Principals' use of the Teaching, School, and Principal Leadership Practices survey tool

Cathy Wylie and Cathie Johnston

2021

NZCER
Rangahau Mātauranga o Aotearoa

Contents

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

The Teaching, School, and Principal Leadership Practices survey tool

The Teaching, School, and Principal Leadership Practices survey tool (TSP) aims to give busy principals good quality data about teacher, school, and leadership practices in their schools. The online tool is available during Terms 2 and 3 each year, so it can be used when it suits an individual school.

TSP is funded by the Ministry of Education to provide schools with a reliable, free, and confidential tool to support their ongoing development, and at the same time provide aggregate national information about practice that can inform policy. The tool, advice on its use, information about its development, and the aggregate reports are available at www.tspsurveys.org.nz.

The TSP tool has four sections:

The *Teaching Practices/He Mahinga Kaiako* section is completed by teachers and teaching principals.

It covers:
- Optimising students' opportunities to learn (8 items)
- Diversity, equity, and inclusion (6 items)
- Learning-focused partnerships with parents/whānau and community (4 items)
- Teaching as inquiry (4 items)
- Being professional (7 items).

The *School Practices / He Mahinga Kura* and *Principal Leadership / He Aratakinga Tumuaki* sections are both completed by teachers and principals.

The *School Practices/He Mahinga Kura* section focuses on practices that provide the conditions for effective teaching.

It covers:
- Supportive and caring environment (9 items)
- Coherent curriculum and evaluation (9 items)
- School goals (9 items)
- Learning-focused partnerships (5 items)
- Teaching as inquiry (4 items)
- Strategic resource allocation (5 items)
- Professional feedback and support (4 items).

The *Principal Leadership / He Aratakinga Tumuaki* section focuses on principal practices, with two domains:
- Directions and fresh horizons
- Interpersonal relations and working with others.

Questions are also asked about workload, morale, years of experience as teacher or principal, and gains from Community of Learning | Kāhui Ako participation.

The items that teachers and principals rate are all drawn from the strong body of evidence now available about effective teaching, school, and leadership practices. They align with key national guidelines: *The New Zealand Curriculum*'s dimensions of effective pedagogy; the Education Review Office's (ERO's) school evaluation indicators; the Standards for the Teaching Profession; and the Educational Leadership Capability Framework. The development of the tool was supported by an active advisory group which brought together knowledge, experience, and enthusiasm from the peak education bodies, government education agencies, researchers, and professional development providers.

Principals can download their school report whenever schools have completed the TSP. The report gives them one set of results using teacher data, and another that locates the principal response in relation to the teacher responses for the common items. A demonstration example of this reporting is given in the Appendix A.

To underline the aim of using these data for ongoing improvement, the school report is owned by the principal, who can decide how best to use it in their school context.

A brief survey at the end of TSP's first year in 2017 had responses from 75 of the 403 schools that had used it. Almost all of these principals said TSP supported teaching and learning in their school. Most said the reports they got were useful. Many had already used the information in school review and planning, and they could see its use for their own principal appraisal. Around half discussed their school's report with their leadership team, and they had shared it with their staff.

Investigating TSP as a tool in schools' ongoing development

In late 2020, when this study was done, TSP had been available for 3 years—2017, 2018, and 2019[1]—but without the publicity of its first year, it was used by fewer schools in subsequent years. In total, 600 schools used TSP over these 3 years.

The TSP team at NZCER and our advisory group were not sure how often schools would use TSP: whether it would become part of an annual cycle of data collection and use, or whether it would be used periodically, as a health check. When we collated the 2019 aggregate national picture we found that 105 schools had used TSP for 2 years in a row, 44 schools had used it in alternate years, and 54 schools had used it each year, with 50 having teachers taking part each year. These 50 schools included a good range of school types (14 full primary, 20 contributing primary, three intermediate, two composite, nine secondary, and two specialist schools) and school deciles.

We saw the opportunity to investigate how these schools have used their data, the role it plays in relation to other data (such as student engagement and performance), and what supports or hinders schools to make good use of data related to their practice.

Research questions

1. How has TSP data been used by schools doing TSP over 3 years, and why?
2. What other data has it been used with?
3. What supports or hinders use of TSP data for improvement?
4. Are different patterns of use associated with different patterns of change in TSP ratings over the period?

---

1   Ministry of Education funding for TSP was not available in 2020.

This report focuses mainly on the uses that school principals described. It starts, however, with a summary of quantitative analysis of changes in TSP scores over time for these schools. We undertook this to see if there were overall changes in TSP scores over the 3-year period for these schools, and also to select a range of schools to approach for interviews with the principal.

The first step in this analysis was a global picture of the patterns over time for the 50 schools, using median scale scores for teacher ratings on each of the three TSP aspects taken as a whole. Comparing 2017 and 2019, we found correlations of 0.49 in relation to school practices, and 0.59 in relation to principal leadership, indicating that shifts have occurred over this time.

Appendix C shows these shifts in median teacher ratings for individual schools. The median scale scores are on a scale of 0–3. We used teachers' median scale scores on the school practices scale to sort the schools into five categories:
  • schools that had stable patterns 2017–2019
    - nine had comparatively high median scale scores
    - 23 had medium median scale scores
    - four schools had low median scale scores
  • seven schools where the median scale scores increased from a low or medium median score in 2017
  • seven schools where the high or medium median scale scores decreased from 2017.

Then we randomly chose schools in each of these categories to provide a range of schools to approach to participate in our research:
  • two schools with comparatively high median scale scores
  • two schools where high or medium median scale scores had decreased
  • four schools with medium median scale scores
  • two schools whose low or medium median scale score in 2017 had increased in 2019
  • two schools whose median scale score remained low.

Ten of the 12 principals we contacted in late 2020 spoke to us about their use of TSP. One of the schools we approached had changed principals, and the new principal was interested in TSP but had yet to use it. We replaced this school with another. Two of the 12 principals we approached became unavailable. Most of the interviews were by Zoom, or phone, with one face to face. The questions we sent to principals ahead of talking with them are in Appendix B. We spoke with the principals of four full primary schools, two contributing primary schools, and four secondary schools; their size ranged from 37 students to more than 1,300 students.

We analysed our notes and transcripts of the interviews to identify themes and gain insights into what principals valued, and why. This is reported in the following section.

Our conclusion picks up the growing emphasis on data use for improvement, and insights from several US studies of principals' use of school survey data about factors that can help or hinder such use.

2. Why use TSP?

Among the reasons why principals used TSP each year were that:
- they find the items relevant and rich
- it's a "one stop shop" for data that can be used for a number of purposes
- they trust NZCER as a provider of robust and valid research-based tools
- TSP is efficient of staff time
- TSP is safe for teachers; they can be sure their views are anonymous—and that gives principals confidence that teachers are giving honest views
- results are quick.

Comments by principals included the following:

I really value the domains in TSP—each one is important to me in what needs to be valued in a school. They really resonated. It's amazing to have such good items for teachers to respond to. As a leader, these are the things we should be basing our decisions on.

Unless we have data to support something with our teachers, it won't fly. Everything we do is based around data.

Good, probing items that really make you think and reflect on leadership. It provides coherency of what to aim for.

3. How do principals use TSP?

Principals used TSP reports to inform their own development and appraisal, to identify priorities for change, check trends over time, and check whether change was happening at a sustainable pace. They used TSP reports on their own, and also alongside other school data, particularly data about student achievement, wellbeing, and engagement.

Principals use TSP for their own development and for appraisal

Most of the principals used the TSP reports for their own development and appraisals. The reports provided useful evidence, as well as material for discussion and challenge.

> It makes you think about things you maybe otherwise wouldn't have thought of as part of your job. It lines up very nicely with professional standards and your own job description.

> My appraiser has used it [TSP report] really effectively, to have those challenging conversations.

Principals new to their school or first-time principals spoke of using TSP first to provide a baseline, and then to track their progress.

> I began wanting data about myself, as a first-time principal—what do staff think of me? I also had a sense that the items in the survey were important, so getting a key focus from the data seemed a good idea. I really value the principal data, I look through everything in detail, I focus on what the teachers rate as a deficit, and I work on that next year, I discuss it with the BoT chair.

Principals were interested in how staff saw them, though it could be hard.

> Some things hit you sensitively and personally.

> Don't obsess about what staff say about you—don't think, 'Who are the people who weren't positive about my leadership?' They're entitled to their view. This data helps you understand and reflect. And that's also why it's valuable to work with your senior leadership team to unpack the stuff.

Only one principal did not rate their own leadership practices.

The set of reports comparing principal and teachers' responses was particularly valuable for principals' self-reflection, with some talking of "discrepancy" analysis where their own rating and teachers' ratings were markedly different, and provoking thought about why they differed.

In a very small school, the principal found it useful to reflect themselves on what evidence or thinking had gone into their own rating of their leadership, as well as having team conversations to discuss why these ratings, and constructive feedback, was so valuable.

Identifying priorities for development and change

The principals also spoke about using TSP to make cases for change, and to identify priorities for focus and professional learning, usually working with their school leadership team.

> I took over the school when morale was low, low levels of trust, the school was stagnating. People needed some wake-up calls. The data from TSP helped to define where to push, when to push, and when to pull back. I find discrepancies between my ratings and the teacher ratings give real food for thought. I shared all the data with the principal response with the senior leadership team and the board. I wanted transparency as well as a sense of unity in what needed to be done. With the staff, I shared all the reports without my data, I provided an overview and used it to explain the strategic decisions. The data backed me up.

> We find it useful for our annual planning, and it highlights things we might not otherwise hit on, like we've made an effort in the last couple of years to do something about leadership development a bit more formally—none of the scores were so bad, but that score wasn't as good as the others, so we started a leadership development collaboration where we meet once or twice a term with people who are aspirational, want to know more about leadership.

> We've shared the data with our PLD provider, used it to help plan our PLD.

> Senior leadership team have had to take a few on the chin. It showed that curriculum design was not being supported by PLD—the focus of PLD was in the wrong place.

> We ask the teachers to look at their own report,[2] and just ask themselves two questions about the patterns, two things you could get better at.

> [in a small school] I just put the report on the staffroom table, principal and staff data together. It allowed the conversations to generate themselves. This is how we work, informally, chats just emerged, and individual staff did approach me also with comments we could discuss further.

> [in a small school] We discuss the results at staff meeting, we highlight surprises or concerns, look for things to work on, they become strategic goals, professional development, or inquiries. We focus on an area of need—looking at student achievement, and the collaboration/sharing items that made us focus on good ways to operate. Purposefully using the data. Can't respond to everything—we're trying to work smarter.

Another principal, seeing no change in teachers' reports of having sufficient time for collaborative work when the school had made collaborative inquiry a priority in relation to improving student learning, put aside her scepticism about students starting school late one day a week to give staff a common time to work together. This school found that freeing up time this way was valuable and allowed them to make progress. But another principal who also experienced some frustration in her staff's lack of progress with collective inquiry saw items relating to resourcing time as decided by the teachers' collective contract and the school meeting structure, and not within her control. Thus the use of data to make change was also linked to how principals understood their remit.

Several principals found that teachers' ratings of teaching practice items were higher than they would rate them.

> It showed me that their understanding of the items was different from what I saw of their practice. It allowed opportunities to discuss pedagogy, and their knowledge and beliefs, promoted challenging conversations—saw an eventual shift.

---

2   Teachers can download a PDF of their own responses.

It helped shift the staff culture. I could look at the ratings of teaching practice, and ask teachers to show me their evidence for that rating.

TSP data were commonly shared with the school board of trustees, usually in summary form. They were used as part of reporting on progress, charting what the school would focus on in the next year, to support the board's strategic understanding and thinking, and as evidence in cases for improved resourcing.

They're my employers, so if I want to do something, ask for resources, if I put myself in their shoes, I'd want to know a little bit more detail to make that decision in relation to the bigger picture. The way to do that is to provide data and the thought processes around it.

Checking teacher wellbeing and the pace of change

Principals also used TSP to gauge teacher morale so that shifts in practice were not undercut by asking too much, too fast.

The TSP is a good way to take staff temperature, to review what is happening. Even with a committed staff, you have late adopters, and it's really important to listen and understand where they are—important to have the signals. It helps me work with teachers to cope with challenges in the process, helps to get things right as we go.

It's a really good way to surface issues.

You think 'I know my staff', but you don't know your staff. It's a really useful reality check.

I needed a snapshot. I'm conscious of workload. There's also the drive to improve—wellbeing and teacher workload are an important part of the puzzle.

Making sure teachers are resourced and supported as a result of looking over items in the data.

Relating TSP data to other school data

Other relevant material was put alongside TSP, particularly evidence about student experiences, with mention of the Wellbeing at School survey,[3] Me and My School student survey,[4] student attendance and achievement data; in the context of what the school was working on to improve. What principals who mentioned this were looking at was at a high level, of how consistent the picture was, and whether changes in student views, attendance, and achievement were tracking in line with any changes in teaching and school practices.

When we were looking at developing a wellbeing role, we used some of the TSP data to say this is why we need to be focusing on wellbeing, and we linked it to what students are saying in the Wellbeing at School data.

Sometimes when we look at an item in TSP and what kids say in Wellbeing at School, we see that kids tell us the opposite. You can only work on a few things at a time, but that difference tells you you've got something to work on.

---

3 The Wellbeing at School toolkit of surveys is also free to schools, and funded by the Ministry of Education. NZCER developed the toolkit, hosts the tool, provides schools with their reports, and has analysed patterns at the national level. https://www.wellbeingatschool.org.nz/

4 The Me and My School survey was developed by NZCER to provide schools with insight into their students' engagement in learning at the school. https://www.nzcer.org.nz/tests/me-and-my-school

Digging deeper

TSP data also led to further investigation. Usually this focused on particular TSP items and led principals and school leadership teams to ask further questions, initiate staff discussions, and to try ways of addressing the issues they had identified.

> When we were concerned about the level of trust in the school early on, because we didn't understand why that was the case, we developed a set of questions around that and used our [middle leadership] to ask teachers what they thought was working well and what we could improve on. Again, actively taking the [TSP] result and saying we want this to be better, and how can we go about it.

> One year teachers wanted more time so we rescheduled meetings, carved time out of the schedule, but a year later teachers hadn't changed their opinions, so the leadership team had to think—why do they feel like that?

> We didn't look so flash on students being set challenging learning goals, and I was thinking about the annual plan for next year, and whether we should look more deeply into what success is for individual students, move away from numerical targets like the 85% NCEA Level 2 success. So in the teacher only day this week staff will work in departments, and look at that one item and share what they were thinking about, whether they answered it positively or not, and what do you think it means? A gentle, light touch way of asking people to think about it. Because anything in the TSP, you have to find out more about it if you're making a decision about what you're going to do.

Tracking items over time

Most of the principals tracked items that gave them some evidence about a priority area for the school.

> It's good for evaluating the impact of the initiatives we've put in place, and seeing whether we've done a good job.

One principal noted that ratings on the teaching practice items could go down after professional development: "they were rating quite well, then the more you know, the teacher ratings actually declined". Another observed "the more you know about something, or have deeper understanding, the more likely you are to give a more critical rating of your practice". What principals were often watching for was patterns across the items, in relation to changes or stages in change; for example, in timetable organisation, new pedagogical approaches, and PLD, rather than simply changes in the frequency data on the TSP.

Care needed to be taken in small schools not to read too much into changes in percentages or numbers. One small school principal also thought tracking over time was not useful when there was not continuity in staff over the period.

Principals focused on shifts at "either end" of the item frequencies: for the schooling practices items, these would be the proportion who rated a practice as "not at all" or "a little" like our school at one end, and the proportion who rated a practice as "very like our school".

A couple noted caution about putting too much weight on shifts if the numbers of teachers doing the survey each year was markedly different. Some noted the importance of providing a common time for all teachers to complete the survey. This also gave them more control over when they had the school picture.

Principals largely focus on the school journey

The national aggregate reports and summaries for each year have been put on the TSP website and an email sent out about them to all the principals who registered for use of TSP that year. Few of the principals had looked at these aggregate reports. They were using TSP for their own self-review and planning, not for comparison with a national picture or with other schools.

> Each school is different. No-one else has got my children. It's more the change over time that's the true test.

> I've got no time for that. You need to deal with what's in front of you, to get the data on how that's going.

> The value for me in using TSP is about the school's journey, not comparing with national averages. What would be good for a school that had worked hard to change things over a few years would not be so good for another, it would be a sign of complacency. If you were comparing, it should be like with like in terms of challenges and journey, not just school characteristics.

The interviews with these 10 consistent users of TSP underlined the value they found in data that were specific to their school. They approached these data as something to be used alongside other knowledge and data, as a barometer, as food for thought, as a guide. They were not seen as something that classified the school, as standing on its own.

We were interested to see how our five global categories of median score levels and shifts between 2017 and 2019 were related to what the principals reported about the use they had made of their school's data. We could not see a clear pattern: there were positive shifts, for example, in schools whose median scores stayed low. Perhaps a much larger study over a longer period would show more affinity. But as the principal quoted above observes, the speed of change in an individual school reflects the challenges it faces, as well as its ambitions and capability.

We found when we looked at changes in the individual items for each school that there were positive shifts in some teacher ratings in every school, some slippage in some items, and some that stayed much the same. These patterns also underline the multifaceted nature of schools, and the likelihood that most development over time will not be smooth or uniform across a school.

5. Principals recommend the use of the TSP tool

When we asked these principals for any advice they would give other principals about TSP, they recommended its use, and doing it in staff meetings so that all teachers were included. They also talked about the value of discussing the data it produced with knowledgeable advisers beyond the school as well as the school's leadership team and groups of teachers. And they spoke of the importance of focusing on key aspects that mattered—to where the school was on its journey, an aspect that would make a big difference for students, their students' needs, and staff morale—rather than trying to grasp and respond to each item in the data.

Some would like TSP to be extended to include support staff, and parents and whānau. Some would welcome longitudinal individual school reports that tracked each item over time. Some would like to have a resource that linked items with relevant research and guidance.

6. Discussion

Using survey data about practices for school improvement

We live in a data-rich world, but not a world with much time to examine data. Aotearoa New Zealand principals have increasingly complex roles, with NZCER's national surveys showing that most cannot schedule enough time for educational leadership even with the long hours they work.[5]

Use of data for improvement is identified as one of the nine Educational Leadership capabilities identified in the Leadership Strategy | Rautaki Kaihautū.[6]

Evaluating practices in relation to outcomes

An organisational leader:

Ensures that the organisation produces useful, consistent, and robust information about:
- all learners' achievement across the whole curriculum, patterns of progress over time, their engagement in learning, and their wellbeing
- organisational practices
- staff wellbeing,

enabling analysis over time to see what needs to be strengthened.

Analyses the learner and practice data in relationship with each other, asking what they indicate about progress towards the organisation's vision and goals.

Identifies any "puzzles" and finds out about what is happening in the organisation, and what is known about the causes of the puzzle and effective responses to it by drawing on relevant research and working with trusted advisers beyond the organisation, either by themselves, or in collaboration with relevant staff member/s.

Uses this analysis and enlarging of their knowledge in the discussion they have with positional leaders and organisational stakeholders to identify actions to improve, and the best way to allocate resources across the organisation.

---

5   Bonne, L., & MacDonald, J. (2019). *Secondary schools in 2018. Findings from the NZCER national survey.* NZCER. https://www.nzcer.org.nz/system/files/NZCER_Nat-Survey-Report-Secondary.pdf. See Section 7, Principals' perspectives on their work. Wylie, C., & MacDonald, J. (2020). *What's happening in our English-medium primary schools. Findings from the NZCER national survey 2019.* NZCER. Section 14, Principal careers, wellbeing, and support. https://www.nzcer.org.nz/research/publications/what-s-happening-our-english-medium-primary-schools-findings-nzcer-national-0
6   Leadership_Capability_Framework.pdf (cwp.govt.nz)

TSP was funded by the Ministry of Education to be a "smart tool"[7] for school use, which would also provide insight for national policy—the frameworks and supports that should enable school leaders and teachers to do well with their students.

The principals we interviewed found that TSP provided meaningful data that they used as a check on how things were going, and to identify aspects for closer attention or improvement. This use is in line with the expectations of the *Evaluating practices in relation to outcomes* leadership capability. Those who made most use of TSP data were those who could unpack the TSP data alongside other data, and discuss it with trusted others to check assumptions and develop strategies for the ongoing improvement of practices that would benefit students. Not every principal was confident in drawing different kinds of data together, or had such advisers.

Some found the difference between their own and teachers' ratings of school practices and principal leadership particularly useful, though it could also be hard. Studies of feedback surveys in the US school context have focused on the use of such discrepancies, and point to the value of support for principals as they unpack data.

Some US school systems have required teacher surveys and ratings of principals, sometimes with high stakes. Goldring et al. (2014)[8] interviewed 14 principals in one school district to understand whether the assumption that such feedback was useful was valid. They note that such "multisource" feedback can produce dissonance with a leader's own view of their effect, and cite a study finding that it "can expose the domains of leadership behavior most in need of improvement" (p. 575). However, they also cite research showing that leaders' reactions to multisource feedback in other fields are highly variable, and research from management literature on the role played by leaders' own self-awareness in their own ratings.

The reports the principals received compared their own response with their teachers', and also these responses with other schools in the district. Principals whose teachers rated items lower than their own self-rating tended to be more defensive, more likely to "explain away" teacher ratings, and less likely to use the feedback. Where average teacher ratings at a school were lower than the principal's but higher than the district average on items, one principal used the comparison to "justify maintaining the status quo" (Goldring et al., 2014, p. 589). In this context, it was easier to see ratings as a judgement, rather than information to be used to improve school and leadership practices. Goldring et al. recommended "scaffolding principals' learning around how to productively manage the cognitive dissonance they experience" (p. 592).

Martin-Kniep and Lane (2020, p. 18) note that effective school surveys designed to inform continuous improvement use "an evidence-based framework [that] allows users to quickly visualise areas for growth and strength, as well as to track change over time".

They also noted that "in our work with leaders we have found that it is difficult for principals to actively use teacher survey data without directly referencing, or being able to assess, how their own actions and perceptions mesh with teachers' perceptions" (p. 18). They describe how one principal

---

7   "Smart tools" incorporating sound theory which are well designed for practical use is a concept developed and described in the School Leadership Best Evidence Synthesis, which remains a prime source of understanding of effective leadership practices.
    Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why. Best evidence synthesis iteration* [BES]. Ministry of Education. https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515/60170
8   Goldring, E. B., Mavrogordalo, M., & Taylor Haynes, K. (2014). Multisource principal evaluation data: Principals' orientations and reactions to teacher feedback regarding their leadership effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 5(4)* 572–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X14556152

became more effective and teaching practices improved through a focus on items where teacher and principal ratings diverged, using these to consider what actions the principal could take to change teaching practices, rather than "dwelling on explanations as to *why* there are differences … which can lead to potentially defensive or non-productive responses" (p. 27).[9]

Most of the principals we spoke with were discussing the school's TSP data within the school, and some with their appraiser. Some would like to use knowledgeable advice beyond the school to make the most of the data. The US studies underline the importance of "sense-making" with others who are also invested in a school's wellbeing and its students' success.

NZCER was entrusted with the development of TSP as a credible, trustworthy, and timely source of data for school leaders and teachers that would support self-evaluation.[10] This small study reassures us that TSP is fit for its purpose for school leaders.

---

9 Martin-Kniep, G. O., & Lane, B. (2020). Using parallel surveys and reflective conversations to tap perspectives and promote improvement. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 17*(1), 16–30.

10 It would be good to know what use teachers make of the teaching practices items for their own reflection, discussion with others, and as a spur to change. Teachers can download a PDF of their responses, and could use these to track change over time.

Appendices

APPENDIX A Two examples of reporting with both principal and teachers' ratings (trial school)

Professional community

In our school:

Teachers and leaders trust one another	12% 10%	48%	31%	NR = 6
Concerns teachers raise are listened to and steps taken to address them	10% 17%	44%	29%	NR = 6
Staff take the initiative to identify and solve problems	13%	48%	38%	NR = 6
We regularly share our students' progress within teaching teams and discuss strategies to improve the progress of students who are of concern	16%	41%	35%	NR = 7
Staff share knowledge about individual students that helps us understand their needs and reactions	18%	37%	45%	NR = 7
Observations of each other's teaching are a valuable source of learning and reflective discussion	13%	42%	38%	NR = 6
Things that don't work well are seen as opportunities for learning	10%	41%	41%	NR = 7
We discuss trends in society and the economy and what they might mean for our teaching now and in the future	29%	37%	29%	NR = 7

Principal Leadership

How well does the principal of this school:

Model the school values	13% 77%	NR = 6
Share a clear and compelling direction for the school	12% 27% 58%	NR = 6
Show commitment to continual improvement	13% 81%	NR = 6
Create the conditions for staff to be motivated to do their best for improved student learning	8% 16% 22% 54%	NR = 8
Provide a fresh perspective, asking questions that get staff thinking	10% 40% 46%	NR = 6
Encourage staff to search for, discuss, assess and try out new ideas	25% 65%	NR = 7
Keep staff up to date with education initiatives that have an impact on teaching	23% 67%	NR = 6
Lead and support appropriate cultural engagement	29% 60%	NR = 6
Promote the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi	10% 27% 59%	NR = 7
Consult staff appropriately before making most important decisions	10% 39% 18% 33%	NR = 7

APPENDIX B Use of TSP data interview questions

1. Why did you use TSP for 3 years in a row?

2. How do you look at the TSP data and who is involved in this use? (e.g., yourself, leadership team, teachers, external adviser, board chair?)
    –   Do you look at all the data—all the scales and items—each year, or focus on just a few?
    –   What's the most useful part of the data for you, and why?
    –   What's the least useful part of the data for you, and why?

3. What purposes do you use the TSP data for? (e.g., school planning and review, reporting, your own development, development of other staff?)

4. Have you tracked particular items or scales over time? Has that been useful?

5. What's the role of TSP in relation to other school data?

6. Do you compare your school's TSP data with the aggregate TSP picture?

7. Has the way you use the data changed over time?
    If so, what are the reasons?

8. What is your take on the patterns over time for your school?

9. Looking back, what were the main goals, things you worked on changing, and challenges for the school 2017–2019?

10. What advice would you give other principals about TSP and its use?

11. What support or advice, if any, would you like to make the best use of TSP for your school?

APPENDIX C Shifts in median scale scores 2017–2019

The table below shows the median teacher scores on each of the three TSP scales 2017–2019 for the schools that did TSP each year, grouped by their median scores on the school practices scale.

HH = high median score both years

HorM D = high or medium median score in 2017, decreased in 2019

MM = medium median score both years

LorM U = Low or medium median score in 2017, increased in 2019

LL = Low median score both years

The table shading compares median scores, running from dark blue for the highest median score, through lighter blues, white, shades of pink, to red for the lowest median score among these schools.

TP.All.2017	TP.All.2018	TP.All.2019	SP.All.2017.x	SP.All.2019.x	PL.All.2017.x	PL.All.2019.x	SP.x
2.15	2.26	2.33	2.58	2.55	2.68	2.70	1 HH
2.39	2.48	2.18	2.79	2.53	2.94	2.74	1 HH
2.14	2.03	2.34	2.47	2.75	2.50	2.71	1 HH
2.16	1.94	1.89	2.65	2.75	2.77	2.60	1 HH
2.22	2.04	1.99	2.58	2.61	2.82	2.82	1 HH
1.92	2.28	2.24	2.59	2.66	2.84	2.57	1 HH
2.41	2.22	2.30	2.87	2.60	2.80	2.84	1 HH
2.47	2.30	2.03	2.89	2.76	2.98	2.96	1 HH
2.07	2.03	2.02	2.53	2.54	2.42	2.70	1 HH
2.09	2.12	1.98	2.08	1.88	2.31	1.94	2 HorM D
1.99	2.03	2.01	2.32	1.80	2.38	1.81	2 HorM D
2.20	2.30	2.13	2.56	2.34	2.86	2.65	2 HorM D
2.03	2.14	2.11	2.50	2.30	2.57	2.71	2 HorM D
1.86	1.80	1.93	2.56	2.01	2.34	2.21	2 HorM D
2.12	2.14	2.21	2.50	2.45	2.53	2.60	2 HorM D
1.97	2.38	1.79	2.58	2.11	2.35	2.13	2 HorM D
1.95	2.01	2.12	2.15	2.46	2.29	2.73	3 MM
1.43	1.52	1.58	2.27	1.97	2.36	1.91	3 MM
1.89	1.94	2.07	2.24	2.10	2.43	2.58	3 MM
2.17	2.09	2.11	2.22	2.06	2.35	2.44	3 MM
1.96	1.96	2.06	2.12	2.21	2.38	2.34	3 MM

TP.All.2017	TP.All.2018	TP.All.2019	SP.All.2017.x	SP.All.2019.x	PL.All.2017.x	PL.All.2019.x	SP.x
1.87	2.02	2.07	2.22	2.06	2.18	1.76	3 MM
2.31	2.23	2.21	2.28	2.27	2.06	2.07	3 MM
1.94	1.49	2.20	2.22	2.38	2.54	2.70	3 MM
2.19	1.96	2.09	2.14	2.33	2.08	2.55	3 MM
1.82	1.82	1.95	2.01	2.12	1.99	2.17	3 MM
2.04	1.89	2.32	1.97	2.36	2.48	2.69	3 MM
2.10	1.97	2.09	2.21	2.26	2.28	2.36	3 MM
1.88	1.87	1.98	1.97	2.10	1.86	2.03	3 MM
1.64	1.87	2.03	2.22	2.47	2.58	2.78	3 MM
1.93	2.01	1.97	1.99	2.45	2.17	2.48	3 MM
2.16	2.21	2.25	2.44	2.47	2.72	2.77	3 MM
1.89	2.02	2.02	2.32	2.35	2.74	2.56	3 MM
1.72	1.70	2.07	2.01	1.97	2.26	2.34	3 MM
1.31	1.51	1.55	2.44	2.31	2.61	2.51	3 MM
2.16	2.08	2.06	1.99	2.42	1.82	2.84	3 MM
1.98	1.98	2.02	2.38	2.16	2.45	1.85	3 MM
2.10	1.86	2.09	2.04	2.10	1.82	1.66	3 MM
1.79	1.70	1.70	2.16	2.15	2.70	2.46	3 MM
1.97	1.94	2.45	1.78	2.87	1.85	2.63	4 LorM U
1.77	1.77	1.89	2.36	2.72	2.13	2.97	4 LorM U
2.18	2.40	2.29	1.93	2.16	1.99	2.14	4 LorM U
2.23	2.01	2.40	2.36	2.61	2.13	2.31	4 LorM U
2.19	2.33	2.16	1.82	2.09	2.11	2.36	4 LorM U
2.73	2.07	2.04	2.14	2.90	1.68	3.00	4 LorM U
1.72	1.84	1.80	2.01	2.67	2.87	2.95	4 LorM U
1.80	1.78	1.74	1.61	1.70	1.89	1.85	5 LL
1.92	1.96	1.89	1.61	1.79	2.12	2.10	5 LL
2.15	2.19	2.08	1.74	1.92	1.52	1.77	5 LL
1.83	2.03	1.81	1.89	1.31	1.26	0.78	5 LL

NZCER
Rangahau Mātauranga o Aotearoa