Review and synthesis of evidence on the (mechanisms of) impact of school inspections[1]

R. Nelson and M. Ehren
February 2014

Introduction

The purpose of this review was to identify and summarize findings from international empirical research on the impact of inspections. Details of the process followed for review and an annotated bibliography of cited research is included as Appendix 1.

Applying the conceptual model provided by Ehren et al. (2013), the extent to which inspections are effective may be sought in four categories. Three of these four categories are also those used by Klerks (2013) in an earlier review of empirical evidence on the impact of inspections:

- School improvement
- Improvement/introduction of school self-evaluation
- Behavioural change of teachers (and school leaders) to improve effective school and teaching conditions
- Student achievement results

There is a high degree of overlap in relation to these categories in the way in which research studies report results.

Evidence from the reviewed research suggests that inspection *may* have an impact on any or all of the above, but that this is not necessarily the case. Where accountability systems that include inspection have been in place for a lengthy period, annual reports and evaluations from, or on behalf of, inspectorates show that schools are improving overall. Interventions in place in these systems ensure that those schools which perform very poorly will either improve, with the extensive support provided, or be closed down. However, although they do not sink into the category where they are judged to be failing to provide an adequate quality of education, some schools in these jurisdictions remain 'stuck' or 'coasting', with evidence that such schools tend to serve areas of disadvantage. Research on the factors which link inspection to impact is complicated both by the position of inspection within an accountability framework which may include national testing and school self- evaluation and by numerous other variables. As well as positive effects, research shows that inspection, as part of a high stakes external accountability system, may have unintended negative consequences.

This review of research presents evidence from international studies which examine inspection on school improvement, school self evaluation, behavioural change and student achievement. It includes evidence reviewed in earlier summaries of published research (OECD, 2013; Klerks, 2013; Whitby, 2010; de Wolf and Janssens, 2007) although, of these, only Klerks provides a full methodology for systematic review. However, all of these reviews demonstrate a high degree of consistency in their conclusions. All earlier reviewers noted that little empirical research has been conducted on the impact of inspection, particularly outside the UK, and this was also the case for this review, with little additional material identified in English. The largest number of studies on the impact of inspection and related factors is from England. Factors identified in the literature, which lead to inspection having more or less impact, are then listed and relevant empirical literature for some of these factors presented.

---

[1] This review was commissioned by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education to inform their strategy development 'Toezicht 2020'

Methodology
Literature for inclusion in the review was found through the following steps:
- Identify the relevant key resources in English in research and practitioner-oriented publications.
- Critically appraise identified publications for their content with regard to relevance and the use of empirical evidence
- Weight publications reporting empirical studies for internal validity using the Maryland Scientific Methods Scale (MSMS).

Publications for review were drawn from educational research, official government and international body publications, and a variety of other sources of evidence, including internet resources. Sources were identified through:

- general databases (e.g. Digital Resource Archive (DERA), British Education Index (BEI); Australian Education Index (AEI); ERIC; Web of Science)
- internet search engines and gateways (e.g. Google Scholar)
- manual keyword searching of journals
- scanning lists of references
- contacts with those in the professional networks of the research team and those suggested by key informants.

The detail with which each source was considered varied according to the degree of relevance to the focus of this research and the extent to which the evidence presented and its implications have been discussed in earlier reviews (de Wolf and Janssen, 2007; Whitby, 2010; Klerk (submitted) and summarising literature (for example, OECD, 2013, Ehren et al. 2013).

The search for high value publications continued iteratively until no new, relevant, high quality sources were identified in English. Lists of references and searches on Google Scholar for other European nations indicated that other relevant empirical research may be available in other languages (e.g. German) and, where possible, articles on the research in English were identified.

Keywords used in search strategy:
- school inspection and (impact or effect or improvement)
- school inspection and quality
- school inspection and performance
- school inspection and evaluation
- school inspection and (poor performance or failing or underperformance)
- school (self evaluation or self- evaluation or internal evaluation)
- school accountability
- school external review and (impact or effect or improvement)
- school (self- review or internal review)
- (coasting or stagnating or stuck) schools
- underperforming schools and (inspection or review)
- failing schools and (inspection or review)
- Schools (requiring or needing) improvement and (inspection or review)
- Schools not making progress and (inspection or review)
- Parental choice and school
- School league tables or school rankings
- Feedback and school
- Institutionalize/institutionalization

- Performativity
- Professionalism
- Governance
- School boards
- Accountability + school

Authors' names were used to search for relevant papers in English, where reference lists indicated relevant texts in another language.

The annotated bibliography in this document includes the empirical research referred to in the summary literature review. It only notes aspects of the studies that relate directly to the focus of the review.

Appendix 1 provides brief details of the studies included in this review.

Impact of school inspections on school improvement
The OECD (2013) report *Synergies for Better Learning* includes a chapter that draws together previous research findings on external evaluation (inspection). As with the other literature reviews considered (de Wolf and Janssens, 2007; Whitby, 2010; Klerks, 2013) much of the empirical research they cite was conducted before (e.g. New Zealand, England) or shortly after (e.g. Germany) changes were made in systems and processes for inspection, thus restricting the value of such studies for judging long- term and sustainable impact on school quality.   All reviewers note that research suggests that external school evaluation has differing impact on school improvement and that certain conditions are associated with schools accepting and acting on feedback from external school evaluation. More recent research identified for this review has confirmed these findings about necessary conditions.

Acceptance
Previous reviews report that acceptance of inspection findings is necessary to drive improvement, with, for example, OECD citing Blondin and Giot, (2011) and Klerks citing Ehren and Visscher, 2008). OECD also note that acceptance is not sufficient, citing Ehren et al., (2013) as suggesting that the clarity of expectations established for inspection and the extent to which the school and other stakeholders are engaged with and knowledgeable about the inspection process has a significant impact on results. Whitby (2010) concludes that external inspection is most likely to be effective when there is collaboration with the school, focused on improvement. Both the content and focus of the review should be agreed with the school and inspection criteria should be clearly understood.

In Ireland, McNamara and O'Hara (2006) found that inspection had little impact on school improvement. Principals they interviewed were sceptical of the value of any kind of external evaluation, considering it too focused on academic achievement in relation to the broader aims of education. However internal self-evaluation conducted by teachers was seen very positively, with evidence that without the risk of criticism from outside, teachers were prepared to challenge each other and to use the outcomes constructively.

Feedback
All previous reviewers note that the nature of feedback following an inspection has a greater impact on school improvement than the amount provided, with OECD citing Matthews and Sammons, (2005); Klerks citing Ehren and Visscher, (2008); and Whitby citing McCrone et al. (2009). Reporting on the impact of Ofsted (the school inspectorate in Engand), McCrone et al. (2009) add that specific and clear recommendations were most helpful, to refocus leadership and to have an impact after the inspection. Schools sometimes felt that there was insufficient observation of teaching or that inspection judgements were purely data based. Schools in particularly challenging circumstances also sometimes felt that inspectors ought to

be able to take more account of these and this was similarly noted by Courtney (2012). In a study of five schools in Louisiana, Schildkamp and Visscher (2010) pointed to the need for good quality feedback in findings which are tailored to the needs of the school. They suggest that this might include individual feedback to teachers as well as indicating how improvements can be made.

In Sweden, Nusch et al. (2011) concluded that schools get comprehensive, high quality, feedback on performance via SSE, student and parent surveys, municipal evaluation, publication and ranking of student attainment data and external inspection, stating that 'the quality of feedback given to them (schools) about their performance, as well as their capacity to improve their own work using this feedback, have become a key success factor in the Swedish system.' (p78) They say that inspection reports are detailed and specific with actions identified for improvements needed and that schools have to submit a plan to say how they will make improvements within three months. The structure of inspection reports allows for progress to be seen over time and the SSE is well developed to make improvement.

Support for improvement
OECD noted that follow up measures, including intervention support, when external inspection reveals weaknesses has been found to support school improvement. Schildkamp and Visscher (2010) identified a need for support and training, both for understanding data in the report and in using it to make improvement. HMIE (2009) reported on the need for challenge and support from external stakeholders and the local authority as being significant in the improvement of schools following inspection, as well as training and support for senior leaders.

Leadership
Leadership of the principal and 'ownership' of findings and action plans by school staff are necessary for school improvement actions to be implemented (Schildkamp and Visscher, 2010, HMIE,). Knapp and Feldman (2012) reporting on research conducted in the USA claim that it is the role of the school principal to manage the demands of external and internal accountability in pursuit of school- defined improvement, rather than being driven by external demands. The most successful principals in their study used externally- defined expectations to support the development of accountable practice within the school, particularly through use of data, and modelling leadership for learning.

Recent research provides examples of school improvement following inspection where these conditions are met. Thus, the positive influence of inspection on school's actions in The Netherlands is indicated in a case study from (Hogenbirk and Braak, 2013) of a school that underwent inspection from a group of European inspectors in relation to their use of ICT in 2007, using a European framework devised for this purpose. The practitioner case study provides a detailed description of how action plans were formulated and implemented as result of findings from the inspection and of how these led to improvements in student learning, indicating a clear sense of ownership among staff at the school.

Inspection systems in Federal states in Germany were introduced relatively recently and research by Dedering and Muller (2011) reports positively on schools' first experience of external inspection under the newly introduced framework in North Rhine Westphalia. Whether or not they had a positive or negative report, schools found the inspection report relevant and accurate, with appropriate awareness of the school context and its work. Overall the report and the process of preparing for this by compilation of school data was seen as helpful and supportive, with both oral and written feedback seen positively as helpful in planning development activities. Dedering and Muller also report on two other studies in Germany (not available in English), from Brandenburg (Gaertner et al, 2009) and Bavaria (Huber, 2008) as similarly positive about inspection. A difference in German systems which

is highlighted by Dedering and Muller is the emphasis on the use of inspection to guide the internal processes of the school, with no mandatory publication of inspection reports or test results.

Impact of school inspections on school self evaluation
Research cited above mentions the influence of inspection on the quality of school self evaluation, which may or may not be linked directly to the inspection system. The six high performing systems (The Netherlands, Hong Kong, New Zealand, Singapore, England, Scotland) considered by Whitby (2010) noted that all of these countries use school self evaluation to inform school inspection though to varying degrees. In Hong Kong, for example, external inspection is used to complement SSE. She quotes the McCrone (2009) independent review of Ofsted in England to state that the majority of school leaders view SSE positively and as inspection as a means of validating the school's judgements and priorities for improvement.

Whitby is of the opinion that the Scottish system is of interest for the way in which inspection and SSE complement one another "self evaluation and external inspection documentation uses 'the same language', this means that 'teachers are much more likely to see external inspection in a developmental perspective rather than a judgmental one' (Livingston and McCall, 2005, p175). " (Whitby, 2010, p 15).
On the other hand Whitby found literature that noted a tension between school self evaluation and inspection and a risk that they may simply be written to comply with expectations of the inspectorates (citing MacBeath et al., 2000; Estonian Ministry of Education and Research, 2005; De Grauwe and Naidoo, 2004; Meuret and Morlaix, 2003). Whitby's overall conclusion to her review is that it is the amount of guidance and support that schools have for school self evaluation and external inspection that affect the impact of inspection systems on school improvement.

Despite Whitby's positive comments about systems in Scotland, and similarly positive reports from England (Cowan,2008; Bubb and Earley, 2008) in and Australia (Masters, 2012), a report from Scotland's own inspectorate is less positive and the both mixed quality of SSE and the variability in its use among schools is noted in several other studies (Blok et al., 2008; Hofman et al., 2010; Wong and Li, 2010; Mutch, 2012; Hall and Noyes, 2007; McNamara et al., 2011; Schildkamp et al., 2012; Karagiorgi, 2012). The additional work required for SSE was noted in several studies (Wong and Li, 2010; Hall and Noyes, 2007; Karagiorgi, 2012). The influence of the school principal and senior leadership team and the attitudes of teachers were considered to be highly significant in the extent to which SSE is a collaborative and non- threatening process or otherwise (Bubb and Earley, 2008; Hall and Noyes, 2007; Schildkamp et al., 2012), as well as the extent to which it was followed by improvement actions (Emstad, 2011). The extent to which school self evaluation is externally imposed or internally developed was found to be significant by McNamara et al. (2011) in comparing SSE in Ireland and Iceland with Karagiorgi (2012) similarly noting the positive reception of an internally developed process in a school in Cyprus. However Masters (2012) reports positively on the impact of using a standard framework in Australia as do Bubb and Earley (2008) in England. Cowan (2008) identifies the positive impact of external support for both the SSE process and subsequent improvement action from the local authority (school district). Ozga (2009) points to the pressure for the interpretation and use of complex data required for self- evaluation in readiness for inspection in England and of the tensions between a data-driven system and trusting collegial relations.

A small study in Cyprus by Demetriou and Kyriakides (2012) found a positive influence on test results of SSE using a theoretical framework based on school effectiveness factors.

Impact of school inspections on behavioural change of teachers and school leaders
Research reviewed from England, indicates the powerful influence of Ofsted on schools' actions (Dougill et al., 2011; Courtney, 2012) as did earlier research in England, Learmonth (2000) and Ouston *et al.* (1997) cited by de Wolf and Janssens (2007). Courtney approached schools that had been recently inspected in the first three months following the introduction of a revised Ofsted inspection framework and found that principals expected to focus more on revised framework priority areas. Other themes in Courtney's findings were the variability in the quality of inspectors, the implications of inspection outcomes for headteachers' careers and that the contexts and challenges facing schools serving areas of disadvantage are insufficiently taken into account. It is suggested that this may make it more difficult to recruit headteachers for such schools. Courtney's findings about variability in the quality of inspectors may be a consequence of changes to the framework, which purports to give greater weight to the professional judgement of inspectors and the implications of this are discussed further in Baxter and Clarke (2013), which draws on interviews with members of inspectorates and other relevant bodes in participating countries carried out as part of the *Governing by Inspection* project (Grek et al., 2013).

The reviews by de Wolf and Janssens and by Klerks (2013) refer to Chapman (2001), whose case study of five English schools just after an Ofsted inspection found that high quality feedback may be the key to teachers' intentions to change practice. Approximately 20% of teachers studied felt that inspectors' feedback had prompted changes in teaching practice. More recently, Dobbelaer et al.'s (2013) results indicate that feedback provided by trained inspectors in the Netherland can foster professional development of teachers in primary education and that short feedback training has added value.

Impact of school inspections on student achievement
This review found little empirical research which attempted to link inspection to pupil achievement, while controlling for other variables. Much of the research is based on data collected many years ago and shows slight or no effect (Luginbuhl et al.,2009; Shaw et al., 2003; Rosenthal, 2004; Matthews and Sammons, 2005; Hanushek and Raymond, 2005; Jacob, 2005). Luginbuhl et al (2009) found that test scores of pupils in primary education improved by 2 to 3 % of a standard deviation in the two years following an inspection visit. The improvement is the largest in arithmetic and persisted over four years after the visit.
More recent reports presented by Allen and Burgess (2012) and Hussain (2012) are based on separate, large, longitudinal datasets in England with a sophisticated process for analysis. Both of these provide convincing recent evidence of a link between the findings of an inspection report and student achievement results and suggest that a negative inspection judgement may prompt or accelerate actions to improve student performance, even where no external interventions are made. Hussain also examined improvement in relation to prior attainment, to control for 'gaming' by schools, for example by failing to enter pupils less likely to perform well or by targeting borderline pupils. He found no evidence to suggest such gaming and found improvement for all pupils in the schools studied. Furthermore, the improvement in student attainment was found to be maintained in student data for the following three years.

Coasting schools
The only explicit reference found to inspection and to schools considered to be stagnating in terms of education outcomes or 'coasting' was in England, where changes to the inspection framework in 2012 removed the term 'satisfactory' from judgements to 'requires improvement', which would trigger a follow- up visit within 18 months to monitor improvement (Vasagar in The Guardian, 17 January, 2012). The impact of the change has yet to be seen. The change had been preceded by a report (Francis,2011) produced with the cooperation of Ofsted, who supplied data about inspection judgements in successive inspections for all secondary schools and a sample of inspection reports from secondary schools that had received 'satisfactory' ratings in two successive inspections with

'satisfactory' capacity to improve. The data from all inspections showed that such schools were more likely to be found in areas where children faced multiple disadvantages, with implications for educational and social equity. Francis comments that although the inspection reports highlight <u>what</u> needs to be done, there is little guidance on <u>how</u> to do it and the report recommends that a range of support measures are implemented to help such schools improve. A reference to coasting schools can also be inferred from the evaluation of the *New Relationship with Schools* policy in England (Cowan, 2008) although it was the additional oversight provided to local authorities by the deployment of School Improvement Partners (SIPs) for five days per year in each school that was credited with enabling greater challenge and support to schools that had not been identified as required 'special measures' or 'notice to improve' from Ofsted. In a report which looks at the importance of the context of a school in the institutionalization of national policy, Braun et al. (2010) provide an example of a school that was 'coasting' that was shocked by the judgements of an Ofsted inspection in 2002, but had been able to move forward, quoting a teacher as saying 'you know, it was a really good thing that we had that Ofsted report because it did challenge those perceptions, it did enable us to really start moving things forward' (p 594).Other jurisdictions do not appear to have terminology for 'coasting' schools, although Whylie (2012) cites data from the Education Review Office in New Zealand suggesting that, as in England, some schools struggle to improve and then maintain improved performance. Schools serving low-income communities and schools with very small enrolment were overrepresented in this group. In other countries it may be that issues of 'coasting' schools have not been identified as the use of regular external review has only recently been established, as, for example, in Sweden where the current process is now in its second cycle of operation (Nusche et al., 2011).

Unintended consequences of school inspections

School inspections may also lead to unintended negative consequences for teaching and learning in schools. Possible negative consequences have been categorized by De Wolf and Janssens (2005) as intended and unintended strategic behavior of schools and teachers. Intended strategic behavior consists of window dressing, fraud, gaming and misrepresentation. Window dressing refers to schools implementing procedures and protocols that have no effect on primary processes in the school, but are implemented to be assessed more positively. Schools are 'brushed up' to receive a more positive assessment. They can use several methods that vary in fairness and lawfulness to do so, such as fraud, gaming and misrepresentation. Fraud occurs when schools falsify numbers or records (such as test scores or lesson plans) used in accountability systems to assess output or educational processes of/in schools. Ehren (2006) for example found Dutch schools to include outside playing time of pupils into lesson schedules to comply with the minimum number of lesson hours. Misrepresentation occurs when schools manipulate behavior they have to report on. Examples are excluding low performing students from exams that are used to assess schools as these students may lower the average test scores of schools. Gaming refers to schools manipulating actual behavior. Schools may for example choose to do so when performance targets are based on previous behavior. Schools may lower the targets by performing low in the year the targets are set. Actual behavior is manipulated instead of reported behavior. Another example of gaming was found by Chapman (2001). He found that teachers prepared and structured their lessons better when inspectors visited the school. They also taught in a more structured, classical way and refrained from having pupils work together in small groups, which could cause disruption.

Unintended strategic behavior refers to the unintended influencing of behavior by the assessor and/or by the method of working used for the assessment. In effect this means a (usually unintended) one-sided emphasis on the elements that are assessed. Schools for example emphasize phenomena that are quantified in the performance measurement scheme, at the expense of unquantifiable aspects of performance (tunnel vision). Schools focus for example on programming a large number of lesson hours instead of trying to improve the quality of lessons offered. Suboptimization is another example of unintended strategic behavior. Local objectives are pursued by schools, at the expense of the objectives of the school as a whole.

Myopia, a third example, includes schools pursuing short term targets (for example improving test scores by means of redirecting students to easier subjects) at the expense of legitimate long term objectives (improving student achievement in difficult subjects). Schools aim at success that can be established very quickly, instead of long-term school improvement. Ossification, or organizational paralysis, is a fourth type of unintended strategic behavior. Schools refrain from innovating and ignore changes and threats, because innovative arrangements are not rewarded in the external evaluation. Teachers and principles may for example choose to focus the teaching and learning on mathematics and literacy (instead of other subjects) as these two subjects are central in the inspection framework. Within these subjects they will use a way of teaching that is considered to be 'inspection-approved', for example using 4-part lessons with pre-arranged assignments for pupils. Schools are expected to suffer from ossification when performance measurement schemes are used rigidly. Measure fixation is a last example of unintended strategic behavior and refers to schools that focus on measures of success rather than the underlying objective. Schools implement, for example, self-evaluation instruments to score positively on inspection indicators used for measuring quality assurance, instead of implementing such instruments to improve the quality of their education.

These types of behaviors may negatively affect student achievement in schools. Some studies have found a negative relation between school inspections and student achievement (although it is not clear whether these decreases in student achievement are mediated by strategic behavior of schools). Rosenthal (2003) for example found a decrease in examination results of pupils in England in secondary education in the year of the inspection visit. He explains this result by pointing to the extensive preparation of schools for the visit that may take time and energy away from the teaching and learning process. Shaw et al (2003) found that schools where achievement was already much higher or lower than the average, the inspection was associated with slight improvement in achievement. Inspection did not improve examination achievement in maintained comprehensive schools.

Factors identified as being significant to the impact of inspection
The research evidence above is consistent is demonstrating that factors which contribute to inspection and/or self- evaluation having more or less impact are:
- Feedback;
- Publication of reports, test results and league tables;
- School leadership;
- Parental choice;
- Institutionalization, including 'performativity';
- Sanctions and support;
- Internal school capacity.

This section of the review presents additional literature relevant to some of these factors. Although studies are consistent in identifying the importance of school leadership in contributing to school improvement following inspection, this aspect is amply covered in other educational research on school effectiveness and school improvement and is only discussed here in reference to governance. As with earlier sections, factors and impacts are interlinked and may overlap, so research rarely falls into one category only. The influence of school governance is included as significant aspect of school leadership.

What do we know about performance feedback and school improvement?
Several of the reports cited earlier cite the importance of high quality feedback to schools, noting also that it is the way that it is provided that is important if the feedback is to lead to improvement in student outcomes (for example, McCrone, 2007; Dedering and Muller, 2010; Dobbelaers, 2013). Additional sources are presented below, with much of the literature focusing on student performance feedback systems (SPFSs) which offer schools, and individual teachers, data on student progress and achievement using a range of measures,

which may be tailored directly to the needs of the school. They focus on the design features of such a system (which may perhaps be compared to parallel requirements for high quality inspection reports) with less research identified on the influence of *how* the feedback is provided. Based on a review of literature and empirical studies by Hendricks et al. (2002) and Tymms and Albone (2002), Visscher and Coe (2003) hypothesise that:

'SPFSs will be used more intensively and effectively when they are more in accordance with the factors that are identified in the research as significant… :
– school staff have developed more ''ownership'' of the SPFSs introduced into their school;
– SPFSs are more flexible in meeting varying information needs among schools;
– the information fed back is more valid, covers school quality better, and allows more in-depth analysis of data;
– the introduction of SPFSs is accompanied by comprehensive, tailored reform and support strategies;
– implementation of the SPFSs in schools is monitored more consistently;
– the schools into which SPFSs are introduced promote organisational learning, and have a more developed innovation capacity.' (p 346)

Visscher and Coe's hypotheses are confirmed by later research by Alonzo et al. (2010), Bain and Swan (2011), Geijsel, Kruger and Sleegers (2010) and Verhaege et al. (2010). Principals in Verhaege et al.'s study made little systematic use of feedback, which the authors ascribe to lack of time, skills and support. 'Support' falls into two categories; the training and support for use of the system and interpreting the data and support in identifying and implementing improvement actions. However, although a need for support in interpreting the data was also identified by principals in research by Van Petegem and Vanhoof (2007), Vanhoof et al. (2011) found no difference in use of the data in schools that had participated in a training programme and those which had not. In another paper based on questionnaire data from the same project (Vanhoof et al, 2012) the research team found that it was those schools where principals had established a strong collaborative culture and professional relationships among staff that were more likely to be able to encourage teachers to use the school performance feedback in a productive way.

The applicability of findings on feedback systems which also include external evaluation visits and publication of test results may be found in a comparative study by Shildkamp and Teddlie (2008). They compared findings from two separate research studies, those on the ZEBO system in The Netherlands, which is designed to support SSE and that of the School Accountability Monitoring (SAM) system in Lousiana, in which schools identified through published test results as underperforming receive a visit from Department of Education officers and are expected to produce and implement an action plan. For both systems, the factors that were identified as important in enabling use may be summarised as:
• feedback coincides with the needs of the users;
• training is provided both in understanding the data and also in using it to design improvement actions;
• leadership of the principal;
• ownership by all staff, especially teachers, of the findings and process for acting on these;
• the availability of time and resources to interpret the data and to plan for and implement improvement actions.

Visscher and Coe (ibid) do summarise earlier research on 'Cues in the Feedback Message' (Kruger and deNisi, 1996) which relates to the importance of how feedback is provided. Their summary of Kruger and deNisi notes that feedback needs to be related to the task, rather

than the person, to avoid raising issues of self-efficacy, professional identify and wider self-goals. Feedback which offers personal praise or criticism is less effective, although drawing attention to past performance may help focus attention on goals, and is to be preferred to the comparison of performance with that of others. Feedback needs to be specific, but not so detailed as to be confusing to the recipient. Vissscher and Coe cite Coe (1998) in suggesting that

> 'feedback should be made to seem credible and accurate, and perceived as providing information and supporting self-determination, rather than as surveillance or control. It should seek to generate feelings of competence but not complacency … it should encourage recipients to attribute their level of performance to the effort they have applied or to specific, alterable factors such as their choice of strategy, and so make them feel they have control over the outcomes' (Visscher and Coe, 2009, p 328).

Lack of trust and scepticism about feedback from inspection may be seen in studies from England on the role of Ofsted in providing feedback, where attention is also drawn to the style of individual inspectors in providing verbal feedback. Bates (2013) suggests that feedback which focuses on the few negative issues in a school which is otherwise performing well and improving may undermine confidence and increase cynicism and resentment about the inspection process.

The impact of publication of inspection reports, pupil performance data and league tables
Arguments for the publication of inspection reports and/or 'league tables' of pupil performance data are that parents will use these to select schools for their children and that and that the publication of a negative report will stimulate lower- performing schools to improve (Emmelot et al., 2004 cited in de Wolf and Janssens, 2007; Ozga, 2013). However, research evidence from the Netherlands (Meijer, 2004 cited in de Wolf and Janssens, 2007; Denessen, 2005; Koning and van der Weil,2013) and England (Ipsos Mori, 2006, 2008) shows that parents rarely use published information as the primary motive for their choice of school. Neither Koning and van der Weil nor, in Austria, Altrichter et al., (2011) found differences among socio- economic groups in the reason for the choices. Empirical evidence from England (for example, Ball and Vincent, 1998; Vincent et al., 2010; Burgess et al., 2009) suggests that middle class parents are better able to access and interpret published information, have access to social networks and informal data about the school and experience fewer constraints, such as proximity to the school or cost of housing in its catchment area, with similar findings from France reported in a study by Karsten (2001).

The majority of research on the impact of league tables shows negative effects, such as a narrowing of the curriculum, focusing on particular groups of pupils or teaching to the test (Simmons and Vass, 2002 cited in Whitby, 2010; Wiggins and Tymms, 2002; Ehren and Swanborn, 2012). An opportunity to investigate the impact of publication of league tables based on external tests was provided in the UK by the abolition, in 2004, of external testing and publication of results at age 11 in Wales. Previously, in 2001, publication of league tables of GCSE results for 16- year- olds in Wales had been stopped, although students continued to take the same examinations as in England, where publication continued. Other measures for monitoring school performance, including external inspection and publication of reports were not affected by these change. Two studies which draw on comparative data from Wales and England, before and after the changes, have differing findings, with the study by Collins et al. (2010) which focuses on the teaching of science in primary schools finding positive impact of the ceasing of external testing and publication of results. However, in contrast to other research findings, a positive example of the impact of publication of league tables is the study by Burgess et al. (2010) which compared performance in the GCSE examinations, used at age 16 in both Wales and England. This large- scale, quantitative study found that Welsh schools

performance declined relative to schools in England, where league tables continued to be published and widely reported in the press.

An investigation in the USA by Gonzalez and Firestone (2013) found external accountability was significantly more likely to be cited by principals as the main source of accountability in those schools which were low achieving, where there was a high risk of receiving adverse publicity, and loss of parental approval, through being judged to be 'failing'. However, Gonzalez and Firestone suggest that although the principals in their study were influenced by the range of accountabilities and demands of testing regimes, they had found a way to manage these in line with their own principles and beliefs. Diamond and Spillane (2004), in a study of urban schools in Chicago, similarly found that high external accountability measures impacted more on schools serving areas of disadvantage.

Institutionalization and Performativity
Although 'institutionalization' of practice may considered a neutral term, with spreading of good practice through, for example, professional development and professional learning communities and networks, searches under this term identified research that was often negative in tone, often giving unintended effects of school accountability measures, such as 'performativity' or 'teaching to the test'. However, examples of positive effects were also identified in research reports.

Research identified for this review from is mostly from England and indicates that national expectations for high standards and external accountability are accepted by teachers, confirming the changing view of professionalism noted by Hall and Noyes (2007) and Storey's (2007) and by the responses to a survey of teachers on the impact of 'new professionalism' by Walker et al. (2011). Wilkins (2011) research with beginning teachers suggested that younger teachers' experiences as pupils have led them to expect high accountability and external pressures, such as inspection and league tables, to the extent that they are impatient of complaints by more experienced staff. However, other recent studies from England (Hobson and McIntyre, 2013; Cain and Harris, 2013) suggest that, although teachers may not either question or resist high performance expectations, this may affect their willingness to ask for support from senior staff or attitudes to professional development. Braun et al. (2010) report a 'preoccupation' (p586) with Ofsted inspection and test results, as well as recognition that these may be positive influences, citing an example of a coasting school that was prompted to improve after a negative report. In the USA, Diamond and Spillane (2004) argue that, as in England (Storey, 2009; Lupton and Hempel- Jorensson, 2012), the impact of high stakes accountability and teaching to the test is greater in schools with high levels of disadvantage, with a narrowing of professional development to skills training, unaligned to teacher beliefs about the needs of their pupils or their own development needs.

Institutionalisation of teacher behaviours may occur through implementation of regulations and national agreements (Walker et al., 2011), directly to teachers through common acceptance of the need for external accountability as part of their professionalism (Berry, 2012); through directives from senior managers (Tuck, 2012; Keddie et al., 2011); through induction for new staff (Keddie et al., 2012); and through pressure from both colleagues and parents on trainee teachers (Rose and Rogers, 2012). However, with the support and trust of senior leaders, teachers are able maintain autonomy and creativity in their teaching within a framework of high challenge and high accountability (Day and Gu, 2010; Storey, 2007). In Sweden, Lunneblad and Carlsson (2012) suggest that teachers may use their professional autonomy to evade elements of expected performance behaviours

A recent study by Ehren et al (submitted) reports the results of a survey to principals in primary and secondary education in six European countries to attempt to clarify how school inspections impact on the improvement of schools. Their study suggests that inspection in

these countries primarily drives change indirectly, through encouraging certain developmental processes, rather than through more direct coercive methods. Inspectorates that set clear expectations and standards on good education have a distinct impact on the improvement of self-evaluation in schools and on the improvement of capacity-building in the school.

The role of school boards and school governance in school improvement[2]

Reviewing the American and Dutch literature of effective school boards, Land (2002) shows that school boards have traditionally only focused on financial, legal and constituent issues, while they left the responsibility for students' academic achievement to their administrators and educators. Only recently do school boards run the risk of being judged ineffective when they fail to develop policies and support programmes explicitly designed to improve students' academic achievement, oversee and evaluate the implementation and performance of these policies and programmes and demonstrate improved and/or high academic achievement.

According to Stringfield (2002), describing effective school boards (one that impacts student achievement) involves evaluating virtually all functions of a board, from internal governance and policy formulation to communication with teachers, building administrators, and the public.

Available studies on effectiveness of school boards (e.g. Hofman, 1995, Land, 2002) compare high-achieving to low achieving boards and point to markedly different habits and characteristics between the two, such as the extent to which school boards engage in goal setting and monitoring progress, their data savviness in identifying students' needs and justifying decisions based on data, their detailed knowledge of the district, including initiatives to jump-start success and the working relationships with superintendents, teachers, and administrators based on mutual respect, collegiality and a joint commitment to student success. School boards are advised to establish a vision for educational excellence, to advocate the vision inside and outside of the school system, to provide the resources and structures necessary to achieve this vision and to hold programmes and people accountable for academic achievement of students.

Descriptions of effective school boards can be found in a number of studies and generally include the following characteristics (Hofman, 1995, Land, 2002, Stringfield, 2002):

- Commitment to a *clear and shared vision and goals for student achievement* and quality instruction that trickle down to the classroom. The school board should ensure that goals on student achievement include specific targets and benchmarks and are the top priority in all schools without distraction to other goals and initiatives. Professional development and other resources are aligned to meeting these goals and the school board continuously monitors progress towards these goals without micro-managing schools and spending little time on day-to-day operational issues. High priorities are supported, even during times of fiscal uncertainty.
- *Effective use of data*. High quality school boards are data savvy; they monitor data and use it to drive continuous improvement, even when the information is negative. They analyse and discuss trends on dropout rates, test scores, and student needs, often on a monthly basis to identify specific student needs and justify decisions based on that data, without ascribing blame or eliciting emotional responses.
- *Strong accountability and transparent evaluation*. School boards evaluate and hold their principals accountable on shared goals, mutually agreed upon procedures and progress of students. They support decisions that enhance improvement of student achievement rather than the daily management of the school.
- *Collaborative relationships* and mutual trust with staff and the community. Effective school boards have a trusting and collaborative relationship with their principals and engage in a collegial policy-making process that emphasizes the need to find solutions

---

[2] This section is cited from Ehren, M.C.M., Honingh, M.E., Hooge, E.H., and O'Hara, J. (2014). Changing school board governance in primary education through school inspections. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership (in press)*

and develop consensus among board members and other leaders on the identification and implementation of improvement strategies. They establish a strong communications structure to inform and engage both internal and external stakeholders in setting and achieving district goals, to receive information from many sources (e.g. principal, teachers and outside sources), and to share findings among all board members and to communicate actions and goals to staff. According to Hofman et al (2002), coherence between school governors, school leaders, teachers and the school community (parents) produces a sense of community that, in turn, shapes conditions in schools that have a positive effect on pupil achievement.

- *Political and organizational stability*. Choices on goals and resources remain stable over longer periods of time and school boards and principals have a long term service meeting goals and aligning resources to these goals, showing stability in the governance of schools. There is a low turnover rate and school board members and principals have long tenures, which is sustained by regular retreats for evaluation and goal setting purposes.

School boards' governance of successful or failing schools
The above literature review summarizes a set of common characteristics of effective school boards. Carver and Carver (2001) and Mordaunt and Cornforth (2004), however, point out that effective school boards align their expectations, their role and their choice of actions to the specific circumstances of their schools. These authors describe how school boards should fit their theory of action to the performance of their schools. School boards with successful schools can for example use routine operating policies to maintain stability and incremental improvement, whereas school boards with failing schools need to turnaround organizational failure and implement reform policies to drive change.

School boards with successful schools can stick to incremental improvements in the status quo of their schools; they don't need to implement fundamental changes and can primarily govern their schools for oversight (McAdams, 2006). Their practice of effective management and governance of their schools (which is framed as *performance management/empowerment*) includes activities such as hiring and evaluating principals, setting goals, building collaborative relationships, promoting a positive climate, approving policies and overseeing management.

School boards with failing schools on the other hand need to identify the types of failure and their causes and need to align their reform policy to the specific stage of turnaround each failing school is in (Mordaunt and Cornforth, 2004; McAdams, 2006). Mordaunt and Cornforth (2004) describe that school boards of successful turnarounds, for short periods of time, often take on a very hands-on approach, sometimes taking over aspects of the management in failing schools. Such a reform strategy is framed by McAdams (2006) as *'managed instruction'*. In this case, school boards directly manage instruction, using the same comprehensive and aligned curriculum in all failing schools, and making sure that all teachers know how to teach it. Building on content and performance standards, school boards choose a tightly coupled instructional-management system in which they construct a coherent and aligned curriculum that covers every subject for every grade that is detailed down to individual lesson plans, teaching materials, and sample assessments which are available to teachers. Teaching is continually monitored and a comprehensive student-information-management system, including frequent formative assessments to track student performance, is implemented. This theory of action requires significant resources for curriculum development, professional development, a student information-management system, strong instructional leadership from administrators and great sensitivity to the needs of teachers.

Bibliography

Allen, R. & Burgess, S. (2012). How should we treat under-performing schools? A regression discontinuity analysis of school inspections in England. Bristol, University of Bristol, Centre for Market and Public Organisation, Bristol Institute of Public Affairs.

Alonzo, J., Tindal, G., & Lai, C.-F. (2010). Making the Good Even Better: Feedback from easyCBM Focus Groups, School Year 2009/2010. Technical Report # 1001 (pp. 10). University of Oregon, USA.: Behavioral Research and Teaching. 175 Lokey Education 5262 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403.

Altrichter, H., Bacher, J., Beham, M., Nagy, G., & Wetzelhutter, D. (2011). The effects of a free school choice policy on parents' school choice behaviour. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 37*(4), 230-238.

Anderson, S., Leithwood, K. & Strauss, T. (2010) Leading Data Use in Schools: Organizational Conditions and Practices at the School and District Levels. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9(3), 292-327.

Bain, A., & Swan, G. (2011). Technology Enhanced Feedback Tools as a Knowledge Management Mechanism for Supporting Professional Growth and School Reform. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 59*(5), 673-685.

Balarin, M. B., S.;James, C.;McCormack, M. (2008). The School Governance Study. Bath: Business in the Community.

Ball, S. J., & Vincent, C. (1998). 'I Heard It on the Grapevine': 'Hot' Knowledge and School Choice. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 19*(3), 377-400.

Bates, A. (2013). Transcending systems thinking in education reform: implications for policy-makers and school leaders. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(1), 38-54.

Baxter, J., & Clarke, J. (2013). Farewell to the tick box inspector? Ofsted and the changing regime of school inspection in England. *Oxford Review of Education, 39*(5), 702-718.

Bekkers, V., de Kool, D. and Straten, G. . (2012). NWO/Beleidsgericht Onderzoek Primair Onderwijs: Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Berry, J. (2012). Teachers' Professional Autonomy in England: Are Neo-Liberal Approaches Incontestable? *FORUM: for promoting 3-19 comprehensive education, 54*(3), 397-409.

Blok, H., Sleegers, P., & Karsten, S. (2008). Looking for a Balance between Internal and External Evaluation of School Quality: Evaluation of the SVI Model. *Journal of Education Policy, 23*(4), 379-395.

Blondin, C. a. G., B. (2011). Cadres d'évaluation en vue d'améliorer les resultants scolaires – Etude thématique de l'OCDE: Rapport de base pour la Communauté française de Belgique. Brussels: Ministère de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles.

Braun, A., Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Hoskins, K. (2011). Taking context seriously : towards explaining policy enactments in the secondary school. *Discourse, 32*(4), 585-596.

Braun, A., Maguire, M., & Ball, S. J. (2010). Policy enactments in the UK secondary school: examining policy, practice and school positioning. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(4), 547-560.

Brimblecombe, N. (1996). Teachers' Intention to Change Practice as a Result of OFSTED School Inspections (pp. 339-354).

Brimblecombe, N., Ormston, M., & Shaw, M. (1995). Teachers' Perceptions of School Inspection: a stressful experience. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 25*(1), 53-61. doi: 10.1080/0305764950250106

Brimblecombe, N. O., M., Shaw, M. (1996). OFSTED Inspections: The Early Experiences Teachers' Perceptions of School Inspection In J. Ouston (Ed.), *OFSTED Inspections: The Early Experiences*: David Fulton.

Bubb, S., & Earley, P. (2008). *From self-evaluation to school improvement: the importance of effective staff development*: CfBT Education Trust.

Burgess, S., Greaves, E., Vignoles, A. F., & Wilson, D. (2009). *What parents want: school preferences and school choice*: University of Bristol. Centre for Market and Public Organisation.

Burgess, S., Wilson, D., & Worth, J. (2010). *A national experiment in school accountability: the impact of school performance information on pupil progress and sorting*: University of Bristol. Centre for Market and Public Organisation.

Cain, T & Harris, R. (2013). Teachers' action research in a culture of performativity. *Education Action Research*, 21(3), 343-358.

Case, P., Case, S., & Catling, S. (2000). Please Show You're Working: A Critical Assessment of the Impact of OFSTED Inspection on Primary Teachers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 21*(4), 605-621.

Chapman, C. (2001). Changing Classrooms through Inspection. *School Leadership & Management, 21*(1), 59-73.

Chapman, J. (2012, 23 January 2012). Hundreds of 'coasting' schools in 'leafy' areas to be ordered to push pupils further, *Daily Mail.* Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2087639/Hundreds-satisfactory-schools-ordered-better-new-education-reforms.html#ixzz2ogTx0Qyn accessed 21 December 2013.

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., Vigdor, J. L., & Diaz, R. A. (2004). Do School Accountability Systems Make It More Difficult for Low-Performing Schools to Attract and Retain High-Quality Teachers? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 23*(2), 251-271.

Coe, R. (2002). Evidence on the role and impact of performance feedback in schools. In A. J. V. R. Coe (Ed.), *School improvement through performance feedback*. Lisse/Abingdon/Exton/Tokyo: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Collins, S., Reiss, M. J., & Stobart, G. (2010). What happens when high-stakes testing stops? Teachers' perceptions of the impact of compulsory national testing in science of 11-year-olds in England and its abolition in Wales. *Assessment in Education, 17*(3), 273-286.

Commission on School Reform (2013). By diverse means: improving Scottish education. Commission on School Reform Final Report. edinburgh: Reform Scotland.

Courtney, S. J. (2012). *Ofsted's revised school inspection framework: experiences and implications*. Paper presented at BERA conference, Manchester. available at http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/216133.pdf

Cowan, G. (2008). *New relationship with schools evaluation*: Department for Children, Schools and Families.

Davidsdottir, S., & Lisi, P. (2007). Effects of Deliberative Democracy on School Self-Evaluation. *Evaluation, 13*(3), 371-386.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2010). *The new lives of teachers*. London: Routledge.

De Grauwe, A., & Naidoo, J. P. (2004). School Evaluation for Quality Improvement. Meeting of the Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning (ANTRIEP) (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, July 2-4, 2002)

de Wolf, I. F., & Janssens, F. J. G. (2007). Effects and side effects of inspections and accountability in education: an overview of empirical studies. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*(3), 379-396. doi: 10.1080/03054980701366207

Dedering, K., & Muller, S. (2011). School Improvement through Inspections? First Empirical Insights from Germany. *Journal of Educational Change, 12*(3), 301-322.

Demetriou, D., & Kyriakides, L. (2012). The impact of school self-evaluation upon student achievement: a group randomisation study. *Oxford Review of Education, 38*(2), 149-170.

Doolaard, S. & Karstanje, P. (2001) Gebruik van publieke prestatie-indicatoren voor schoolverbetering, in: A. B. Dijkstra, S. Karsten, R. Veenstra & A. J. Visscher (Eds) Het oog der natie: scholen op rapport. Standaarden voor de publicatie van schoolprestaties (Assen, Van Gorkum), 155–172. [Use of public performance indicators for school improvement, in A. B. Dijkstra et al., The eye of the nation: schools on report]

Denessen, E., Driessen, G. W. J. M., & Sleegers, P. (2005). Segregation by choice? A study of group-specific reasons for school choice. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(3), 347-368.

Department of Education, Western Australia. (2013). *Annual Report 2012- 13*. Perth, Australia.

Diamond, J. B. & Spillane, J. P. (2004). High-Stakes Accountability in Urban Elementary Schools: Challenging or Reproducing Inequality? *Teachers College Record*, 106(5), 1145-1176.

Dobbelaer, M. J., Prins, F. J., & van Dongen, D. (2013). The Impact of Feedback Training for Inspectors. *European Journal of Training and Development, 37*(1), 86-104.

Dougill, P. R., Mike; Blatchford, Roy; Fryer, Lyn; Robinson, Carol; Richmond, John. (2011). To the next level: good schools becoming outstanding. Reading: CfBT Education Trust.

Education Review Office (2008). The Quality of Teaching in Kua Maori. Wellington, New Zealand Government.

Education Review Office (2012) Working with National Standards to Promote Students Progress and Achievement June 2012 (Final). Wellington, New Zealand Government.

Education Scotland (2012). Quality and Improvement in Scottish Education: Trends in Inspection Findings 2008-2011 (pp. 48). Livingston, Scotland.

Education Scotland (2013). Examples of highly effective practice. available at http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/inspectionandreview/reports/examplesofpractice/index.asp accessed 30 December 2013.

Ehren, C. M., Altrichter, H., McNamara, G., & O'Hara, J. (2013). Impact of School Inspections on Improvement of Schools--Describing Assumptions on Causal Mechanisms in Six European Countries. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 25*(1), 3-43.

Ehren, C. M., Honingh, M.E. ;Hooge, E.H.;O'Hara, J. (2013)Changing school board governance in primary education through school inspections. unpublished paper.

Ehren, C. M., & Visscher, J. A. (2008). The Relationships between School Inspections, School Characteristics and School Improvement. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 56*(2), 205-227.

Ehren, M. C., & Swanborn, M. S. (2012). Strategic Data Use of Schools in Accountability Systems. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 23*(2), 257-280.

Ekonomistyrningsverket. (2006). Skolverkets utbildningsinspektion – ger den några effekter? Effektutvärdering genomförd på uppdrag av Skolverket Stockholm: Ekonomistyrningsverket (Swedish National Financial Management Authority)

Emstad, A. B. (2011). The Principal's Role in the Post-Evaluation Process.--How Does the Principal Engage in the Work Carried out after the Schools Self-Evaluation? *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 23*(4), 271-288.

Emmelot, Y., Karsten, S., Ledoux, G. & Vermeulen, A. (2004) Ervaringen met het vernieuwde onderwijstoezicht (Amsterdam, SCO/Kohnstamminstituut). [Experiences with the new-style education school inspections. Report by the SCO Kohnstamm Institute for Educational Research, Amsterdam]

Faubert, V. (2009). School Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and a Literature Review. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 42. Paris, OECD.

Flemish Ministry of Education and Training. (2010). OECD Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes: Country Background Report for the Flemish Community of Belgium. Brussels: Flemish Ministry of Education and Training.

Francis, B. (2011). (Un)satisfactory? Enhancing life chances by improving 'satisfactory' schools. London, Royal Society for Arts and Manufactures (RSA).

Gaertner, H., & Pant, H. A. (2011). How Valid Are School Inspections? Problems and Strategies for Validating Processes and Results. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 37*(2), 9.

Gaertner, H. H., D.; Pant, H. A. (2009). Wirkungen von Schulinspektion aus Sicht betroffener Schulleitungen. Die Brandenburger Schulleiterbefragung. *Empirische Pädagogik. Zeitschrift zu Theorie und Praxis erziehungswissenschaftlicher Forschung, 23*(1), 18.

Geijsel, F. P., Kruger, M. L., & Sleegers, P. J. (2010). Data Feedback for School Improvement: The Role of Researchers and School Leaders. *Australian Educational Researcher, 37*(2), 59-75.

Gonzalez, R. A., & Firestone, W. A. (2013). Educational Tug-of-War: Internal and External Accountability of Principals in Varied Contexts. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(3), 383-406.

Goodman, J. S. (1998). The interactive effects of task and external feedback on practice performance and learning. . *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 76*(3), 50.

Grek, S., Lawn, M., Ozga, J., & Segerholm, C. (2013). Governing by inspection? European inspectorates and the creation of a European education policy space. *Comparative Education, 49*(4), 486-502.

Hall, C., & Noyes, A. (2007). *The impact of school self evaluation processes on British teachers' views of their work and professionalism*. Paper presented at the BERA, London available from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/167834.doc

Hanushek, E. A., & Raymond, M. E. (2005). Does School Accountability Lead to Improved Student Performance? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 24*(2), 297-327.

Hardy, I. (2012). "Managing" Managerialism: The Impact of Educational Auditing on an Academic "Specialist" School. *European Educational Research Journal, 11*(2), 274-289.

Harris, Z., & Webster, A. B. (2009). *Missouri Rural School Board Governance and Student Performance.* (EdD), Saint Louis University.

Hendriks, M. A., Doolaard, S., & Bosker, R.J. (2002). Using school effectiveness as a knowledge base for self-evaluation in Dutch schools; the Zebo-project. In A. J. V. R. Coe (Ed.), *School improvement through performance feedback* Lisse/Abingdon/Exton/Tokyo: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales (2012). How well are the All-Wales Core Data Sets used to inform self-evaluation and planning for improvement? Cardiff, Estyn.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE)(2009). *Learning together*, Livingston, Education Scotland.

Hobson, A.J. & McIntyre, J. (2013) Teacher fabrication as an impediment to professional learning and development: the external mentor antidote. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(3), 345-365.

Hofman, R. H. (1995). Contextual Influences on School Effectiveness: The Role of School Boards (pp. 308-331).

Hofman, R. H., de Boom, J., & Hofman, H. W. (2010). Quality Control in Primary Schools: Progress from 2001-2006. *School Leadership & Management, 30*(4), 335-350.

Hofman, R. H., Dijkstra, N. J., & Hofman, H. W. (2008). Internal versus External Quality Management. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11*(3), 281-300.

Hofman, R. H., Dijkstra, N. J., & Hofman, H. W. (2009). School Self-Evaluation and Student Achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 20*(1), 47-68.

Hogenbirk, P., & Braak, P. (2013). ICT action school development at Helen Parkhurst Dalton School. *Education and Information Technologies, 18*(2), 233-243.

Huber, F. (2008). Konsequenzen aus der externen Evaluation an Bayerns Schulen. In W. B. W. Boettcher, H. Doebert, & H. G. Holtappels (Ed.), *Bildungsmonitoring und Bildungscontrolling in nationaler und internationaler Perspektive* (pp. 265-268). Munster: Waxmann

Hussain, I. (2012). *Subjective performance in the public sector: evidence from school inspections*: London School of Economics and Political Science. Centre for Economic Performance.

IpsosMori (2008). *School inspections - final report 2008*: Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills.

Jacob, B. A. (2005). Accountability, incentives and behavior: the impact of high-stakes testing in the Chicago public schools. *Journal of Public Economics, 89*(5), 6.

Janssens, F. J. (2011). An Evaluation of the Impact of the Publication of School Performance Indicators in the Netherlands. International Journal of Educational Policies, 5(2), 55-73.

Janssens, F. J. G. & Visscher, A. J. (2004) Naar een kwaliteitskaart voor het primair onderwijs, Pedagogische Studiën, 81, 371–383. [Towards a school report card for primary education, Educational Studies, 81]

Jung, T. N., J.; Kim, J. (2008). Synthetic Report of School Assessment , Seoul. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Karagiorgi, Y. (2012). School self-evaluation at an embryonic stage: depicting teachers' experiences with a participative project. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: theory and practice, 15*(2), 199-220.

Karsten, S., Visscher, A., & De Jong, T. (2001). Another Side to the Coin: The Unintended Effects of the Publication of School Performance Data in England and France. *Comparative Education, 37*(2), 231-242.

Keddie, A., Mills, M., & Pendergast, D. (2011). Fabricating an Identity in Neo-Liberal Times: Performing Schooling as "Number One". *Oxford Review of Education, 37*(1), 75-92.

Kim, K. K., K.; Kim,S.; Kim, J.; Kim, J.; Park, J. . (2010). OECD Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes: Country Background Report for Korea. Seoul.

Kim, S., Jung, T. and Kim, J. (2009). Analytical Study on School Evaluation Results and Improvement Measures. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Klerks, M. (2013). The effect of school inspections: a systematic review. *www.schoolinspections.eu (retrieved January 2014)*.

Kluger, A. N. a. D. (1996). The effects of Feedback Interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary Feedback Intervention Theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*(2), 30.

Knapp, M.S. & Feldman, S. B. (2012). Managing the Intersection of Internal and External Accountability: Challenge for Urban School Leadership in the United States. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(5), 666.

Koning, P., & Wiel, K. V. d. (2013). Ranking the schools: how school-quality information affects school choice in the Netherlands. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 11*(2), 466.

Land, D. (2002). Local School Boards Under Review: Their Role and Effectiveness in Relation to Students' Academic Achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(2), 229-278.

Learmonth, J. (2000). *Inspection: What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.

Lee, J. (2010). Review of "Stuck Schools: A Framework for Identifying Schools Where Students Need Change--Now" (pp. 10) rectrived from http://www.colorado.edu/education/centersoutreach/epic.html. 21 December 2013.

Livingston, K., & McCall, J. (2005). Evaluation: Judgemental or Developmental? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(2), 165-178.

Luginbuhl, R., Webbink, D., & de Wolf, I. (2009). Do Inspections Improve Primary School Performance? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 31*(3), 221-237.

Lunneblad, J. & Carlsson, M. A. (2012) Performativity as pretence: a study of testing practices in a compulsory school in Sweden. *Ethnography and Education*, 7(3), 297-309.

Lupton, R., & Hempel-Jorgensen, A. (2012). The importance of teaching: pedagogical constraints and possibilities in working-class schools. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(5), 601-620.

MacBeath, J. (2000). *Self-evaluation in European schools : a story of change*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Maslowski, R., & Visscher, A.J. (1999). The potential of formative evaluation in program design models. . In R. M. B. J. van den Akker, K. Gustafson, N. Nieveen, & Tj. Plomp (Ed.), *Design methodology and development research in education and training*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Masters, G. N. (2012). Measuring and rewarding school improvement *Measuring and rewarding school improvement.*: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), Melbourne.

Matthews, P., & Sammons, P. (2005). Survival of the Weakest: The Differential Improvement of Schools Causing Concern in England. *London Review of Education, 3*(2), 159-176.

Matthews, P. & Sammons, P. (2004). Improvement through Inspection: An Evaluation of the Impact of Ofsted's Work. London: Institute of Education.

Maughan, D., Teeman, D., Wilson, R. (2012). What leads to positive change in teaching practice?

McCrone, T., Coghlan, M., Wade, P., & Rudd, P. (2009). Evaluation of the impact of Section 5 inspections - strand 3. Final report for Ofsted. *Evaluation of the impact of Section 5 inspections - strand 3. Final report for Ofsted*, 58.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited; macro perspectives and micro realities, Educational Researcher, 19(9), 11–16. *Educational Researcher, 19*(9), 6.

McNamara, G., & O'Hara, J. (2006). Workable compromise or pointless exercise? School-based evaluation in the Irish context. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 34*(4), 564-582.

McNamara, G., & O'Hara, J. (2008). The Importance of the Concept of Self-Evaluation in the Changing Landscape of Education Policy. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 34*(3), 173-179.

McNamara, G., O'Hara, J., Lisi, P. L., & Davidsdottir, S. (2011). Operationalising self-evaluation in schools: experiences from Ireland and Iceland. *Irish Educational Studies, 30*(1), 63-82.

Meuret, D., & Morlaix, S. (2003). Conditions of Success of a School's Self-Evaluation: Some Lessons of an European Experience. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 14*(1), 53-71.

Meijer, A. (2004) Vreemde ogen dwingen. De betekenis van internet voor maatschappelijke controle in de publieke sector (Den Haag, Boom Juridische uitgevers). [The authority of external forces. The significance of the Internet for social control in the public sector].

Mutch, C. (2012). Complementary Evaluation: The Development of a Conceptual Framework to Integrate External and Internal Evaluation in the New Zealand School Context. *Policy Futures in Education, 10*(5), 569-586.

Nees, P. (2006). SCHOOLS AND THEIR E.R.O. RECOMMENDATIONS: a study of six Wellington area schools – May / June 2006 Sabbatical Report.

Nusche, D., Halász, G. G., Looney, J., Santiago, P., & Shewbridge, C. (2011). OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Sweden 2011.

Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. (2012). How colleges improve. A review of effective practice: what makes an impact and why. Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills.

Onderwijs, I. v. h. (2010a). Risico gericht toezicht beoordeeld. Utrecht: Inspectie van het Onderwijs

Onderwijs, I. v. h. (2010b). Tevredenheidsonderzoek Periode juni–oktober. Utrecht: Inspectie van het Onderwijs.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). *Synergies for better learning : an international perspective on evaluation and assessment*. [Paris]: OECD.

Ouston, J. (1997). What Do Schools Do after OFSTED School Inspections--Or Before? (pp. 95-104).

Ozga, J. (2009). Governing education through data in England: from regulation to self-evaluation. *Journal of Education Policy, 24*(2), 149-162.

Ozga, J. (2013). Accountability as a policy technology: accounting for education performance in Europe. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 79*(2), 292-309.

Perryman, J. (2005). School Leadership and Management after Special Measures: Discipline without the Gaze? *School Leadership and Management, 25*(3), 281-297.

Perryman, J. (2006). Panoptic Performativity and School Inspection Regimes: Disciplinary Mechanisms and Life under Special Measures. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 147-161.

Perryman, J. (2007). Inspection and Emotion. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 37*(2), 173-190.

Perryman, J. (2009). Inspection and the Fabrication of Professional and Performative Processes. *Journal of Education Policy, 24*(5), 611-631.

Perryman, J. (2010). Improvement after Inspection. *Improving Schools, 13*(2), 182-196.

Ranson, S., Farrell, C. M., Peim, N., & Smith, P. (2005). Does governance matter for school improvement? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16*(3), 305-325.

Rose, J., & Rogers, S. (2012). Principles under Pressure: Student Teachers' Perspectives on Final Teaching Practice in Early Childhood Classrooms. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 20*(1), 43-58.

Rosenthal, L. (2004). Do School Inspections Improve School Quality? Ofsted Inspections and School Examination Results in the UK. *Economics of Education Review, 23*(2), 143-151.

Rossi, P. H., & Freeman, H.E. (1993). *Evaluation; A systematic approach.* . Newbury Park/London/New Delhi: Sage.

Saatcioglu, A., Moore, S., Sargut, G., & Bajaj, A. (2011). The Role of School Board Social Capital in District Governance: Effects on Financial and Academic Outcomes. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 10*(1), 1-42.

Schagen, S. a. W., C. (2009). School Resources, Culture and Connections, , Wellington. Wellington: New Zealand Council of Educational Research (NZCER).

Schildkamp, K., & Teddlie, C. (2008). School Performance Feedback Systems in the USA and in the Netherlands: A Comparison. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 14*(3), 255-282.

Schildkamp, K., Vanhoof, J., Petegem, P. v., & Visscher, A. J. (2012). The use of school self-evaluation results in the Netherlands and Flanders. *British Educational Research Journal, 38*(1), 125-152.

Schildkamp, K., & Visscher, A. (2010a). The Use of Performance Feedback in School Improvement in Louisiana. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 26*(7), 1389-1403.

Schildkamp, K., & Visscher, A. (2010b). The Utilisation of a School Self-Evaluation Instrument. *Educational Studies, 36*(4), 371-389.

Shaw, I., Newton, P. D., Aitkin, M., & Darnell, R. (2003). Do OFSTED Inspections of Secondary Schools Make a Difference to GCSE Results? *British Educational Research Journal, 29*(1), 63.

Simmonds, G. & Vass, P. (2002). External Review – Theory and Practice for the Regulatory State.

Smith, P. (1995). On the unintended consequences of publishing performance data in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration, 18*(2&3), 43.

State Services Commission, the Treasury, and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (2012). Performance Improvement Framework Formal Review: Education Review Office. Wellington, New Zealand Government.

Storey, A. (2007). Cultural Shifts in Teaching: New Workforce, New Professionalism? *Curriculum Journal, 18*(3), 253-270.

Storey, A. (2009). How Fares the "New Professionalism" in Schools? Findings from the "State of the Nation" Project. *Curriculum Journal, 20*(2), 121-138.

Tuck, J. (2012). Feedback-giving as social practice: teachers' perspectives on feedback as institutional requirement, work and dialogue. *Teaching in Higher Education, 17*(2), 209-221.

Tymms, P., & Albone, S. . (2002). Performance indicators in primary schools. In A. J. V. R. Coe (Ed.), *School improvement through performance feedback* Lisse/Abingdon/Exton/Tokyo: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Ushomirsky, N. (2011). Stuck Schools Revisited: Beneath the Averages. K-12 Policy (pp. 24): Education Trust. 1250 H Street NW Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005.

Ushomirsky, N., & Hall, D. (2010). Stuck Schools: A Framework for Identifying Schools where Students Need Change--Now! K-12 Policy (pp. 22): Education Trust. 1250 H Street NW Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005.

Van Petegem, P., & Vanhoof, J. (2007). Towards a Model of Effective School Feedback: School Heads' Points of View. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 13*(4), 311-325.

Vanhoof, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). Evaluating the quality of self-evaluations: The (mis)match between internal and external meta-evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 36*(1-2), 20-26.

Vanhoof, J., Verhaeghe, G., Van Petegem, P., & Valcke, M. (2012). Flemish Primary Teachers' Use of School Performance Feedback and the Relationship with School Characteristics. *Educational Research, 54*(4), 431-449.

Vanhoof, J., Verhaeghe, G., Verhaeghe, J. P., Valcke, M., & Van Petegem, P. (2011). The Influence of Competences and Support on School Performance Feedback Use. *Educational Studies, 37*(2), 141-154.

Vasgar, J. (2012, 17 January 2012). Ofsted 'satisfactory' rating to be scrapped, news report, *The Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/education/2012/jan/17/ofsted-satisfactory-rating-scrapped 21 December, 2013.

Verhaeghe, G., Vanhoof, J., Valcke, M., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). Using School Performance Feedback: Perceptions of Primary School Principals. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21*(2), 167-188.

Vincent, C., Braun, A., & Ball, S. (2010). Local Links, Local Knowledge: Choosing Care Settings and Schools. *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(2), 279-298.

Visscher, A. J. (2001). Public school performance indicators: Problems and recommendations. . *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 27*(3), 16.

Visscher, A. J., & Coe, R. (2003). School Performance Feedback Systems: Conceptualization, Analysis, and Reflection. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 14*(3), 321-349.

Wales, H. M. s. I. f. E. a. T. i. (2012). *How well are the All-Wales Core Data Sets used to inform self-evaluation and planning for improvement?* Cardiff: Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales (Estyn).

Walker, M., Jeffes, J., Hart, R., Lord, P., & Kinder, K. (2011). *Making the links between teachers' professional standards, induction, performance management and continuing professional development*: Department for Education.

Waterreus, I. (2003) Lessons in teacher pay; studies on incentives and the labour market for teachers. Doctoral Thesis, University of Amsterdam.

Weiss, C. H. (1988). Improving the use of evaluations: Whose job is it anyway? In A. J. R. H. J. Walberg (Ed.), *Advances in educational productivity* (Vol. 7). Greenwich, London: JAI Press.

West, A., Mattei, P., & Roberts, J. (2011). Accountability and Sanctions in English Schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 59*(1), 41-62.

Whitby, K. (2010). School inspections: recent experiences in high performing education systems. Reading, England.: CfBT Education Trust.

Whylie, C. (2012). Challenges around capability improvements in a system of self-managed schools in New Zealand. San Francisco: WestEd.

Wiggins, A., & Tymms, P. (2002). Dysfunctional effects of league tables: a comparison between English and Scottish primary schools. *Public money and management, 22*(1), 43-48.

Wilkins, C. (2011). Professionalism and the post-performative teacher: new teachers reflect on autonomy and accountability in the English school system. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(3), 389-409.

Willis, L. (2010). Is the process of special measures an effective tool for bringing about authentic school improvement? *Management in Education, 24*(4), 142-148.

Wong, M. N., & Li, H. (2010). From External Inspection to Self-Evaluation: A Study of Quality Assurance in Hong Kong Kindergartens. *Early Education and Development, 21*(2), 205-233.

Wong, W.L. (2010). Implementation of School Self-Evaluation in Secondary Schools: Teachers' Perspective. (Ed.D.) The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Appendix 1. Details of studies included in the literature review

Title	Authors	Document type	Publisher	Publication year	Country	Sector	MSMA level	Design	Data	Sample	Research period
How should we treat under-performing schools? A regression discontinuity analysis of school inspections in England.	Allen, R. and Burgess, S.	Working paper	University of Bristol, Centre for Market and Public Organisation, Bristol Institute of Public Affairs.	2012	England	Secondary schools	4	Regression discontinuity design (RDD)	quantitative	All secondary schools inspected from 2002 to 2009 with a panel identified from those 'just failing' and 'just passing'	2002 - 2009
Making the Good Even Better: Feedback from easyCBM Focus Groups, School Year 2009/2010. Technical Report # 1001	Alonzo, Julie;Tindal, Gerald;Lai, Cheng-Fe	technical report	Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon.	2010	USA	schools	-	evaluation	qualitative (survey and focus groups)	survey of 42 schools, teachers and administrators, 2 focus groups	2010
The effects of a free school choice policy on parents' school choice behaviour	Altrichter, Herbert Bacher, Johann Beham, Martina Nagy, Gertrud Wetzelhutter, Daniela	journal article	Studies in Educational Evaluation	2011	Austria	primary schools	1	survey	quantitative	3245 surveys, with 55% response rate	2007-8
Leading Data Use in Schools: Organizational Conditions and Practices at the School and District Levels	Anderson, Stephen;Leithwood, Kenneth;Strauss, Tiiu	journal article	Leadership and Policy in Schools	2010	Ontario, Canada	primary, secondary, special	3	mixed methods	quantitative and qualitative	180 schools	not stated

Title	Author	Type	Journal/Publisher	Year	Country	School type		Methodology	Data type	Sample	Date
Technology Enhanced Feedback Tools as a Knowledge Management Mechanism for Supporting Professional Growth and School Reform	Bain, Alan;Swan, Gerry	journal article	Educational Technology Research and Development	2011	USA	independent school	-	case study	qualitative	1 school	not stated
The school governance study	Balarin, M; Brammer, S.;James, C.;McCormack, M.	report	Business in the Community	2008	England	primary, secondary, special	1	mixed methods	quantitative (survey) and qualitative (Interviews)	5000 for survey	2008
I heard it on the grapevine': 'hot' knowledge and school choice.	Ball, Stephen; Vincent, Carol	journal article	British Journal of Sociology of Education	1998	England	secondary schools	-	qualitative	qualitative, interviews	138 interviews with 172 parents	not stated
Transcending systems thinking in education reform: implications for policy-makers and school leaders	Bates, Agnieszka	journal article	Journal of education policy	2013	England	primary	-	case study	qualitative	2 primary schools	over 12 months, date not provided
Farewell to the tick box inspector? Ofsted and the changing regime of school inspection in England	Baxter, Jacqueline; Clarke, John	Journal article	Oxford Review of Education	2013	England, Scotland, Sweden	schools	-	mixed methods	qualitative	document analysis, interviews in England from research outlined in Grek et al 2013	2010-3
Teachers' Professional Autonomy in England: are neo-liberal approaches incontestable?	Berry, Jon	journal article	Forum	2012	England	primary and secondary	-	longitudinal case studies	qualitative, interviews and emails	22 teachers, 4 HTs, 2 education professionals	May 2010- Apr 2011
Policy enactments in the UK secondary school: examining policy, practice and school positioning.	Braun, Annette Maguire, Meg Ball, Stephen J.	journal article	Journal of education policy	2010	England	secondary	-	case study	qualitative	4 secondary schools	not provided
From self- evaluation to school improvement: the importance of school improvement.	Bubb, Sarah and Earley, Peter	report	CfBT Education Trust	2008	England	primary, secondary, special	-	case studies	qualitative	38 schools	2006-7

Title	Author	Type	Publisher	Year	Country	Level	N	Method	Approach	Sample	Period
A natural experiment in school accountability: the impact of school performance information on pupil progress and sorting,	Burgess, S., Wilson, D., Worth, J.	technical report	CMPO working paper, University of Bristol	2010	England and Wales	secondary	1	England used as a control group in a difference in difference design	quantitative		2000-
Parental choice of primary school in England: what "type" of school do parents choose?	Burgess, Simon;Greaves, Ellen; Vignoles, Anna F.;Wilson, Deborah	report	University of Bristol. Centre for Market and Public Organisation	2009	England	primary schools	1	survey	quantitative	data on 115333 children	2006
Teachers' action research in a climate of performativity	Cain, Tim; Harris, Richard	journal article	Education Action Research	2013	England	secondary	-	case study	qualitative	1 school	2010-11
	Case et al. (2000) as cited in Klerks										
	Chapman (2001) (as cited in Klerks)										
(2010) What happens when high-stakes testing stops?: teachers' perceptions of the impact of compulsory national testing in science of 11-year-olds in England and its abolition in Wales.Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice, 17 (3). pp. 273-286.	Collins, Sue and Reiss, Michael and Stobart, Gordon	journal article	Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice	2010	England and Wales	primary	-	mixed methods	quantiative (survey) and qualitative (focus group interviews)	600 for telephone survey, 74 focus group participants	2007-8
By diverse means: improving Scottish education	Commission on School Reform	think tank report	ReformScotland	2013	Scotland	schools	-	refers to interviews with stakeholders and schools in section on inspection	n/a	n/a	2011-13

By diverse means: improving Scottish education	Commission on School Reform	think tank report	ReformScotland	2013	Scotland	schools	-		n/a	refers to interviews with stakeholders and schools in section on inspection	n/a	2011-13
Ofsted's revised school inspection framework: experiences and implications	Courtney, Steven, J.	conference paper	BERA Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 4-6 September 2012	2012	England	secondary schools		1	mixed methods	quantitative and qualitative	36 respondents from HTs of 175 recently inspected schools, 6 follow up interviews.	2012
New relationship with schools evaluation	Cowan, Georgina	Evaluation report	Department for Education, Schools and Families	2008	England	primary, secondary schools		1	mixed methods	quantitative (surveys) and qualitative (case studies)	survey- 2857 HTs, 778 SIPs, 97 LA officers, 44 school case studies	2005-7
New relationship with schools evaluation	Cowan, Georgina	Evaluation report	Department for Education, Schools and Families	2008	England	primary, secondary schools		1	mixed methods	quantitative (surveys) and qualitative (case studies)	survey- 2857 HTs, 778 SIPs, 97 LA officers, 44 school case studies	2005-7
The New Lives of Teachers	Day, Christopher; Gu, Qing	book	Routledge	2010	England	primary and secondary	-		part of a larger mixed methods longitudinal study, also draws on data from a separate mixed methods study on the impact of school leadership	qualitative	300 teachers, 100 schoos	2001-5

Effects and side effects of inspections and accountability in education: an overview of empirical studies	de Wolf, Inge F; Janssens, Frans J.G.	Journal article	Oxford Review of Education		2007	The Netherlands, England, USA	schools	-	Non systematic literature review	not stated	not stated	Not stated, cited papers date from 1996 to 2005.
	Dedering and Muller (2011) (as cited in Klerks)											
School Improvement through Inspections? First Empirical Insights from Germany	Dedering, K. and Muller, S.	Journal article	Journal of Educational Change		2011	Germany	Primary, secondary, special and vocational schools	1	survey	Quantitative (responses to closed questions) and qualitative (responses to open questions)	468 principals of the 600 schools that had been inspected between 2005 and 2008. 140 primary, 201 secondary, 64 special and 60 vocational school responses.	2008
The impact of school self-evaluation upon student achievement: a group randomisation study	Demetris Demetriou and Leonidas Kyriakides	Journal article	Oxford review of education		2012	Cyprus	Primary schools	5	Multi treatment experimental study	quantitative	60 schools were divided into four groups and assigned randomly to each of the three SSE approaches, plus a control group.	2007-8

Title	Author	Type	Publisher/Journal	Year	Country	Level		Method		Approach	Sample	Data period
Segregation by choice? A study of group specific reasons for school choice.	Denessen, Eddie; Driessena, Geert; Sleegers, Peter	journal article	Journal of Education Policy	2005	The Netherlands	primary schools	1	survey		quantitative	data on 11 362 children and 573 schools	1998-9
High-Stakes Accountability in Urban Elementary Schools: Challenging or Reproducing Inequality?	Diamond, John B.; Spillane, James P.	journal article	Teachers College Record	2004	USA	primary	-	interviews and observation		qualitative	4 schools	1999-2000
To the next level: good schools becoming outstanding	Dougill,Peter; Raleigh, Mike; Blatchford, Roy; Fryer, Lyn; Robinson, Carol; Richmond, John	research report	CfBT Education Trust	2011	England	schools	-	case studies		qualitative	8 schools	2010
Working with National Standards to Promote Students' Progress and Achievement	Education Review Office	evaluation report	New Zealand Government	2012	New Zealand	primary, secondary schools	439	document analysis		quantitative	analyses review report statements about student achievement	2011-2
Working with National Standards to Promote Students' Progress and Achievement	Education Review Office	evaluation report	New Zealand Government	2012	New Zealand	primary, secondary schools	439	document analysis		quantitative	analyses review report statements about student achievement	2011-2

Title	Author	Type	Source	Year	Country	School type		Study design	Method	Sample	Period
Quality and Improvement in Scottish Education: Trends in Inspection Findings 2008-2011	Education Scotland	Government report	Education Scotland	2012	Scotland	Primary schools, secondary schools, independent schools, special schools	-	Presents key findings from reports on inspections conducted between 2008 and 2011 in Scottish schools	Quantitative and qualitative	Inspection reports from 901 primary, 166 secondary, 34 independent and 112 special schools	2008-11
	Ehren and Visscher (2008 (as cited in Klerks)										
Strategic data use of schools in accountability systems	Ehren, M.C.M.; Swanborn, M.S. L.	journal article	School Effectiveness and School Improvement	2012	The Netherlands	secondary	1		quantitative		2006-2007
The Principal's Role in the Post-Evaluation Process.--How Does the Principal Engage in the Work Carried out after the Schools Self-Evaluation?	Emstad, Anne Berit	Journal article	Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability	2011	Norway	Primary schools	-	Comparative Case study	qualitative	2 primary schools	Not provided
(Un)satisfactory? Enhancing life chances by improving 'satisfactory' schools	Francis, Becky	report	RSA http://www.thersa.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/563155/Unsatisfactory_schools_updated.pdf	2011	England	secondary schools	-	mixed methods	quantitative (re-analysis of Ofsted data) and qualitative (document analysis of inspection reports)	inspection judgements in two successive inspections from 1971 schools, case studies of 36 schools	2011

Title	Author	Type	Source	Year	Country	Level		Method	Approach	Sample	Period
(Un)satisfactory? Enhancing life chances by improving 'satisfactory' schools	Francis, Becky	report	RSA http://www.thersa.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/563155/Unsatisfactory_schools_updated.pdf	2011	England	secondary schools	-	mixed methods	quantitative (re-analysis of Ofsted data) and qualitative (document analysis of inspection reports)	inspection judgements in two successive inspections from 1971 schools, case studies of 36 schools	2011
Data feedback for School Improvement: The Role of Researchers and School Leaders	Geijsel, Femke P.;Kruger, Meta L.;Sleegers, Peter J.	journal article	Australian Education Researcher	2010	The Netherlands	primary schools	-	process evaluation	qualitative	18 schools	not stated, 3 year project
Educational Tug-of-War: Internal and External Accountability of Principals in Varied Contexts	Gonzales, R.A.; Firestone, W.A.	journal article	Journal of Educational Administration	2013	USA	elementary	-	interviews	qualitative	25 principals	-
Governing by inspection? European inspectorates and the creation of a European education policy space	Grek, Sotiria; Lawn, Martin;Ozga, Jenny;Segerholm, Christina	journal article	Comparative education	2013	England, Scotland, Sweden	schools	-	mixed methods	qualitative	document analysis including 50 inspection reports, interviews with 90 reps of inspectorates and schools.	2010-3

Title	Author	Type	Venue	Year	Country	School type		Design	Methodology	Sample	Time period
The impact of school self evaluation processes on British teachers' views of their work and professionalism	Hall, Christine; Noyes, Andrew	conference paper	Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Institute of Education, University of London, 5-8 September 2007	2007	England	Secondary schools	-	Multiple case study	Qualitative	Eight schools, selected as representative of secondary schools in England, 4 interviews with a senior and 3 curriculum leaders in each of 7 schools (senior leader only in other school)	2005 - 6
"Managing" Managerialism: The Impact of Educational Auditing on an Academic "Specialist" School	Hardy, I.	journal article	European Education Research Journal	2012	England	secondary school	-	case study	qualitative	1 secondary school	not provided
"Managing" Managerialism: The Impact of Educational Auditing on an Academic "Specialist" School	Hardy, I.	journal article	European Education Research Journal	2012	England	secondary school	-	case study	qualitative, interviews with 18 school staff	1 secondary school	not provided
Missouri Rural School Board Governance and Student Performance	Harris, Zach; Webster, Amanda Beeler	EdD thesis	-	2009	USA	schools	-	not stated	not stated	not stated	not stated
Looking for a balance between internal and external evaluation of school quality: evaluation of the SVI model	Henk Blok , Peter Sleegers & Sjoerd Karsten	Journal article	Journal of Education Policy	2008	The Netherlands	Primary schools, special schools	1	Content analysis of reports from all three phases, questionnaires to school leaders	Qualitative and quantitative	27 volunteer schools, 3 of which were special school	2004-2006

Title	Author	Type	Source	Year	Country	Level		Method	Approach	Sample	Data years
How well are the All-Wales Core Data Sets used to inform self-evaluation and planning for improvement?	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education and Training in Wales (Estyn)	evaluation report	Estyn	2012	Wales	primary, secondary	-	case study	qualitative	23 schools	2012
Teacher fabrication as an impediment to professional learning and development: the external mentor antidote	Hobson, Andrew J.; McIntyre, Joanna	journal article	Oxford Review of Education	2013	England	secondary	-	narrative analysis	qualitative	19 mentors and 47 mentees	2010-11
Contextual Influences on School Effectiveness: The Role of School Boards	Hofman, R	journal article	School Effectiveness and School Improvement	1995	The Netherlands	primary	1	mixed methods	Quantitative) survey and qualitative (case study)	133 for survey	1987-8
Quality Control in Primary Schools: Progress from 2001-2006	Hofman, Roelande H.; de Boom, Jan; Hofman, H. W	Journal article	School Leadership and Management	2010	The Netherlands	Primary schools		Survey followed by both trend, cluster and regression analysis	qualitative	233 primary schools, classified into four types	2003-6
ICT action school development at Helen Parkhurst Dalton School	Hogenbirk, Peter and Braak, Peter	journal article	Education and Information Technologies	2013	The Netherlands	secondary schools	-	case study	qualitative	1 school	2007-11
Subjective performance in the public sector: evidence from school inspections	Hussain, Iftikhar	technical report	London School of Economics and Political Science. Centre for Economic Performance, 2012	2012	England	primary	3	comparative analysis	quantitative	120 schools approx in each year.	2006-9
School inspections - final report 2008	Ipsos MORI	report	Ofsted	2008	England	schools	1	survey	quantitative	541 parents	2008

Title	Authors	Type	Journal	Year	Country	Level		Method	Approach	Sample	Year
The influence of competences and support on school performance feedback use	Jan Vanhoof , Goedele Verhaeghe , Jean Pierre Verhaeghe , Martin Valcke & Peter Van Petegem	journal article	Educational Studies	2011	Flanders		1	randomised field experiment	quantitative (from test and survey data)	188 principals	2008
School self-evaluation at an embryonic stage: depicting teachers' experiences with a participative project	Karagiorgi, Yiasemina	Journal article	International Journal of Leadership in Education: theory and practice	2012	Cyprus	Primary school	-	Case study	Quantitative and qualitative- Questionnaire and document analysis	One primary school	
School self-evaluation at an embryonic stage: depicting teachers' experiences with a participative project	Karagiorgi, Yiasemina	Journal article	International Journal of Leadership in Education: theory and practice	2012	Cyprus	Primary school	-	Case study	Quantitative and qualitative- Questionnaire and document analysis	One primary school	
Another Side to the Coin: The Unintended Effects of the Publication of School Performance Data in England and France	Karsten, S., Visscher, A., & De Jong, T.	journal article	Comparative Education	2001	England, France	schools	-	literature review and interviews	qualitative	18 principals in England	-
Fabricating an Identity in Neo-Liberal Times: Performing Schooling as "Number One"	Keddie, Amanda Mills, Martin Pendergast, Donna	journal article	Oxford Review of Education	2011	Australia	secondary	-	case study	qualitative	1 secondary school	

Title	Author	Type	Source	Year	Country	School		Design	Methodology	Sample	Year
The effect of school inspections: a systematic review	Klerks, M	Working paper	www.schoolinspections.eu	2013	England, The Netherlands, Germany	schools	-	Systematic literature review	14 articles selected for accordance with criteria for peer reviewed, empirical research since 2000.		2012
Managing the Intersection of Internal and External Accountability: Challenge for Urban School Leadership in the United States	Knapp, Michael S.; Feldman, Susan, B.	journal article	Journal of Educational Administration	2012	USA	high schools	-	multi site case study of 15 high schools	qualitative - interviews, observation, document analysis	multi site case study of 15 high schools	2007-8
Managing the Intersection of Internal and External Accountability: Challenge for Urban School Leadership in the United States	Knapp, Michael S.; Feldman, Susan, B.	journal article	Journal of Educational Administration	2012	USA	high schools	-	multi site case study of 15 high schools	qualitative - interviews, observation, document analysis	multi site case study of 15 high schools	2007-8
Ranking the schools: how school-quality information affects school choice in the Netherlands	Koening and van der Wiel	journal article	Journal of the European Economic Association	2013	The Netherlands	secondary schools	3	longitudinal data set analysis	quantitative	all secondary school quality cards, Trouw randings, observations on school and school tracks	data used was from 1995-2006
Local School Boards Under Review: Their Role and Effectiveness in Relation to Students' Academic Achievement	Land, Deborah	journal article	Review of Educational Research	2002	USA	schools	-	literature review	not stated	not stated	180-2002
	Luginbuhl et al. (2009) as cited in Klerks										
Performativity as pretence: a study of testing practices in a compulsory school in Sweden	Lunneblad, J. ;Carlsson, M.A.	journal article	Ethnography and Education	2012	Sweden	primary	-	case study	qualitative	1 school	2006-7

Title	Author	Type	Publisher/Journal	Year	Country	Level		Method		Sample	Data year
The importance of teaching: pedagogical constraints and possibilities in working-class schools	Lupton, Ruth Hempel-Jorgensen, Amelia	journal article	Journal of education policy	2012	England	primary	-	case study	qualitative	4 schools	2004-7
Changing school board governance in primary education through school inspections	M.C.M. Ehren;M.E. Honingh;E.H. Hooge;J.O'Hara	unpublished paper	-	2013	The Netherlands	primary	1	survey	quantitative	244 schools	2011
Measuring and rewarding school improvement	Masters, G. M.	Schools	Australian Council for Educational Research	2012	Australia	schools	-	n/a	Includes quantitative data taken from inspectorates in Queensland and New South Wales		n/a
	Matthews and Sammons (2005) (as cited in Klerks)										
Evaluation of the impact of Section 5 inspections - strand 3. Final report for Ofsted	McCrone, Tami; Coghlan, Misia; Wade, Pauline; Rudd, Peter	Evaluation report	NfER	2009	England	schools	-	case studies	qualitative	18 schools	2008-9
Workable compromise or pointless exercise? School-based evaluation in the Irish context	McNamara, Gerry; O'Hara, Joe	Journal article	Educational Management Administration and Leadership	2006	Ireland	primary and secondary	-	case studies	qualitative	14 interviews in 10 schools	2005

Operationalising self evaluation in schools: experiences from Ireland and Iceland (based research reported in McNamara and O'Hara, 2008, 2009) Iceland 2002- 2004 [available in Icelandic])	McNamara, Gerry; O'Hara, Joe; Lisi, Penelope L.; Davidsdottir, Sigurlina	Journal article	Irish Educational Studies		2011	Ireland and Iceland	schools	-	Ireland: evaluation Iceland survey and multiple case study	Ireland: qualitative	Ireland:interviews with leaders and teachers in 38 schools and with 6 inspectors Iceland: longitudinal study, using surveys and interviews at 3 points from 2002 to 2004	Ireland 2004-2009 ()
Complementary Evaluation:the development of a conceptual framework to integrate external and internal evaluation in the New Zealand school context	Mutch, C	journal article	Policy Futures and Education		2012	New Zealand	primary, secondary schools, EY settings	-	descriptive account, refers to data from case studies, focus groups and literature review	qualitative	not provided	2007-8
Complementary Evaluation:the development of a conceptual framework to integrate external and internal evaluation in the New Zealand school context	Mutch, C	journal article	Policy Futures and Education		2012	New Zealand	primary, secondary schools, EY settings	-	descriptive account, refers to data from case studies, focus groups and literature review	qualitative	not provided	2007-8
Schools and Their ERO Recommendations: a study of six Wellington area schools.	Nees, J.	practitioner report	http://educationalleaders.govt.nz/content/download/744/6082/file/nees-sabbatical-06.pdf		2007	New Zealand	primary schools	-	document analysis and interviews	qualitative	6 schools	2006

Title	Author	Type	Source	Year	Country	School level		Method	Approach	Sample	Year
Schools and Their ERO Recommendations: a study of six Wellington area schools.	Nees, J.	practitioner report	http://educationalleaders.govt.nz/content/download/7446082/file/nees-sabbatical-06.pdf	2006	New Zealand	primary schools	-	document analysis and interviews	qualitative	6 schools	2006
OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Sweden 2011	Nusche, Deborah Halász, Gábor Gábor Looney, Janet Santiago, Paulo Shewbridge, Claire	report	OECD publishing	2011	Sweden	primary, secondary schools	-	interviews with stakeholders and visits to schools	qualitative	not stated	2010
OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Sweden 2011	Nusche, Deborah Halász, Gábor Gábor Looney, Janet Santiago, Paulo Shewbridge, Claire	report	OECD publishing	2011	Sweden	primary, secondary schools	-	case study	qualitative - interviews with stakeholders and visits to schools	not stated	2010
School evaluation: Compliance or Quality? Chapter 6 in Synergies for better learning : an international perspective on evaluation and assessment	OECD	Report	)ECD	2013	25 OECD countries	schools	-	non-systematic literature review as part of the chapter			includes reference to documents from 1990s onwards, includes reference to OECD national studies, which

											included school visits and interviews in ten of the countries included.
School evaluation: Compliance or Quality? Chapter 6 in Synergies for better learning : an international perspective on evaluation and assessment	OECD	Report	)ECD	2013	25 OECD countries	schools	-	non-systematic literature review as part of the chapter			includes reference to documents from 1990s onwards, includes reference to OECD national studies, which included school visits and interviews in ten of the countries included.
Governing education through data in England: from regulation to self-evaluation	Ozga, Jenny	Journal article	Journal of educational policy	2009	England	schools	-	case studies	qualitative	not stated	not stated
Accountability as a policy technology: accounting for education performance in Europe	Ozga, Jenny	journal article	International Review of Administrative Sciences	2013	England, Scotland, Sweden	schools	-	mixed methods	qualitative	document analysis, interviews	2010-3
	Perryman (2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010) (as cited in Klerks)										

Does Governance matter for school improvement?	Ranson, Stewart; Farrell, Catherine M.; Peim, Nick;	journal article	School Effectiveness and School Improvement	2005	Wales	primary	1	mixed methods	quantitative and qualitative	72 schools	2001-2
Principles under Pressure: Student Teachers' Perspectives on Final Teaching Practice in Early Childhood Classrooms	Rose, Janet; Rogers, Sue	journal article	International Journal of Early Years Education	2012	England	early years	-	narrative analysis	qualitative	100 trainee teachers placed in 76 schools	not stated, 'over a 4 year period'
	Rosenthal (2004) (as cited in Klerks)										
The Role of School Board Social Capital in District Governance: Effects on Financial and Academic Outcomes	Saatcioglu, Argun;Moore, Suzanne;Sargut, Gokce;Bajaj, Aarti	journal article	Leadership and Policy in Schools	2011	USA	schools	1	survey	quantitative	175 school boards	2004-7
The use of school self evaluation results in the Netherlands and Flanders	Schildkamp, Kim, Vanhoof, Jan, Petegem, Peter van, Visscher, Adrie J	Journal article	British Educational Research Journal (peer reviewed)	2012	The Netherlands, Flanders	Primary education (The Netherlands) Primary and secondary education (Flanders)	1	survey	Quantitative (responses to closed questions)	The Netherlands, 2003 - 50 schools, av 5 questionnaires per school; 2004 50 schools av 6 questionnaires per school; 2006 31 school, av 5 questionnaires per school. Flanders, 96 schools and 1786 questionnairs	2003-2006
	Shaw et al. (2003) (as cited in										

	Klerks										
Formal Review of the Education Review Office	State Services Commission	NZ govt. performance review	New Zealand Government	2012	New Zealand	primary, secondary schools, EY settings	-	interviews with relevant govt agencies, teacher associations, school principals	qualitative, but quotes some quantitative data from an ERO survey	not stated	not stated
Formal Review of the Education Review Office	State Services Commission	NZ govt. performance review	New Zealand Government	2012	New Zealand	primary, secondary schools, EY settings	-	n/a	qualitative,interviews with relevant govt agencies, teacher associations, school principals, but quotes some quantitative data from an ERO survey	not stated	not stated
Cultural Shifts in teaching: new workforce, new professionalism	Storey, A	journal article	The Curriculum Journal	2007	England	secondary	-	mixed method	quantiative (survey) and qualitative(interviews, school visits, document analysis)	prospective teachers, mature career changes	2004-6
How fares the 'New Professionalism' in schools? Findings from the 'State of the Nation' project.	Storey, A	journal article	The Curriculum Journal	2009	England	primary, secondary	-	mixed method	survey and case studies	teachers, HTs, govs, LA officers	not stated
Feedback-giving as social practice: teachers' perspectives on feedback as institutional requirement, work and	Tuck, Jackie	journal article	Teaching in Higher Education	2012	England	higher education	-	part of a larger ethnographic study	qualitative, interviews	14 university teachers	not provided

dialogue											
Towards a Model of Effective School Feedback: School Heads' Points of View	van Petegem, Peter; Vanhoof, Jan	journal article	Educational Research and Evaluation	2007	Flanders	high schools	-	qualitative	qualitative (interviews)	5 principals	not stated
Flemish Primary Teachers' Use of School Performance Feedback and the Relationship with School Characteristics	Vanhoof, Jan Verhaeghe, Goedele Van Petegem, Peter Valcke, Martin	journal article	Educational Research	2012	Flanders	primary schools	1	survey	quantitative (survey responses based on teacher perceptions)	2578 repspondent, 183 schools	2008
Evaluating the quality of self-evaluations: The (mis)match between internal and external meta-evaluation	Vanhoof, Jan; van Petegem, Peter	Journal article	Studies in Educational Evaluation	2010	Flanders	primary and secondary	1	survey	quantitative	sample of 598 schools	not stated
Using School Performance Feedback: Perceptions of Primary School Principals	Verhaeghe, Goedele;Vanhoof, Jan;Valcke, Martin;Van Petegem, Peter	journal article	School Effectiveness and School Improvement	2010	Flanders	primary schools	-	qualitative	qualitative (interviews)	16 principals	2008
Local Links, Local Knowledge: Choosing Care Settings and Schools	Vincent, Carol,Braun, Annette, Ball, Stephen	journal article	British Education Research Journal	2010	England	primary schools	-		qualitative	98 interviews with parents in 70 working class families in two inner city areas	2005-7
Making the links between professional standards, induction, performance management and continuing professional development of teachers: A study, NFER, DfE.	Walker, M., Jeffes, J., Hart, R., Lord, P., Kinder, K.	report	NfER/DfE	2011	England	primary, secondary	1	survey	quantitative	teachers, HTs, govs, LA officers	2010

School inspection: recent experiences in high performing education systems	Whitby, K.	Literature review/report	CfBT Education Trust		2010	The Netherlands, Hong Kong, New Zealand, Singapore, England, Scotland	Primary schools, secondary schools (compulsory education only)	-	Systematic, Thematic comparison of inspection systems	Document analysis	Restricted to work in English, 40 documents reviewed	Based on review of documents from 2000 onwards
Challenges around capability improvements in a system of self-managed schools in New Zealand	Whylie, Carol	report	Wested	2012	New Zealand	schools	-	-	-	n/a	n/a
Challenges around capability improvements in a system of self-managed schools in New Zealand	Whylie, Carol	report	WestEd	2012	New Zealand	schools	-	n/a	document review	n/a	2009-2012
Professionalism and the post-performative teacher: new teachers reflect on autonomy and accountability in the English school system	Wilkins, Chris	journal article	Professional Development in Education	2011	England	primary	-	case studies	qualitative (interviews)	14 beginning teachers	not stated
	Willis (2010) (as cited in Klerks)										
Implementation of School Self-Evaluation in Secondary Schools: Teachers' Perspective	Wong W. L.	Ed D Thesis	The Chinese university Hong Kong	2010	Hong Kong	Secondary school	-		qualitative	3 secondary schools	
- From External Inspection to Self-Evaluation: A Study of Quality Assurance in Hong Kong Kindergartens	Wong, Margaret N., Li, Hui	Journal article	Early Education and Development	2010	Hong Kong	kindergartens	-	Mixed methods	Quantitative analysis of inspection outcomes, qualitative (interviews with principals and school staff)	80 recently inspected kindergartens, 3 case studies	2004 - 2007