



# Submission by the Foundation for Young Australians on the DEECD's New Directions for School Leadership and the Teaching Profession

September 2012



FOUNDATION FOR  
Young Australians



## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Key recommendations and outline of this paper .....	1
Section 1: What matters? .....	2
Section 2: What should the priorities be? .....	4
Section 3: What is missing? .....	7
Section 4: Where should effort not be directed? .....	8
Conclusion.....	10
Acknowledgements .....	11
References .....	12



## **Introduction**

The Foundation for Young Australians' (FYA) Centre for New Public Education (CNPE) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development's (DEECD) New Directions for School Leadership and the Teaching Profession Discussion paper (DEECD 2012a).

FYA is a national, independent, non-profit organisation dedicated solely to young people. It provides a national platform of respect and opportunity for the best ideas and actions that young Australians have to offer. FYA believes that all young people have the courage, imagination and will to shape their education and create social change. Its vision is for a generation of connected, confident and optimistic young people with a deep sense of purpose and belonging. Its mission is to empower young Australians to be successful learners and creative, active and valued citizens through research, initiatives and partnerships and by harnessing the passion of young people.

The Centre for New Public Education (CNPE) is an initiative of FYA, focused on mobilisation and research. CNPE believes education reform must be driven by increased public will, informed by what educators and experts know works and sustained due to increased pressure from monitoring. CNPE works to engage and empower people, shape and monitor policy and accelerate alliances to achieve change.

FYA has a proven track record in the delivery and development of education programs, research and community engagement over the past 30 years. Its many education initiatives aid young people in developing the skills and beliefs required to be successful in the 21st century. Our research documents and promotes young people's capacity for active participation across all areas of public life. This includes the annual How Young People are Faring (HYPAF) report, which provides a regular snapshot of the education and employment situation for young people across Australia.

For over 10 years, FYA's research team has been engaged in work seeking to understand learner centred environments and the broader institutional, technological social and economic implications of these for public education in Australia in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The team has been commissioned to provide advice about this research to Cisco Systems, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, Flexible Learning Framework and National Curriculum Board (now ACARA).

## **Key recommendations and outline of this paper**

CNPE is responding to the New Directions paper on behalf of FYA. We commend DEECD for its vision and the rigour of its comprehensive approach to improving teacher quality in Victoria. CNPE supports DEECD's recognition of teacher quality as central to improving student outcomes. Section 1 (What Matters?) argues that while teachers matter they are only one part of a learning ecosystem, and accountability systems for equity and 21<sup>st</sup> century learning are also needed to deliver change. While supporting all DEECD's actions, the focus of this Submission is on Action 2, 'Creating a High Performance Profession: Stimulating a Culture of Excellence and Effective Professional Development'. As discussed in Section 2 (Priorities), CNPE supports the alignment of the system around professional collaboration and collective responsibility, viewing these as the key levers to achieve systemic and cost-effective reform. Highlighting emerging research, Section 3 (What is Missing?) strongly recommends the involvement of students in teacher evaluation mechanisms as they are the



primary stakeholders in education. Section 4 (Where Should Effort Not Be Directed?) suggests that prioritising individual incentive performance pay or exiting low performing teachers do not support professional collaboration or collective responsibility, and may conversely detract from a collaborative culture of excellence in the teaching profession.

## **Section 1: What matters?**

### ***Teachers matter***

While teachers are the single most important in-school factor that impacts student learning (McCaffrey, Koretz, Lockwood & Hamilton 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek & Kin 2005; Rockoff 2004), they are just one part of a learning ecosystem. Teacher quality is a critical lever in improving student outcomes, but to have impact, must work in concert with other reforms that address whole school and system factors (e.g., school funding to address disadvantage, 21<sup>st</sup> century curriculum, school and community partnerships, etc.) The central question of how to define, quantify and improve teacher effectiveness underpins all teacher policy and practice reforms. Within a context of greater public accountability (My School), declining international performance, the availability of student and school level performance data (NAPLAN) and the development of new national teaching and school leadership standards by AITSL – teacher quality and the associated policy areas such as teacher evaluation can take on a more charged and publicly debated role.

Teacher quality can be regarded by political leaders and policy makers as a silver bullet for education reform. Keating argues that “teacher quality is seductive for policymakers as it simplifies the highly complex sociology of schooling” (Keating 2009, p.13). A relentless focus on teacher quality can result in teachers being cast as the saviour or the villain, with corresponding policies that can reduce the complexity of teacher effectiveness to single issue actions such as performance pay or an aggressive focus on exiting the lowest performing teachers from the system.

This has been partially fuelled in an international context by the development of systems to measure the effectiveness of teachers that are focused on value-add measurements, based on students’ test scores. These appear to provide “objective data” and are focused on the outputs of teaching – the students. In the US this process was accelerated by the Obama administration’s federal Race to the Top (RTTT) policy, which strongly incentivised the use of multiple measures of teacher effectiveness including student test scores in teacher evaluations (Eds Clapp et al. 2012, p.79). As a result in some US public school systems, value-added scores for individual teachers now account for 50 percent of teacher appraisal (District of Columbia Public Schools 2011, p.6).

### ***Accountability for equity matters***

Teacher quality issues in Victoria cannot be analysed without considering the larger policy enablers and accountability frameworks. The New Directions paper is aligned to and nested within DEECD’S 2012-16 Draft Strategic Plan (DEECD Strategic Plan). The DEECD Strategic plan clearly articulates that it is seeking to lift the educational performance of all young Victorians and also close the gap for young Victorians who are disadvantaged by geography, socioeconomic status, indigeneity, disability and English language proficiency. The paper states:



The challenge is to lift our education and development outcomes to the global top tier both on average and across the distribution – that is, we have to “move the curve right” (DEECD 2012b, p.5)

There is a strong commitment to closing equity gaps in the top-line level of this plan. However, this does not necessarily permeate all of the proposed systems and structures when you drill down. For example, the DEECD performance framework draft achievement measures utilise mean scores for literacy and numeracy as an indicator of student achievement (DEECD 2012b, p.6). Means, while a useful measure, can mask achievement trends for disadvantaged populations. Disaggregated data would tell the story of all young Victorians and is an important cornerstone of any accountability and improvement framework at a teacher, school or system level.

The DEECD draft performance framework also includes the measure of “the proportion of students showing high growth” (DEECD 2012b, p.6), which uses value-added definitions of success. Growth measures (value-added) are an important tool in evaluating student, teacher and school level progress. However, the use of “proportions of students with high growth” aggregates value-added data in a way that masks the underlying issues. Value-added measures need to examine improvement across the distribution of students in order to ensure that performance measures do not hide groups of students left behind in a broader context of rising achievement.

A potential model for comparison with Victoria is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Similar to the Victorian goal of “moving the curve to the right”, the new Massachusetts' school and district accountability framework aims to halve proficiency gaps for all schools, and subgroups over the next five years. The Massachusetts state system classifies schools and districts on a five-level scale, with corresponding accountability and support interventions. The indicators used to determine the performance of a school include achievement and growth data on state wide tests, cohort graduation rate and annual drop-out rate. These are reported in aggregate for all students in the school and also for high need subgroups such as students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, etc (Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education 2012). The point of difference with Victoria is the targeted focus on subgroup performance. This helps teachers, schools and the system intentionally deploy resources to where they are needed most and works to close equity gaps. School level disaggregated data also helped identify schools that may have previously been regarded as high performing due to their student body, but failed to effectively serve certain groups.

The Victorian accountability frameworks would be strengthened through the use of additional indicators that disaggregate data for sub-group performance.

### ***Accountability for 21st century learning matters***

The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (MCEECDYA 2008, p.8), endorsed by all of Australia's Education Ministers is in keeping with global shifts of high performing systems towards 21<sup>st</sup> century learning outcomes. In response, assessment and accountability frameworks are starting to try to measure 21<sup>st</sup> Century skills. In 2015, the most influential benchmark of a country's educational performance, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), will begin testing for collaborative problem-solving (Pearson 2011). The DEECD's draft strategic plan rightly focuses on connecting “education and training with the requirements of the 21<sup>st</sup> century economy and society” (Priority 1.e). Victoria must prepare all young Victorians so they are ready for their future and no one is left behind. To be successful, young people's needs extend beyond literacy and numeracy to the range of 21<sup>st</sup> century skills (Binkley et al. 2010, p.2), comprising critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration, communication, creativity, innovation and domain specific



literacy in science, information and civics. The need for skills such as problem solving and enterprise was recognised by the National Foundation Skills Strategy for Adults, in certain COAG targets, in federal budget and some state policy, and through the work of some VET training providers, universities and not-for profit organisations. The Australian national employability skills framework identified a set of skills required for workplace success that include communication, team work, problem solving, initiative and enterprise, planning and organisation, self-management, learning and technology (ACCI & BCA 2002, cited in Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training, p.5). More work could be done in how these may directly relate to the teacher workforce. Measuring primarily literacy and numeracy outcomes risks a narrowing of performance to 20<sup>th</sup> century needs.

In building accountability and performance management frameworks, Victoria needs to ensure that it aligns performance goals to a broader range of educational and wellbeing outcomes, beyond literacy and numeracy. We need to measure what matters.

## **Section 2: What should the priorities be?**

The New Directions paper outlines three key actions (DEECD 2012a) that when taken together, work to improve the quality of teaching across Victoria. These are:

1. Attract great people into teaching: attract stronger candidates and improve their preparation.
2. Create a high performance profession: stimulate a culture of excellence and effective professional development.
3. Provide strong direction and support: elevate the role of leadership at school and system levels.

All of these levers are important for systemic reform and when combined, will have the largest impact on learning outcomes in Victoria. However, CNPE believes that the largest opportunity for the greatest impact in the next decade is in directly creating a high performance profession (2), guided and supported by integrated school and system leadership (3).

The focus on the 'teaching profession' as a whole hides a complex labour market for teachers, as previously recognised by MCEECDYA's analysis of the issue (MCEECDYA 2004, p.72). The teacher force cannot only be understood in terms of quality, but also in the number of available teachers, as well as their distribution across schools and qualification areas. 'Flows' of teachers within the labour force include not only the training and entry of new teachers, but also the retirement or resignation of existing high quality teachers.

Attracting stronger candidates and pre-service training reforms are fundamental to longer-term systemic change, but there are current constraints. First, the requirements of training new teachers currently leads to both large government expense and protracted lead-times before these reforms translate into improved educational outcomes. The Productivity Commission's School Workforce Report highlighted that this was an area for potential review (Productivity Commission 2012, p.119). Second, beyond DEECD's ability to influence initial teacher training through market forces (e.g., improving regulatory oversight and inducing competition), the quality of entering teachers relies on a number of factors outside their direct control (e.g., university qualifications).



Arguably, improving the performance of the existing profession is likely to lead to more cost effective improvements in Victoria's learning outcomes. These measures should also focus on retaining existing high performance teachers, who may leave due to a lack of recognition, career progression and better prospects elsewhere (Jensen 2010, p.13; Hanushek 2011; The New Teacher Project 2012, p.15). Without changing the existing profession, investments in attracting higher quality applicants to the teaching profession is likely to rely on relatively expensive short-term incentives.

With over 40,000 public school teachers in Victoria (DEECD 2012c), and nearly 550,000 public school students (DEECD 2012c), reform efforts must be scaleable, cost effective, and serve all Victorian students. Additionally, this must occur within the context of Victoria's highly devolved and increasingly autonomous system. So how do we create the high performance profession (2), guided and supported by integrated school and system leadership (3) required to achieve this?

***Priority Action 1: Full system alignment around professional collaboration***

Professional collaboration works to improve the "collective capacity" (Fullan 2011, p.2) of the profession, shifting the "drive for change away from the centre to the front lines of schools" (Mourshed, Chijioke & Barber 2010, p.22) and making reform efforts self-sustaining.

Utilising professional collaboration as the "primary driver of school performance" (DEECD 2012a, p.15) in Victoria is pivotal to moving the Victorian system to the global top tier (DEECD 2012b, p.5). The challenge then arises in aligning the whole system to support, demand, incentivise and reward effective professional collaboration that is oriented around increasing student learning. This alignment also requires a fundamental shift in professional culture, as teaching is currently a highly atomised profession with teachers inherently spending the majority of their professional life alone in classroom (2) with their students. According to Jensen and Reichl "the culture within most schools, and schools systems, is a long way from one of openness and sharing, continuous learning and high performance" (Jensen & Reichl 2012, p.1).

Victoria has already implemented key reforms that address this culture shift and build school-based capacity through the Professional Development Culture Initiative undertaken between 2003-2009 (Marshall, Cole & Zbar 2012, Appendix). This used an accreditation approach, with over 96 percent of government schools becoming accredited during this time. The University of Deakin's evaluation reported significant shifts in professional culture with "greater openness, the sharing of ideas and practices" between teachers and "increased collaborative planning and collective responsibility for student learning" (Starr in 2008, cited in Kamener 2012, p.6). This resulted in higher levels on peer-to-peer accountability and increased the collective efficacy of schools. Unfortunately the effects of this initiative were limited as it was a singular process and there were no ongoing monitoring systems or external incentives to sustain the gains made (Kamener 2012, p.6). It did, however, provide a strong foundation from which to leverage further actions.

Where pockets of good practice do exist, collaborative approaches help enable these practices to be leveraged, across schools and systems. CNPE supports the following actions for aligned professional collaboration that will help build the capacity for schools across the system as outlined by DEECD:

- Establish exchanges and secondments for teachers to work in other schools to allow them to develop their skills and share effective teaching practices. This could be further leveraged if implemented using small teams.



- Support teachers engaging in peer observation and feedback, joint curriculum planning and mentoring activities to improve student learning outcomes.
- Teachers undertaking team-based research projects.

There are also pre-existing structures and practices that could be further modified to incorporate a more collaborative focus:

- Pre-service training –
  - Training teachers to work in teams and continue to do so in the early stages of teaching, as demonstrated by Shanghai (Jensen 2012, pp. 53-54)
- Professional learning –
  - Prioritising school based professional learning, focused on student learning with an emphasis on opportunities for collaborative problem-solving and group support (Cole 2011, p.9; Hawley and Valli 1999, pp. 137-143; Elmore & Burney 1997, p.2; Jensen 2012, p.13)
- Evaluation and feedback –
  - Embedding professional collaboration into performance evaluation and professional development standards (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1995, p. 598)
  - Peer review as a central part of formal feedback on teaching practice (Jackson & Bruegmann 2009, p.106)
  - Systemise the use of informal feedback to build a feedback culture (Marshall, Cole & Zbar 2012, p.6)
  - Regular, rather than annual, review and reporting on individual, group and whole school professional goals (Cole 2011, p.1)
- Accountability and incentives –
  - Use of team or whole school incentives rather than individual incentives (that may undermine collaboration) (Johnson 2012, p.116)

### ***Priority Action 2: Stronger guidelines and monitoring for implementation of performance management systems***

Performance management systems can be used as a professional development tool to improve instructional practice (Papay 2012, p.125), and as a measurement tool to assess performance (Papay 2012, pp.125-126). The Victorian system, like most across Australia, has prioritised improvement purposes over accountability (Marshall, Cole & Zbar 2012, p.7). This can have significant system impact if there is rigour in the evidence used to assess standards not only for individual teachers, but across classrooms and schools. Currently, in Victoria, there are no guidelines on what evidence should be used to demonstrate that standards have been met (Marshall, Cole & Zbar 2012, p.6), for example, student outcomes, peer observation, etc. This decision is up to schools, and can result in high levels of variability across the system.



While localised decision-making and principal autonomy has many benefits, there must be uniformity of performance standards set by the centre and principals must be equipped, supported and held accountable for effective implementation. Within a highly decentralised system, principals become the lynch pin in improving teaching and student learning outcomes and the gatekeepers to schools and teachers. As DEECD has a direct relationship with principals, CNPE strongly supports the potential actions outlined in Action 3 to build the capacity, quality and performance of school leaders (DEECD 2012a, pp.22-23).

In order to effectively support and sustain the implementation of a performance development and management system, DEECD should consider focusing on:

- Promoting stronger accountability by requiring the use of certain types of evidence and data (Marshall, Cole & Zbar 2012, p.6)
- Stronger monitoring of the implementation of performance management practices across the system (Marshall, Cole, Zbar 2012, p.6)
- Building the capacity of school principals to give effective feedback on teaching practices (Marshall, Cole & Zbar 2012, p.6)
- Providing independent monitoring of classroom observations to ensure system level reliability (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012, p.4)
- Providing targeted capacity building, requiring principals to demonstrate ongoing accuracy in the use of classroom observation instruments to reduce issues with inter-rater reliability (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012c, p.3)

### **Section 3: What is missing?**

Students are the primary stakeholders in education and the ones whose futures are most impacted by policy reform. From CNPE's perspective, their potential role has been minimised in this discussion. In Victoria there is a stated commitment to involving students in decisions about their learning and in the how their schools are run (DEECD 2009, p.10). However, despite positive policy frameworks, the reality is that students:

“... remain the group that is least frequently invited to share in the governance or decision-making processes of their schools and whose role within these processes is most limited.” (Black 2009, p.74)

In the context of teacher performance management, the role of students is even more limited as teachers are understandably concerned about student feedback becoming a popularity contest. For instance, on the well known 'Rate my Teachers' website (<http://au.ratemyteachers.com/>), students rate their teachers using indicators such as 'easiness', 'helpfulness' and 'clarity' to give an overall quality rating out of four stars. The open comments section fuels teachers' fears about comments based on personality and are of a highly subjective nature.

So what is the role of student surveys in teacher evaluation? Recent work by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation has begun to develop and trial a new comprehensive measure of teacher effectiveness (MET). It



has involved 3,000 teacher volunteers drawn from across six school districts in the United States (Kane, Staiger 2010, p.4). The MET project is researching tools for measuring effective teaching such as classroom observations, student surveys, assessments of pedagogical content knowledge and different measures of student achievement. The study is using the Tripod survey developed by Harvard Professor Ron Ferguson to survey student perceptions of teacher practice. In the survey, students are asked to agree or disagree with statements such as “my teacher knows when the class understands, and when we do not” or “my teacher has several good ways to explain each topic that we cover in this class” (Kane, Staiger 2010, p.12).

The preliminary findings of the study have found that student surveys used in conjunction with student value-added scores and classroom observation, create a more reliable measure and are a greater predictor of student achievement gains than any of the measures alone (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012b, p.14). Even more powerful was the finding that when used on their own, student surveys were a more reliable measure of a teacher's student achievement gains effectiveness than classroom observation, which is the most common form of teacher evaluation (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012b, p.52). This should not be that surprising as students spend on average 195 days a year in the classroom with their teacher.

Different tools serve different purposes in a performance management system. Classroom observations and student surveys are powerful tools for diagnosing areas of strengths and weakness and supporting the key objective of improving teacher instructional practice. Student surveys also have the benefit of being a low cost option, and can be rolled out across a whole system (Kane & Staiger 2010, p.31), whereas value-added data is limited to only those teachers who teach year groups and subjects that are tested by NAPLAN, and classroom observations are costly.

As a result of strong student-led advocacy, the use of student feedback in teacher evaluations has been adopted into policy in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Boston Student Advisory Council ran a successful campaign that initially started as a trial in 29 high schools. With over 86 percent of the participating principals indicating support for including students as part of the teacher evaluation process, the students ran a successful state wide campaign, “We are the ones in the Classrooms -Ask Us!” Along with the evidence from the MET study and with RTTT reforms requiring an overhaul of teacher evaluations, this resulted in the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopting student feedback as evidence in its new teacher evaluation system, from the 2013-2014 school year.

The New Directions paper mentions the potential use of student feedback as a reliable source of data (DEECD 2012a, p.18). CNPE recommends the appropriate use student survey tools as a required component of any teacher performance review system in Victoria.

## **Section 4: Where should effort not be directed?**

The central means by which a system builds its collective capacity is through the dual levers of professional collaboration and collective responsibility for student learning. Strategies such as individualised incentive pay do not necessarily reinforce these core objectives and can work to undermine improvement reforms. A prioritised focus on exiting the bottom 5 percent of teachers fails to get whole system gains, and any underperformance of teaching should be identified and managed through the implementation of a comprehensive performance management system.



### ***Performance pay***

DEECD's general approach to trialing new ways of rewarding effective teachers (DEECD 2012a, p.18), and the corresponding consideration of non-financial rewards appear sound. In spite of the attractive nature of performance pay schemes as a policy tool, there is very little evidence to support individual incentive pay as an effective lever for improving student outcomes (Productivity Commission 2012, p. 114). The complexities of education and an inability to exclusively correlate student improvement to a single teacher's contributions (improvement could also be attributed to concurrent or past teachers) reduces the efficacy of tying individual performance to incentive schemes (Goodman & Turner 2010, p.1). It also undermines the principles of collaboration and a collegiate culture. Additionally, teachers may become overly focused on the content of what is being measured, to the detriment of other learning outcomes that are not being incentivised, or are difficult to measure (Pederson 2007, p.142). Factors outside a teacher's control – such as the student or school context – have significant impact on student outcomes, and may demotivate teachers if not factored into measurement considerations.

While there is little evidence to support the direct effects of performance pay on individual teachers' performance it may have other indirect positive effects as it may cause schools' to adopt a culture of meaningful performance development, and act as a catalyst for schools and teachers to approach performance and development systems with greater rigour (Kamenar 2012, p.7). There is evidence of this from the Victorian Rewarding Teaching Excellence trials, and in Singapore's highly evolved professional development and appraisal system.

Teachers are more likely to be motivated by rewards related to the moral purpose of teaching (Watts & Richardson 2010, p. 141) and the potential to make a difference rather than fiscal incentives (OECD 2005, p.68). Teachers will explicitly translate this motivation into action when this moral purpose is encouraged and rewarded (Fullan 2006, p.88). Acting for a moral purpose comprises teachers "constantly improving student achievement and ensuring that achievement gaps, wherever they exist, are narrowed. In short, it's about raising the bar and narrowing the gap" (Barber & Fullan 2005, p.3). Appropriate incentives for teacher performance must take these intrinsic motivations into account.

A potential alternative is incentive pay for groups or teams of teachers, which has shown some positive effects in a two-year, randomised school wide study in New York public schools (Goodman & Turner 2010, p.2). Incentivisation through group rewards may reinforce greater professional collaboration, as highlighted in Section 2. However, the design of such a structure must be tightly linked to teachers' individual efforts to counter a potential 'free-rider' problem (Goodman & Turner 2010, p.12). The size of the school must be taken into consideration, as "in schools with a small number of teachers, the NYC School-Wide Performance Bonus Program boosted student learning in math, but it may have had a negative effect in schools with a large number of teachers" (Goodman & Turner 2010, p.22).

### ***Prioritised exiting of the lowest 5 percent of teachers***

While CNPE supports the implementation of a comprehensive teacher evaluation and development process we are concerned by the suggestion of "exiting the lowest performing 5 percent of teachers" (DEECD 2012a, p.5) as an isolated or prioritised action.



It is unfair to exit teachers without an effective teacher evaluation and development process (Jensen 2010, p.13). A 2003 BCG Study for the Victorian Department of Education and Training, where 99.85 percent of teachers were assessed as 'satisfactory' (BCG 2003, p.15), while principals considered 30 percent of teachers to be underperforming points to a significant implementation challenge (BCG 2003, p.25). Before Victoria can focus on exiting people from the profession it needs a workforce that is differentiated (Weisberg et al. 2009, p.7). CNPE strongly supports the Department's focus on building the capacity of principals to effectively support, develop and evaluate teachers (DEECD 2012a, pp.22-23).

Additionally, any assessment of what constitutes the "lowest performing 5 percent of teachers" must be explicitly embedded within a consideration of the contexts of different schools and different students (Johnson 2012, p.112). Without such consideration, high performing teachers that serve in particularly challenging contexts (e.g. disadvantaged or under-resourced schools, poorly administered schools, if they are required to teach outside their fields, etc) may be inadvertently and unfairly evaluated as underperforming.

This is particularly concerning as challenging schools already face high attrition rates (Productivity Commission 2012, p.22) as teachers leave in the search for more supportive environments (Johnson 2012, p.111). Particular areas of concern are those teaching students with disabilities, and those more generally working in regional and remote areas. Without a broader focus on improving the collective efficacy and school environment, a continual revolving door of teachers will only prove a temporary, high-cost and inefficient model.

## **Conclusion**

There are no silver bullets in education reform, but teacher quality is a significant lever for improving student outcomes in Victoria. CNPE strongly supports DEECD's strategy of aligning the system around professional collaboration that is focused on building collective capacity and collective responsibility for student learning. These key objectives should be reinforced by teacher development and performance management systems. However, in order to "move the curve to the right" and improve learning outcomes for all young Victorians, special attention needs to be paid to equity and 21<sup>st</sup> century learning outcomes in the data, accountability and incentive structures. Finally, CNPE believes that students are the primary stakeholders in education and have their part to play in improving teacher practice through the mechanism of student feedback in teacher evaluations.



## **Acknowledgements**

This submission was developed by Ricky Campbell-Allen, Li-xia Tan, Ghazi Ahamat and supported by Calum Lindsay-Field from the Centre for New Public Education, an initiative of FYA. It also draws on work conducted for FYA by Dr Lucas Walsh, Director of FYA's Research and Evaluation program.

For further information about this submission or FYA's research and initiatives, please contact:

Jan Owen

Chief Executive Officer

The Foundation for Young Australians

21-27 Somerset Place Melbourne Victoria 3000

**[jan.owen@fya.org.au](mailto:jan.owen@fya.org.au)**



## References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2012, *Primary and secondary education*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, viewed 24 August 2012, <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/1301.0~2012~Main%20Features~Primary%20and%20secondary%20education~105>>
- Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Business Council of Australia (ACCI and BCA) 2002, *Employability Skills for the Future. Report for the Department of Education, Science and Training*, cited in Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training 2006, *Employability Skills: From Framework to Practice*, viewed 24 August 2012, [http://www.training.com.au/documents/employability%20skills\\_from%20framework%20to%20practices.pdf](http://www.training.com.au/documents/employability%20skills_from%20framework%20to%20practices.pdf)
- Barber, M & Fullan, M 2005, *TriLevel Development: It's the system*, viewed 27 August 2012, <[http://michaelfullan.ca/Articles\\_05/Tri-Level%20Dev't.pdf](http://michaelfullan.ca/Articles_05/Tri-Level%20Dev't.pdf)>
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012a, *Gathering feedback for teaching: policy and practice brief*, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, viewed 15 August 2012, <[http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET\\_Gathering\\_Feedback\\_Practioner\\_Brief.pdf](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Gathering_Feedback_Practioner_Brief.pdf)>
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012b, *Gathering feedback for teaching: research paper*, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, viewed 15 August 2012, <[http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET\\_Gathering\\_Feedback\\_Research\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Gathering_Feedback_Research_Paper.pdf)>
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2012c, *Gathering feedback for teaching: policy and practice summary*, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, viewed 15 August 2012, <[http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET\\_Gathering\\_Feedback\\_for\\_Teaching\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Gathering_Feedback_for_Teaching_Summary.pdf)>
- Binkley, M, Erstad, O, Herman, J, Riazen, S, Ripley, M & Rumble, M 2010, *Defining 21st century skills*, ATC 21S, Melbourne, viewed 24 August 2012, <<http://atc21s.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/1-Defining-21st-Century-Skills.pdf>>
- Black, R 2011, 'Citizenship and participation in schools', in R Black & L Walsh (eds.), *In their own hands: can young people change Australia?* ACER Press, Melbourne, pp.70-89.
- Clapp et al. (eds) 2012, 'By what measure? Mapping and expanding the teacher effectiveness debate', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.82, no.1, pp. 78-82
- Cole, P 2011, *Professional learning that works: a guide for teachers and schools leaders*, PTR Consulting.
- Darling-Hammond, L & McLaughlin, M 1995, 'Policies that support professional development in an era of reform', *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 76 (8), pp. 597-604.
- Department of Education and Early Childhood Development 2009, *Effective schools are engaging schools: student engagement policy guidelines. Promoting student engagement, attendance and positive behaviours in Victorian government schools*, Melbourne, viewed 24 August 2012, <<http://www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/stuman/wellbeing/segpolicy.pdf>>



Department of Education and Early Childhood Development 2012a, *New directions for school leadership and teaching profession*, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Melbourne, viewed 14 August 2012, <<http://www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/commrel/about/teachingprofession.pdf>>

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development 2012b, *DEECD 2012-16 strategic plan: consultation draft*, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Melbourne, viewed 14 August 2012, <<https://custom.cvent.com/D743096EAA0244A58726D4CE13172E82/files/6947ebf712c24ea7936bd6c9305f3235.pdf>>

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development 2012c, *Summary statistics for Victorian schools*, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Melbourne, viewed 23 August 2012, <<http://www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/publ/research/publ/statsvicschbrochure.pdf>>

Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations 2012, *Secondary school teachers*, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Canberra, viewed 24 August 2012, <<http://joboutlook.gov.au/pages/occupation.aspx?search=alpha&tab=stats&cluster=&code=2414>>

District of Columbia Public Schools 2011, *The District of Columbia Public Schools: guide to value-added*, District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C., viewed 21 August 2012, <[http://www.dc.gov/DCPS/Files/downloads/In-the-Classroom/Value-Added%20Guidebook%20\(singles\).pdf](http://www.dc.gov/DCPS/Files/downloads/In-the-Classroom/Value-Added%20Guidebook%20(singles).pdf)>

Elmore, R & Burney, D 1997, *Investing in teacher learning : staff development and instructional improvement in community school district #2*, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, New York City.

Fullan, M 2011, *Learning is the work*, viewed 17 August 2012, <[http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles\\_11/11\\_july\\_fullan\\_learning\\_is\\_the\\_work.pdf](http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles_11/11_july_fullan_learning_is_the_work.pdf)>

Goodman, S & Turner, L 2010, *Teacher incentive pay and educational outcomes: evidence from the New York City bonus program*, viewed 27 August 2012, <[http://www.columbia.edu/~ljt2110/Goodman\\_Turner\\_Nov10.pdf](http://www.columbia.edu/~ljt2110/Goodman_Turner_Nov10.pdf)>

Hanushek, EA 2011, 'Paying teachers appropriately', in D Drury & J Baer (eds), *The American public school teacher*, Harvard Education Press, Cambridge, pp.109-120.

Hay Group 2012, *Growing our potential: Hay Group's view on implementing an effective performance improvement and development framework for teachers*, Hay Group, viewed 27 August 2012, <[http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Growing\\_our\\_potential\\_-\\_Hay\\_-\\_Mar\\_2012.pdf](http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Growing_our_potential_-_Hay_-_Mar_2012.pdf)>

Jackson, C & Bruegmann, E 2009, 'Teaching student and teaching each other: the importance of peer learning for teachers', *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 85-108.

Jensen, B 2010, *Investing in our Teachers, Investing in our Economy*, Grattan Institute, Melbourne, viewed 16 August 2012, <[http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/b8e7dc66/057\\_report\\_education\\_investing\\_teachers.pdf](http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/b8e7dc66/057_report_education_investing_teachers.pdf)>



Jensen, B 2011, *Better teaching appraisal and feedback: improving performance*, Grattan Institute, Melbourne, viewed 16 August 2012,

<[http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/a9daf733/081\\_report\\_teacher\\_appraisal.pdf](http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/a9daf733/081_report_teacher_appraisal.pdf)>

Jensen, B 2012, *Catching Up: Learning from the Best School Systems in East Asia*, Grattan Institute, Melbourne, viewed 16 August 2012,

<[http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/23afab6b/129\\_report\\_learning\\_from\\_the\\_best\\_main.pdf](http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/23afab6b/129_report_learning_from_the_best_main.pdf)>

Jensen, B & Reichl, J 2012, *Implementing a performance and development framework*, Grattan Institute, Melbourne, viewed 22 August 2012,

<[http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Implementing\\_a\\_performance\\_and\\_development\\_framework\\_-\\_Grattan\\_-\\_Feb\\_2012.pdf](http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Implementing_a_performance_and_development_framework_-_Grattan_-_Feb_2012.pdf)>

Johnson, SM 2012, 'Having it both ways: building the capacity of individual teachers and their schools', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.82, no.1, pp. 107-122.

Kamener, L 2012, *Delivering real change in the approach to performance and development in schools*, The Boston Consulting Group.

Kane, T & Staiger, D 2010, *Learning about teaching: initial findings from the measures of effective teaching project*, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, viewed 17 August 2012, <<http://www.gatesfoundation.org/college-ready-education/Documents/preliminary-findings-research-paper.pdf>>

Keating, J 2009, *A new federalism in Australian education*, Education Foundation, Melbourne, viewed 20 August 2012, <[http://www.fya.org.au/wpcontent/uploads/2009/05/fya\\_newfederalism\\_fullreport2.pdf](http://www.fya.org.au/wpcontent/uploads/2009/05/fya_newfederalism_fullreport2.pdf)>

Maher, D & Lloyd, M 2011, *Professional learning: an introduction to the research literature*, Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, view 24 August 2012,

<[http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Professional\\_Learning\\_An\\_introduction\\_to\\_research\\_literature.pdf](http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Professional_Learning_An_introduction_to_research_literature.pdf)>

Marshall, G, Cole, P & Zbar, V 2012, *Teacher performance and development in Australia: a mapping and analysis of current practise*, AITSL, viewed 16 August 2012,

<[http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Teacher\\_Perf\\_Dev\\_Aus\\_AITSL.pdf](http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/resources/Teacher_Perf_Dev_Aus_AITSL.pdf)>

Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education 2012, *School Leader's Guide to the 2012 Accountability Determinations*, Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, Malden.

McCaffrey, Koretz, Lockwood & Hamilton 2004, *Evaluating value-added models for teacher accountability*, RAND, Santa Monica.

Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs 2008, *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*, Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs, Melbourne, viewed 24 August 2012,

[http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/verve/resources/national\\_declaration\\_on\\_the\\_educational\\_goals\\_for\\_young\\_australians.pdf](http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/verve/resources/national_declaration_on_the_educational_goals_for_young_australians.pdf)

Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs 2004, *Demand and supply of primary and secondary school teachers in Australia*, Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood



Development and Youth Affairs, Melbourne, viewed 24 August 2012, <[http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/verve/resources/-das\\_teachers-partsa-d.pdf](http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/verve/resources/-das_teachers-partsa-d.pdf)>

Mourshed, M, Chijioke, C & Barber, M 2010, *How the world's most important improved school systems keep getting better*, McKinsey & Company, viewed 27 August 2012, <[http://mckinseysociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/How-the-Worlds-Most-Improved-School-Systems-Keep-Getting-Better\\_Download-version\\_Final.pdf](http://mckinseysociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/How-the-Worlds-Most-Improved-School-Systems-Keep-Getting-Better_Download-version_Final.pdf)>

Papay, J 2012, 'Refocussing the debate: assessing the purposes and tolls of teacher evaluation', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 82 (1), pp. 125-126.

Pearson 2011, 'Pearson to develop frameworks for OECD's PISA student assessment for 2015', Pearson, 7 October, viewed 27 August 2012, <<http://www.pearson.com/news/2011/october/pearson-to-develop-frameworks-for-oecd-pisa-student-assessment-f.html?article=true>>

Pederson, P 2007 'What is Measured is Treasured: The Impact of the No Child Left Behind Act on Non-Assessed Subjects' *Clearinghouse* 80(6)

Productivity Commission 2012, *Schools Workforce Report*, The Australian Government Productivity Commission, viewed 27 August 2012, [http://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0020/116651/schools-workforce.pdf](http://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/116651/schools-workforce.pdf)

Richardson, P & Watson, H 2010, 'Current and future trends in teacher motivation research', in *The decade ahead: applications and contexts of motivation and achievement*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp.139-173.

Rivkin, Hanushek & Kain 2005, 'Teachers, schools and academic achievement', *Econometrica*, vol. 73, no., pp.417-458.

Rockoff, J 2004, 'The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: evidence from panel data', *The American Economic Review*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp.247-252.

The Boston Consulting Group 2003, *School workforce development strategy*, The Boston Consulting Group.

The Boston Consulting Group 2012, *Effective implementation of performance and development in schools*, The Boston Consulting Group.

The New Teacher Project 2012, *The Irreplaceables*, The New Teacher Project, viewed 16 August 2012, <[http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP\\_Irreplaceables\\_2012.pdf](http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_Irreplaceables_2012.pdf)>

Weisberg, D, Sexton, S, Mulhern, J & Keeling, D 2009, *The widget effect: our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*, The New Teacher Project, viewed 16 August 2012, <<http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect.pdf>>

