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University).
- CODD, J., MCALPINE, D. & POSKITT, J. (1995) Assessment policies in New Zealand: Educational reform or political agenda, in R. PEDDIE & B. TUCK (Eds), *Setting the Standards: Issues in assessment for national qualifications* (Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Press Ltd), pp. 32-58.
- COLLINS, G. (2004) The current work of New Zealand teaching principals, *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 1(1), pp. 23-26.
- CORBETT, M. & WHITE, S. (2014) Introduction: Why put the 'rural' in research? in S. WHITE & M. CORBETT (Eds), *Doing Educational Research in Rural Settings: Methodological issues, international perspectives and practical solutions* (Milton Park, New York: Routledge), pp. 7-25.
- CROOKS, T. J. (2003, April) *Some Criteria for Intelligent Accountability Applied to Accountability in New Zealand*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL (21-25 April). Retrieved 20th June 2017, from: <<http://www.fairtest.org/some-criteria-intelligent-accountability-applied-a>>.
- CROOKS, T. J. (2007, 4th October) *Principles for Intelligent Accountability with Illustrations from Education*. Inaugural professorial lecture (Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago). Audio and video available from: <<https://www.otago.ac.nz/news/itunesu/podcasts/otago017510.html?keywords=principles+fo>>.
- DAVIS, S. & HENSLEY, P. A. (1999) The politics of principal evaluation, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(4), pp. 383-403. doi:10.1023/A:1008161417522
- DEWEY, J. (2011) *Democracy and Education* (Milton Keynes, UK: Simon & Brown). (Original work published in 1916).
- DRUMMOND, M. J. (2012) *Assessing Children's Learning*, 2nd edn (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge).
- DUNNING, G. (1993) Managing the small primary school: The problem role of the teaching head, *Educational Management & Administration*, 21(2), pp. 79-89.

- EARL RINEHART, K. (2017) *Judging What They Do: Formal, informal and self appraisal of New Zealand (rural) primary school principals*. Unpublished PhD thesis (Hamilton, NZ: University of Waikato).
- EDDY, D., CARDNO, C. & CHAI, C. (2008) *Professional Supervision for New Zealand Principals: Analysis of current issues and options. Research and evaluation final report* (Auckland, NZ: Auckland Uniservices Ltd for Ministry of Education NZ).
- EDUCATION REVIEW OFFICE. (2014, May) *Supporting School Improvement through Effective Principal Appraisal. A national evaluation report* (Wellington, NZ: Author). Retrieved 29th October 2016, from: <www.ero.govt.nz>.
- FRIEDMAN, I. A. (2002) Burnout in school principals: Role related antecedents, *Social Psychology of Education*, 5(3), pp. 229-251. doi:10.1023/A:1016321210858
- GERGEN, K. J. (2009) *Relational Being: Beyond self and community* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press).
- GINSBERG, R. & THOMPSON, T. (1990) Dilemmas and solutions regarding principal evaluation, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), pp. 58-74. doi.org/10.1080/01619569209538711
- GRONN, P. (2003) *The New Work of Educational Leaders: Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform* (London, UK: Sage Publishing).
- INGVARSON, L., ANDERSON, M., GRONN, P. & JACKSON, A. (2006) *Standards for School Leadership: A critical review of the literature* (Acton, ACT: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Ltd).
- KOUZES, J. & POSNER, B. (2007) *The Leadership Challenge*, 4th edn (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass).
- LAUDER, H. & HUGHES, D. (1999) *Trading Futures* (Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press).
- MILLER, P. (2015) Leading remotely: Exploring the experiences of principals in rural and remote school communities in Jamaica, *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 11(1), pp. 35-53.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. (1988) *Tomorrow's Schools: The reform of education administration in New Zealand*. White Paper (Wellington, NZ: Government Printer).
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. (2008) *Kiwi Leadership for Principals: Principals as educational leaders* (Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education).
- MORRIS, J. (2014) *The School Leadership Effect. The New Zealand education and scholarship trust* (Wellington, NZ: The New Zealand Initiative). Retrieved 2nd August 2017, from: <https://nzinitiative.org.nz/dms/document/21>.
- NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENT. (2001) *Education Standards Act 2001. Public Act 2001 No 88* (Wellington, NZ: Government Printer).
- O'NEILL, O. (2002) *A Question of Trust*. BBC Reith Lectures 2002 (London, UK: BBC).
- O'NEILL, O. (2013) Intelligent accountability in education, *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(1), pp. 4-16.
- PARYLO, O., ZEPEDA S. J. & BENGTONSON, E. (2012) Principals' experiences of being evaluated: A phenomenological study, *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 24(3), pp. 215-238. doi:10.1007/s11092-012-9150-x
- PIGGOT-IRVINE, E. (2003) Key features of appraisal effectiveness, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(5), pp. 170-78. doi.10.1108/09513540310474392
- PONT, B., NUSCHE, D. & MOORMAN, H. (2008) *Improving School Leadership: Volume 1 Policy and practice*. (Paris, FR: Education and Training Policy Division: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD Publishing).
- RADINGER, T. (2014) School leader appraisal—A tool to strengthen school leaders' pedagogical leadership and skills for teacher management? *European Journal of Education*, 49(3), pp. 378-394. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12085
- ROBINSON, V., HOHEPA, M. & LLOYD, C. (2009) *School Leadership and Student Outcomes: Identifying what works and why. Best evidence synthesis* (Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education, Learning Media).
- SMYTH, J. (2011) The disaster of the 'self-managing school' – Genesis, trajectory, undisclosed agenda, and effects, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 43(2), pp. 95-117. doi.10.1080/00220620.2011.560253
- STUFFLEBEAM, D. & NEVO, D. (1991) Principal evaluation: New directions for improvement, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(2), pp. 24-46.
- THRUPP, M. (1999) *Schools Making a Difference: Let's be realistic! : School mix, school effectiveness, and the social limits of reform* (Buckingham, PA: Open University Press).
- THRUPP, M. (2012) 'Raising our heads': Keeping a critical eye on policy and research, in C. MCGEE & D. FRASER (Eds), *The Professional Practice of Teaching*, 4th edn (Melbourne, VIC: Cengage Learning), pp. 308-319.
- VAN MANEN, M. (2002) *The Tone of Teaching: The language of pedagogy* (London, ON: Althouse Press).
- WYLIE, C. (2012) *Vital Connections: Why we need more than self-managing schools* (Wellington, NZ: NZCER Press).
- WYLIE, C. & BONNE, L. (2014) *Primary and Intermediate Schools in 2013. Main findings from the NZCER national survey* (Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research).
- YUKL, G. & LEPSINGER, R. (2005) Why integrating the leading and managing roles is essential for organizational effectiveness, *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(4), 361-375. doi 10.1016.2005.08.004.