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Performance Measurement of State Secondary Schools of New Zealand — The Teachers’ Perspective

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide managers\(^1\) an understanding about teachers’ expectations from the schools. This research identifies key performance factors and their indicators that reflect the status of teachers’ expectations from the schools. This paper’s focus differs from previous studies of performance measurement of schools by explaining the expectations that teachers have from the schools’ management.

The dataset for this paper comprises of 16 semi-structured interviews of secondary school teachers, 13 teachers were from four different schools chosen purposively, while three teachers from three other schools were chosen on the basis of ease of accessibility and availability. The data was analysed using NVivo2 software. The data was codified into 54 codes, which were aggregated into four themes that led to the development of vignettes depicting each KPF.

It was found that teachers of State secondary schools of New Zealand expect schools to perform on seven key performance factors. Teachers look forward to a collegial atmosphere at schools, where their goals and roles are clearly specified. They expect school’s management system to be robust and meet the needs of teachers, parents and students. Teachers also expect support from management and a workload that is manageable. They want schools to be adequately resourced and last but not the least to be safe.

This study focuses on 13 teachers working in seven different schools which may be reflective of the conditions in State secondary schools of New Zealand. However, the results cannot be generalised to all State secondary schools of New Zealand.

\(^1\) The Principal, Deputy and Vice Principals along with senior teachers manage State secondary schools in New Zealand.
The potential users of the outcome of this research are expected to be the State secondary school’s management as well as the MoE. This investigation argues to change the existing teachers’ performance measurement system by including the teachers’ perspective in it. It is expected to improve the engagement of the school’s teachers with the school’s management. Since teachers’ KPFs are not isolated but affect one another, an improvement in anyone of them may lead to better outcomes for State secondary schools, such as improved performance of teachers, hopefully leading to improved academic achievement of the students.

This is a pioneering attempt to add teachers’ voice into the performance measurement framework of State secondary schools of New Zealand. This study highlights the opportunity to improve performance of schools by engaging the school’s key stakeholders such as teachers while measuring their performance.
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1. Introduction

This paper describes the key performance factors (KPFs) that measure performance of State secondary schools of New Zealand from the teachers’ perspective and the indicators that reflect the status of the KPFs. The paper explains the performance management system (PMS) of State secondary schools of New Zealand. It argues that schools’ PMS does not take into account the expectations of teachers from the school. A PMS inclusive of teachers’ expectations may result in greater engagement of the teachers with the schools, leading to improvement in the schools’ performance.

2. Background

New Zealand’s State Secondary Schools are administered by the Education Act 1990. It provides for a partnership between teachers, community and the government to manage the school. The role of the government through the Ministry of Education (MoE) is to fund and support the school, the community governs it through the Board of Trustees (BOT). Teachers manage the learning processes under the leadership of the schools’ Principal. The schools’ charter sets the partnership between the government, community and the teachers into operation (Taskforce, 1988, p.46). In order to ensure that the school meets the objectives set out in its charter an independent review and audit agency called the Education Review Office\(^2\) has been created. In essence the Education Act 1990 provides for a collaborative model to manage schools (Lange, 1999). However, by 1993 the partnership aspect of the schools’ charter had been reduced to ‘undertakings’ through which BOT’s would undertake to meet the national educational guidelines (Snook et al. 1999).

The MoE provides policy guidelines and bulk of the funds for all State secondary schools. The policy guidelines for schools under the Education Act 1989 are called the National

\(^2\) The Education Review Office was created as per Sections 325-328 of the Education Act 1989.
Educational Guidelines (NEGs) (Ministry of Education, 2003a). They are the key mechanism through which the MoE communicates and enforces its educational goals and priorities for the schools. The NEGs as defined in Sections 60A of the Education Act 1989 contain the National Administration Guidelines (NAGs) for school administration. The NAGs (Ministry of Education, 2003b) consist of six guidelines from NAG 1 to NAG 6, given specifically to the schools’ Board of Trustees (BOT). This policy document forms the basis for administering a school.

Each school’s BOT is responsible to establish the PMS (NAG 2 & 3) to measure the performance of teachers and principals, while the self-review programme evaluates the schools’ PMS and related issues including student achievement (Ministry of Education, 2003b) and (Ministry of Education, 1997). The PMS formalises teachers’ performance expectations and their performance appraisal, which is linked to teachers’ professional development which fills gaps in their skills and knowledge. The performance appraisal process of the teachers also influences their salary progression (Ministry of Education, 1999b, p. 25).

Although the Education Act was passed in 1990, the MoE made performance management systems (PMS) mandatory in 1997 for all New Zealand schools (Ministry of Education, 1999a). In 1999 the MoE introduced professional standards for secondary schools’ teachers to be incorporated into the schools’ PMS. The professional standards establish the criteria for evaluating teachers’ performance. Cardno (1999) is of the opinion that although the MoE uses the term ‘performance management system’ the MoE’s target with respect to measuring school performance is restricted to evaluating staff performances.

The New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) through publication of students’ academic achievements for each school in National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) level 1, 2 and 3 examinations also measures the academic performance of schools. The ERO regularly and periodically reviews schools performance around four information sets, three of which are explicitly related to the Crown namely, regulatory interest, purchase interest, and an ownership interest. The fourth interest is that of the consumer, that is the student. The ERO’s
periodic reviews\textsuperscript{3}, generally take place every three years but at shorter intervals where the school’s performance is poor and there are risks to the education and safety of children. The ERO may also audit schools to ensure their compliance to special government directives\textsuperscript{4}.

The performance of State secondary schools in New Zealand is measured by the schools’ PMS which operates on guidelines of the MoE. Since MoE, ERO and NZQA are all Crown entities the schools’ performance appears to be measured mostly from the perspective of only one of the three partners, as envisioned at the promulgation of the Education Act 1989 that is the government, to the exclusion of the other two that is the teachers and the community. This paper discusses the performance of State secondary schools from the teachers’ perspective, which is currently not taken into account when performance of schools is measured. The next section discusses the theoretical construct that informs this paper.

3. Theoretical construct

The stakeholder concept has been developed by a number of theoretical approaches such as, corporate planning, systems theory, corporate social responsibility, and organisation theory (Freeman, 1984, p.33). Freeman argues that each of these streams of research is relevant for developing an understanding of a stakeholder approach that informs managers about the expectations of organisational stakeholders, so that they can manage their organisations more effectively. Since the purpose of this study is to inform managers about teachers’ expectations from the schools, the Stakeholder theory as explained by Freeman (1984) is apposite.

The Stakeholder theory was initially developed in a corporate context, for managers of profit making organisations. However, the stakeholder approach has been applied to non-commercial organisations by a number of scholars. For example Wisniewski, et al. (2004) has

\textsuperscript{3} For further details see the website http://www.ero.govt.nz/ero/publishing.nsf/Content/ERO%27s+Role#The%20Education%20Review%20Office%20(ERO)

\textsuperscript{4} The government has instructed the ERO to monitor compliance of the schools to the code of practice for international students, as reported by the New Zealand herald dated 11 November, 2003.
applied it to measure performance of a Scottish local authority from the stakeholders’ perspective. Ribbins & Burridge (1992) have applied the stakeholder approach in the context of public schools in Birmingham. Kenny developed a performance measurement framework, “Strategic Factors” that identifies key organisational stakeholders (such as teachers in this study) and their expectations (Key Strategic Factors, KSF) from the management as well as the indicators that reflect the status of each KSF. Kenny (2001, p.176) has applied the ‘Strategic Factors” approach to a number of commercial as well as governmental organisations. Kenny (2001), and Wisniewski, et al. (2004) fit the purpose of this study and have informed this investigation, as both have applied the stakeholder concept to measure performance of non-commercial organisations.

4. Research Design

The four State secondary schools targeted in this study were selected on the basis of three criteria: decile number\(^5\) of schools, size of schools and gender of schools’ students. In terms of decile number two of the schools are from lower decile range (decile 1 to 3), one school is from the average decile range (decile 4 to 7) and one school is from the upper decile range (decile 8 to 10). In terms of size one of the school is a very small school (students roll than 300), one is an average school (students roll greater than 300 but less than 1000), one school is a big school (students roll greater than 1000 but less than 1700) and one is a very big school (students roll greater than 1700). In terms of gender one school is single sex school while three other schools are co-educational schools.

Drawing on the work of Tooley& Guthrie (2007), Jacobs (2000), Kenny (2001, p.174), Broadbent et al. (1994), and Laughlin et al. (1994) the primary research instrument chosen for this research was semi-structured interviews with 16 secondary school teachers. Of the 16

---

\(^5\) New Zealand’s secondary schools are ranked on a decile scale ranging fro 1 to 10. Where 1 stands for the poorest and 10 the richest communities, from where the students come to the school.
teachers, 13 were from four schools chosen purposively\(^6\), while three teachers were from three other schools, chosen on the basis of ease of accessibility and availability. Kenny (2001, p.174) is of the opinion that interviewing stakeholders (such as teachers in this investigation) is the fundamental way to obtain clear understanding of stakeholders’ expectations and the indicators that measure the status of those expectations. Teachers’ expectations determine and explain the decision criteria, termed as Key Performance Factors (KPFs), that teachers employ to assess a school’s performance. The key performance indicators (KPIs) reflect the status of the KPFs from the teachers’ perspective. Interviews were conducted with teachers on a one to one basis, in a semi-structured format. The interviews had two objectives. First was to understand the KPFs with respect to schools’ performance from the teachers’ perspective, and the second was to identify the KPIs that reflected the status of the KPFs.

An interview guide was developed based on the Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) and Kenny’s (2001) performance measurement framework. The response to the questions was analysed using NVivo 2 software for teachers’ KPFs and the attributes that describe and explain each KPF. Typically each KPF had three to five attributes. Most of the attributes were defined by teachers in a fairly consistent manner. However, there were also some variations in explaining the attributes. These variations in explanation of each attribute probably reflect the unique context of each school. In addition to that the KPIs of each KPF were also identified. The following section discusses the KPFs and their associated KPIs identified in this investigation.

5. Research findings and discussion

The teachers who were interviewed identified 11 KPFs. The KPFs that were commented on by at least 15 of the 16 teachers are called core KPFs. The KPFs which at most 14

\(^6\) A deliberate attempt was made by the researcher to select schools with certain characteristics of decile, size and gender of students.
of the 16 teachers have commented upon are called secondary KPFs. Out of the 11 KPFs; seven are core KPFs and the remaining four are secondary KPFs as shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Core and Secondary KPFs**

This paper discusses the seven core KPFs that explain teachers’ expectations from the management of State secondary schools of New Zealand as shown in the inner circle of Figure 1. The core KPFs identified in this investigation has three to five attributes that describe and explain each of the KPFs as shown in Table 1.
Table 1: Summary of the KPFs and their attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPFs</th>
<th>Attribute 1</th>
<th>Attribute 2</th>
<th>Attribute 3</th>
<th>Attribute 4</th>
<th>Attribute 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Atmosphere at School</td>
<td>Relationship between teachers</td>
<td>Relationship of teachers with students</td>
<td>Relationship of students with teachers and the school.</td>
<td>Management Traits</td>
<td>Other traits, (KPF ‘Roles &amp; Goals’, KPF ‘Safety’, Physical Attractiveness of facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roles and Goals</td>
<td>Clarity of Roles</td>
<td>Clarity of Goals</td>
<td>Salient features of Roles and Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management System</td>
<td>Management System and the teachers</td>
<td>Management System and the parents</td>
<td>Management System and the students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salient features of the Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support for Teachers</td>
<td>Supportive management team</td>
<td>Supportive management system</td>
<td>Supportive environment</td>
<td>Other support for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Workload</td>
<td>Systemic workload</td>
<td>Salient features of workload</td>
<td>Teachers’ expectations of workload</td>
<td>Teachers’ suggestions for workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resources</td>
<td>Teaching Resources</td>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>Salient features of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety</td>
<td>Meaning of Safety</td>
<td>Management System</td>
<td>Salient features of Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section discusses the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’.
**KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’**

The KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’ is defined by the interaction of five attributes that consists of three relationships, the traits of the schools’ management and the other traits of the schools as shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2: KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’**

The other traits, consists of the KPFs ‘Roles & Goals’, and ‘Safety’ as well as physical attractiveness of the schools’ facilities that influences the three relationships and the traits of schools’ management to shape the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’.
Table 2: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Relationship between teachers            | 1. Number of Maori cultural practices like Powhiri.  
                                              | 2. Absence of cliques.                    
                                              | 4. Number of staff who have relationships beyond the school 
                                              | 5. Number of social activities in school. 
                                              | 7. Friendly and chatty faces in staff room. 
                                              | 8. Care expressed in meetings upon bereavement or untoward happenings to staff or their family. |
| II. Relationship of teachers with students  | 1. No us and them between teachers and students. 
                                              | 2. Number of truants brought back to school. 
                                              | 3. Number of students saying hello or wishing or talking to teacher outside class. |
| III. Relationship of students with teachers and the school. | 1. Number of fights among students. 
                                              | 2. Number of students calling names to one another. 
                                              | 3. Lack of ongoing conflict among students. 
                                              | 4. Number of students leaving school without qualifications. 
                                              | 5. Number of students voluntarily guiding a visitor in school. |
| IV. Management Traits                       | 1. Sense of having some input into staff meetings 
                                              | 2. No reserved sitting place for anyone in staff room 
                                              | 3. Number of staff scared to speak freely in staffroom or to management / freedom to express freely 
                                              | 4. Schools’ systems performance to meet teachers’ requirements. 
                                              | 5. Number of sick leaves taken by teachers 
                                              | 6. Teachers turnover rate 
                                              | 7. Number of teachers complaining and moaning |
| VI. Other Traits                            | 1. Smile on faces of teachers, students, staff and Principal. 
                                              | 2. Greeting of visitors by Principal and teachers. 
                                              | 3. Number of assemblies to inform staff and students about happenings in school. 
                                              | 4. Number of times staff reported they were unsafe or offended. 
                                              | 5. Number of Graffiti in school. 
                                              | 6. Physical attractiveness of the schools facilities. |

7 Powhiri are ceremonies practiced as part of Maori traditions in New Zealand.
From among the five attributes of the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’, management’s traits appear to be the most decisive influencer on the KPF. Kate an experienced teacher says,

“I think it (atmosphere of the school) comes from management and senior management often. How they make you feel, which works quite well, so we have got a good collegial atmosphere coming through from senior management.”

Management’s traits affect relationship between teachers (attribute 1) the relationship between teachers and students (attribute 2) and the relationship of the students with their teachers and the school (attribute 3). This relationship between the five attributes of the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’ is probably representative of the situation in most schools. However there may be situations in certain schools that one factor may override the others; for example in a very rough neighbourhood, safety can become the over riding factor that shape the school’s atmosphere (ambience).

Table 2 provides a list of the KPIs that may indicate the status of the five attributes of the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’ from the teachers’ perspective. The description of the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’ implies that schools’ ambience is dynamic as is the relationships of teachers, students and traits of management. Hence, atmosphere at a school that is currently not very favourable may not necessarily remain so in the future and vice-versa. The KPF ‘Roles and Goals’ is discussed next.

**KPF ‘Roles and Goals’**

The KPF ‘Roles and Goals’ is defined by the interaction of its three attributes, the clarity of roles, the clarity of goals and salient features of roles and goals as shown in Table 1. Figure 3 depicts ‘clarity of roles’ of teachers. The teachers’ role is to first engage the student and
establish a relationship with the student. This sets the context in which the teacher moves into the second part of their role which is teaching. If the teacher can engage and teach the student it enables the teacher to influence the students in a number of ways which is the third part of the teachers’ roles. The fourth part of teachers’ role is as a support person in the school, supervising non-curriculum activities such as camps and sports, although many teachers provide support to their students in the class, as well as outside the classroom.

**Figure 3: KPF “Roles and Goals”**

Figure 3 portrays that the attribute ‘clarity of goals’ of teachers also has four parts. Academics, sports and behaviour are three parts of goals while balancing, that is striking a right balance among the three parts of goals is an important aspect of teachers’ goals. Behavioural
goals consist of developing a set of values in a students’ personality, so that they behave in an acceptable manner. Some schools are more academically focused, while for others managing behaviour of students is the prime objective. Achieving balance between academics, sports and behavioural goals has been indicated by a number of teachers. The balance among the three parts of goals may not necessarily imply being equal in proportion. Most likely it stands for a mix that is suitable for the student population of a particular school.

**Table 3: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Roles and Goals’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of KPF ‘Roles and Goals’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Roles and Goals’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Clarity of Roles                 | 1. Job descriptions for staff at school.  
2. Clarity of staff on the boundaries and expectations of school from them.  
3. Guidelines for teachers from BOT and Principal |
| II. Clarity of Goals                | 1. 15 plus credits at NCEA  
2. Pass rates at NCEA  
3. Pass rates in junior subjects  
4. Comparison of school’s academic achievement nationally with schools in the same decile range.  
5. Number of class missed for sports.  
6. Retention rates for years 9, 10 and 11 students.  
7. Attendance rates for years 9, 10 and 11 students.  
8. Number of top scholarships/awards obtained.  
9. Number of students who get jobs after leaving school.  
10. Attendance rate of students.  
11. Completion rate of students.  
12. Academic results of students  
13. Number of students who have learnt Te Reo to a high calibre  
14. Number of sporting events won by school. |
| III. Salient features of Roles and Goals | 1. Setting up benchmark for students.  
4. Happiness of staff.  
5. Students come out as better citizens of the community. |

Teachers adapt their roles and goals depending upon the capability of the students and students’ goals. This adaptation of teachers’ roles and goals influences teachers’ workload as
is shown in Figure 3. Teachers also affect students’ goals and capabilities, through the influence that they may have on their students.

The schools’ management system also affects teachers’ roles and goals in addition to the students, as shown in Figure 3. Teachers’ expect that the schools’ management system document their roles, so that they know what is expected of them in their respective roles and how to go about it. Teachers also expect that schools’ management system provide them periodic feedback on their achievements with respect to their goals. They also expect that schools’ management system provides feedback to students on their performance with respect to students’ goals. Figure 3 also shows that teacher roles and goals may overlap one another. The nature of the overlap appears to depend on the work experience of the teachers. The less experienced teachers appear to focus more on the goals while experienced teachers focus on the goals without losing sight of their role as teachers.

Table 3 provides a list of all the KPIs that may indicate the status of the three attributes of the KPF ‘Roles and Goals’ from the teachers’ perspective. KPF ‘Management System’ is discussed next.

**KPF ‘Management System’**

Figure 4 depicts the four attributes of the KPF ‘Management System’. Three of the attributes explain the interactions of the schools’ management system with teachers, parents, and students, while the fourth explains the salient features of the schools’ management system.

The salient feature of the management system explains how schools’ management system affects schools’ safety, atmosphere (ambience) as well as teachers roles and goals. In terms of the management system’s interaction with the parents this investigation found that the scope and intensity of communication between the school and the parents may be influenced by the parents’ expectations from the school. For example in some schools parent take the time and
effort to set goals for their child with the teachers and then follow it up periodically, while in some other schools parent do not even care to ensure that their children attend school regularly and have even been prosecuted for wilful neglect of their children’s attendance at school.

Figure 4: KPF “Management System”

Teachers expect that management applies the system consistently throughout the school and periodically updates it. Teachers expect feedback on ways to improve their performance be given privately while their achievements are acknowledged publicly. Teachers expect that schools’ management system provide procedures for their performance appraisal, communication and gives them a structure in terms of the curriculum that they are expected to
Teach, administrative procedures that they are to follow and the structure of pastoral care for students.

**Table 4: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Management System’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the KPF ‘Management System’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Management System’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Management Systems and the teachers   | 1. Focus of teachers’ appraisal (punitive or professional growth)  
2. Open door policy of management  
3. Response time of procedures for teachers  
4. Focus of teachers’ appraisal (punitive or professional growth)  
5. Procedures driven by senior management  
6. Procedures for performance review of teachers  
7. Procedures for performance review of teachers  
8. Procedures for teachers’ safety  
9. Rate of change in system  
10. Job induction procedures  
11. Procedures exist that meet needs of teacher  
12. Number of procedures and documents  
13. Response time of procedures for teachers  
14. Time spent in teaching  
15. Time spent on administration and disciplining children  
16. Annual upgrade of procedures  
17. Job induction procedures  
18. Clarity of staff  
19. Number of surprises faced by teachers  
20. Health of teachers  
21. Complaining and moaning by teachers |
| II. Management Systems and the parents    | 1. Reporting systems to parents  
2. Report to parents |
| III. Management Systems and the students  | 1. Procedures for student discipline  
2. Academic performance of students |
| IV. Salient features of the Management System | 1. Events taking place in predetermined sequence  
2. Documentation of system  
3. Number of changes in a year to the system  
4. Procedures are followed through  
5. Existence of positions of Deans |

Teachers also expect that schools’ management system provides procedures for engaging the students, disciplining the students as well as supporting the students. Teachers can
engage the students if the system provides for streaming\textsuperscript{8} of classes, teacher aids to help students in their academics and feedback system that informs students of their progress.

Schools’ management system is specific to a school, implying that the system at each school is unique. It is also evolutionary and changes with time in order to satisfy the changing expectations of teachers, students and parents. The management system operates through the organisational structure of the school such as the structure of faculty, deans and form and class teachers.

The KPF ‘Management System’ affects the KPF ‘Roles and Goals’ as the management system’s capability has to be taken into account by management while ascertaining teachers’ roles and goals in the school. Management system at schools also affects the KPF ‘Safety’ at schools, since management system establishes the procedures and methods to ensure safety of teachers as well as students. Management system also affects the schools’ atmosphere as stated by a beginning classroom teacher Judy,

\begin{quote}
We have got a school wide system so basically you got to make sure that in each single class it is the same expectations and I think that’s where you start working on the students and changing the whole real environment of the school.
\end{quote}

Table 4 provides a list of all the KPIs that may indicate the status of the four attributes of the KPF ‘Management System’ from the teachers’ perspective. The KPF ‘Support for Teachers’ is discussed next.

\textit{KPF ‘Support for teachers’}

The KPF ‘Support for Teachers’ has four attributes as shown in Table 1. Figure 5 depicts that teachers consider support of the management team (attribute 1) and the management system (attribute 2) of significance as it impacts on their performance. The atmosphere at the

\textsuperscript{8} Streaming is the process of putting students of similar capabilities in one classroom.
school (attribute 3), the resources provided to teachers together with support from parents (attribute 4) are also important.

Figure 5: KPF “Support for Teachers

Teachers expect support of the schools’ management team in terms of classroom management and disruptive students who misbehave in class. They also expect the management team to stand by them if they are accused of wrong doing from any quarter. At least until they are not proven wrong. The role of the Head of the Department’s (HOD) particularly in guiding and nurturing beginning classroom teachers is also of great significance.
Teachers expect that the management system provide them structures that they can rely on if they are faced with a safety issue in class. They also contend that the system should provide them opportunities for professional development and growth. Teachers at times need emotional support from counsellors and also administrative support so that they can go about their daily business. The friendliness in the schools’ atmosphere affects support for teachers as informal peer support which flourishes in a collegial ambience is vital for teachers. Teachers also expect that management system takes care of the well being of students including the difficult and disruptive students. Parents can support teachers if they readily and regularly make an effort to comply with the schools’ rules. Resources also affect teachers support in the form of teaching resources and professional development opportunities for teachers.

Table 5: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Support for Teachers’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the KPF ‘Support for Teachers’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Support for Teachers’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Supportive management team</td>
<td>1. Number of Deans present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Presence of Specialist Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Presence of Literacy / Numeric Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Existence of PRT Monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Procedures exist for HOD to support teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Supportive management system</td>
<td>1. Outcome for teachers when support is sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Procedures for difficult students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Procedures for rehabilitating difficult students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Documentation of procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Procedures are followed through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Number of times lessons are disrupted by kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Existence of safety procedures (e.g. Red Card).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Procedure for leave planned / unplanned (e.g. Relief Box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Existence of procedures for professional support of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Supportive environment (Atmosphere at School)</td>
<td>1. Procedures for teachers to access peer for professional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Happy staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Existence of procedures for emotional support of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Communication of support procedures to all concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Other support for teachers</td>
<td>1. Budget of PD (Professional Development)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 provides a list of all the KPIs that may indicate the status of the four attributes of the KPF ‘Support for Teachers’ from the teachers’ perspective. The KPF ‘Workload’ of teachers is discussed next.

*KPF ‘Workload’*

The KPF ‘Workload’ of teachers has four attributes as shown in Table 1. The first attribute is systemic workload, the second is salient features of workload, the third is teachers’ expectations of workload, and the fourth is suggestions to manage workload by teachers.

*Figure 6: KPF “Workload”*
The systemic workload of teachers is influenced by the growing expectations of the schools’ management from teachers, the number of changes to assessments and curriculum made by NZQA, the greater need for documentation by the MoE for purposes of accountability and traceability, and the increasing amount of paperwork and procedures that schools’ management system requires teachers to do on a daily basis.

Data on features of workload the second attribute of the KPF suggests that workload is teacher specific and is attributable to different marking modes for different papers that teachers teach. It is also influenced by the number of students in the class and the variability of their competencies. Teachers not only teach, but do a number of administrative tasks, supervise sports camps and students’ social events as well as raise funds. Teaching workload has a cyclical pattern with crests and troughs during a school year.

Table 6: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Workload’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the KPF ‘Workload’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Workload’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Systemic workload</td>
<td>1. Number of students per class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of extra-curricular activities per teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of changes in curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Number of changes in assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Number of classes per teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Salient features of workload</td>
<td>1. Number of deadlines per term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of assessments per term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of forms filled in a period (term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Number of man-hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Percentage of non-teaching man-hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Crowding of teachers’ desks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Teachers’ expectations of workload</td>
<td>1. Looking run down due to workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teachers’ griping (complain) about workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Calm and relaxed feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Inability to meet deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Number of non-contact hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Teachers’ suggestions for workload</td>
<td>1. Number of non-contact hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Time management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Inability to meet deadlines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers expect to work long hours as there is still an ethos of giving their best for the sake of students by most teachers. However, teachers do not enjoy administrative tasks that have been currently increasing which distract them from the bliss of teaching. Teachers expect that the schools’ management should acknowledge their long hours of duty and in case if one of them falters under the burden of the heavy workload management should move in to ease their burden. Teachers also expect that administrative procedures are simplified so that they may have more time for teaching.

Teachers have mixed opinions about schools’ management ability to manage teachers’ workload. In terms of managing teachers’ workload teachers have indicated that acquiring time-management skills may improve teachers’ capability to handle workloads. Schools’ management can also influence teachers’ workload by providing resources such as teaching tools to teachers. Table 6 provides a list of all the KPIs that may indicate the status of the four attributes of the KPF ‘Workload’ from the teachers’ perspective. The KPF ‘Resources’ for teachers is discussed next.

**KPF ‘Resources’**

The KPF ‘Resources’ has three attributes as shown in Table 1. The first attribute is teaching resources, the second is learning environment and the third is salient features of resources. Figure 7 shows that the KPF ‘Resources’ is affected by the supply of equipment, materials and infrastructure by schools’ management for the use of teachers. MoE is the prime source of funding and any change in funding policy of the MoE affects the KPF ‘Resources’. The HOD’s support is vital for teachers to obtain funds for their projects or departments. Students’ expectations to be entertained and have interactive software based learning tools and communication devises such as data show requires teachers to seek additional resources. Students currently tend to be individualistic and are not eager to share their books or computers with peers,
consequently teachers require schools’ management to provide them with resources so that each student is resourced fully individually.

Figure 7: KPF “Resources”

Figure 7 shows that ‘resources’ may affect the ability of the teachers to engage the students, since teaching tools and communication tools aid teachers to attract attention of the students are dependent on availability of resources at the school.
Table 7: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Resources’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the KPF ‘Resources’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Resources’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Teaching Resources</td>
<td>1. Number of text books per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Facility for photocopying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of requisitions rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Amount ($) budgeted for resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Number of board markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Number / Availability of projectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Availability of stationary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Number of students sharing text books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II. Learning environment          | 1. Property budget ($)        |
|                                   | 2. Maintenance budget ($)     |
|                                   | 3. Comfort of desks and chairs|
|                                   | 4. Good lightning in classroom|
|                                   | 5. Clean classroom            |
|                                   | 6. Age of furniture           |
|                                   | 7. Age of computers           |
|                                   | 8. Chairs and Tables per student |
|                                   | 9. Space per student          |
|                                   | 10. Adequate whiteboard space |
|                                   | 11. Upgrading of resources    |
|                                   | 12. Status of Library         |
|                                   | 13. Sharing of resources such as computers |

| III. Salient features of resources| 1. Number of teaching materials |
|                                   | 2. Dollar amount of curriculum budget. |
|                                   | 3. Dollar amount of PD (Professional Development) budget |
|                                   | 4. Number of computers per student |
|                                   | 5. Data projectors per class     |
|                                   | 6. Availability/Number of laptops per teacher |
|                                   | 7. Number of TV                  |
|                                   | 8. Budget ($) for creating resources for students |

Table 7 provides a list of the KPIs that may indicate the status of the three attributes of the KPF ‘Resources’ from the teachers’ perspective. The KPF ‘Safety’ is discussed next.
**KPF ‘Safety’**

The KPF ‘Safety’ of teachers has three attributes from teachers’ perspective, as shown in Table 1. The three attributes are also depicted in Figure 8. The first attribute ‘meaning of safety’ is depicted in a large ellipse at the centre of the figure. The second attribute is the schools’ management system that affects schools’ safety. The third attribute is the ‘salient features of safety’. It includes students’ behaviour and a set of exogenous factors that influence safety at schools. Figure 8 also shows that safety at schools is a source of concern for the MoE and the schools’ BOT.

**Figure 8: KPF “Safety”**
The first attribute ‘meaning of safety’ explains what is meant by the term safety in State secondary schools of New Zealand. Safety includes physical safety of all persons in the school as well as verbal, emotional, professional and health safety. Physical and verbal safety of teachers it appears is primarily at risk from students. Teachers may need counselling and relievers due to work-related stress in order to avoid risk to their emotional safety. Professional safety of teachers is on account of accusations made from any quarter about their professional and even personal conduct. The situation may aggravate due to media attention, which does not appear to be sympathetic to some teachers.

Table 8: Summary of KPIs for each attribute of KPF ‘Safety’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the KPF ‘Safety’</th>
<th>KPIs for the KPF ‘Safety’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Meaning of Safety          | 1. Number of reports about misbehaviour of students  
                                        2. Number of police reports about students  
                                        3. Number of violent incidents by students against teachers in a given period  
                                        4. Number of instances of verbal abuse of teachers  
                                        5. Managements’ actions as their response to fix safety problems  
                                        6. Free expression of views by teachers in meetings  
                                        7. Number of incidents relating to safety |
| II. Management System        | 1. Existence of safety procedures (such as electronic bracelets)  
                                        2. Effectiveness of procedures  
                                        3. Appraisal (periodic) of procedures  
                                        4. Secure rooms  
                                        5. Maintained buildings  
                                        6. Maintained furniture and fixture  
                                        7. Procedures for managing unruly students  
                                        8. Written procedures for managing allegations on teachers.  
                                        9. Number of stand downs  
                                        10. Number of suspensions  
                                        11. Number of expulsions  
                                        12. Number of students tested for drugs  
                                        13. Number of students testing positive for drugs  
                                        14. Safety procedures for verbal abuse |
| III. Salient features of Safety | 1. Number of physical assaults on teachers  
                                        2. Number of verbal attacks on teachers  
                                        3. Large body size of teachers  
                                        4. Teachers’ reluctance to teach a class  
                                        5. Turnover of teachers  
                                        6. Counselling support for teachers  
                                        7. Relievers for teachers |
The second attribute ‘management system’ describe teachers’ expectations from the schools’ management system to setup formal procedures so that safety of teachers and students and all personnel at school is ensured. Some schools have setup formal protocols for managing the problems of drugs in schools with cooperation of the local Police.

The third attribute ‘salient features of safety’ explains the exogenous factors such as widespread and easy availability of drugs to school students leading to increased drug usage, may encourage increasingly violent behaviour of students. Media attention to safety issues in schools has brought the issue to the fore. The schools’ BOT and the MoE appear to be very concerned on the issue of safety at schools. Table 8 provides a list of all the KPIs that may indicate the status of the three attributes of the KPF ‘Safety’. The following section concludes this paper.

6. Conclusion

This paper discussed teachers’ expectations from schools’ management. Analysis of teachers’ expectations resulted in the identification of seven core KPFs. The KPFs do not stand in isolation of each other. They often appear to affect one another, for example the KPF ‘Safety’ and KPF ‘Roles and Goals’ influences the KPF ‘Atmosphere at School’. An investigation into the pattern and nature of interaction of the schools’ KPFs may lead to identification of a set of KPFs that act as prime movers in starting a virtuous or a vicious cycle for the schools’ performance. The KPFs to some extent appear to be context bound for each school. Hence, management actions that may work at one school may, or may not work at another.

We argue that the current PMS at State secondary schools of New Zealand should incorporate the KPFs identified in this investigation (or similar), so that as teachers meet managements’ expectations on one hand, management can be seen to reciprocate on the other. Thereby the partnership between the schools’ management and teachers will be established on a more equitable footing. This is expected to increase the engagement of teachers with the schools’ management, hopefully leading to improved performance of schools.
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