Theses and Dissertations

Fall 2018

A New System of Teacher Evaluation in the Central Valley Elementary School District: An Action Research Study

Bryan Ballenger

A New System of Teacher Evaluation in the Central Valley Elementary School District:
An Action Research Study

by

Bryan Ballenger

Bachelor of Science
California State University of Sacramento, 1998

Master of Arts
California State University Stanislaus, 2005

_____

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education in

Curriculum & Instruction

College of Education

University of South Carolina

2018

Accepted by:

Rhonda Jeffries, Major Professor

Leigh D'Amico, Committee Member

Suha Tamim, Committee Member

Toni Williams, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation committee- Dr. Rhonda Jeffries, Dr. Leigh D'Amico, Dr. Suha Tamim, and Dr. Toni Williams for their feedback and advice on my dissertation. Special acknowledgement goes to Dr. Rhonda Jeffries for serving as my major professor and assisting me in completing this dissertation. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Yasha Becton for all of the work she does behind the scenes to assist students in completing the program.

I would also like to thank my school district, especially my school board members, for the support and encouragement to complete the program. Without their support and the support of the teachers, this study would not have been possible. Additionally, the participants in my study have my sincerest thanks and deepest respect for their willingness to discuss their perceptions and experiences.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife and sons for supporting me over the past three and a half years. Their love and support pushed me to complete my program, and now I look forward to visiting the University of South Carolina soon as alumni.

ABSTRACT

This action research study describes the problem of practice as a dysfunctional evaluation system that is not meeting the needs of the teachers or the administration within the Central Valley Elementary School District. The identification of the problem of practice led to the development of a research focus examining elementary-level teachers' beliefs concerning Danielson's Framework for Teaching as the method for evaluation and the accompanying research question: *What are elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model?* The purpose of the present action research study is to identify elementary teachers' beliefs concerning Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model. This action research study looked at two sets of data on teachers' perceptions. The first set of qualitative data examined teachers' sense of self efficacy using the Teachers' Sense of Self Efficacy Scale (TSES) long form. Teachers were given the TSES at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and at the conclusion. The scaled mean scores were compared. The second set of data was the semistructured interview questions. The information from these two sources was used for the findings of the study that showed a positive perception of elementary teachers toward DFTEM. Upon completion of the data analysis, a committee reviewed the findings and developed an action plan to support the implementation of DFTEM across the district.

Keywords: Danielson Framework for Teaching, teacher evaluation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter One is to describe the present action research study involving Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013) as the model for teacher evaluation in an elementary school district in the Central Valley of California. This research study seeks to examine teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model (DFTEM). Teachers have requested a new evaluation model to replace the current evaluation model used by the district. As the superintendent\principal of the district, I am the participant-researcher with members of the District's evaluation committee serving as participants in the research process.

Background

Our nation's greatest resource is not something we drill or mine for, it is not an abundance of natural resources, and it is not our leaders of today. It is our children and our nation's future depends on our children. Trainer (2015) stated, "Children are not a distraction from more important work. They are the most important work" (para. 4). With this belief, our nation theoretically places a high priority on educating our children. This is evident by all 50 states having some form of compulsory education law on the books.

While the federal government provides guidance, rules and regulations, and financial resources there are no federal laws or mandates in the United States Constitution regarding compulsory education. In fact, in 1973 the United States Supreme Court in *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez* held that education was not a fundamental right under the constitution (State University.com, n.d.). Because of this, education is a state matter and states in turn decide how old students should be to start school, the number of days in a school year, the number years in school, curriculum standards, and preparation requirements for teachers. These policies show how important our children are and the role education plays in their futures. Schwarzenegger (year) allocated funds for education while governor in California and stated, "You know, nothing is more important than education, because nowhere are our stakes higher; our future depends on the quality of education of our children today" (source page number or other reference point). In California and most every U.S. state, parents drop off their public school students 180 days a year with someone who, for the most part, is a stranger. Parents place a great deal of trust on our schools and our teachers to educate their children to the highest standard possible. According to Hill and Herlihy (2011):

> [T]eachers are the most important school-level factor in student success—but as any parent knows, all teachers are not created equal … reforms … if done well, have the potential to remove the worst-performing teachers and, even more important, to assist the majority in improving their craft. (p. 1)

Teachers are the single greatest school level factor influencing student learning. Research studies over the past twenty plus years have supported this conclusion. If teachers have the greatest influence, then it is up to school leaders to ensure students are getting the best

teachers and the best instruction (Cooney & Bottoms, 2003, Danielson, 2007, Darling-Hammond, 2000, 2010, 2012, Kaplan & Owings, 2001, Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001, Schmoker, 1996).

An effective system of teacher evaluation is one tool to help schools and districts ensure students receive highly effective teachers. "Old systems of evaluating educators, relying upon infrequent and unstandardized observations are being replaced with more rigorous systems that include frequent observations with validated protocols, evidence of teacher practice and student outcomes, and measure of student learning" (Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, & Haferd, 2012, p. 3). Legislation such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Race to the Top (RTT) have put increasing teacher quality and teacher effectiveness front and center. More and more schools and districts are reconsidering how they conduct evaluations while looking to research to identify best practices around teacher evaluations.

Central Valley Elementary School District (CVESD)

The Central Valley Elementary School District (CVESD) is a small rural public-school district located in California's Central Valley. The district has 390 students, of which 1/3 are inter-district students living outside the district's boundaries and choosing to enroll in CVESD rather than the student's district of residence. The district has experienced growth over the past five years. Enrollment has increased every year with a total increase of over 100 students since August 2010. The percentage of students on inter-district transfers has also increased from 20% of enrollment to 33% of enrollment. According to the 2015 and 2016 Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) surveys, inter-district parents cited the following reasons for choosing CVESD over their

children's district of residence: smaller class sizes (K-2 < 24, 3-8 < 28), a small school setting (Upper 255 students and Lower 135 students), and the district's commitment to providing students with a 21st Century education (all students are provided with a Chromebook, digital instructional materials, and 24/7 internet service through a mobile broadband MiFi device).

CVESD is made up of two schools four miles apart. Lower Elementary School serves students in grades transitional kindergarten through second and Upper Elementary School serves students in grades three through eight. The district is currently utilizing all classroom space and passed a local school bond to increase property taxes in June 2016 to build a new middle school and modernize existing facilities.

CVESD has eighteen general education teachers, two special education teachers, one counselor, a part-time speech and language therapist, one superintendent\principal, one curriculum director\instructional coach\principal, one vice principal as needed, and a part-time educational technology integration specialist. For school year 2016-2017 the district will have six teachers in their first year with the district and two teachers with less than a year of service with the district. Nearly half of the district's teachers were not employed with CVESD when the evaluation committee was formed.

CVESD administrators work hard to build high levels of trust with the district's teachers. Always included in the superintendent's annual goals is a concern for building and maintaining trust with all stakeholders. Trust in the district is extremely high and as a result less than 30% of the teachers belong to the California Teachers Association (CTA). Collective bargaining with the district's teachers consists of the superintendent and two

teacher representatives meeting over lunch. For one to two hours in conference the district is able to reach an agreement with its teachers.

The last two teacher contracts have been for three years with a raise in the first year and no additional raises for subsequent years in the contract. Both sides have agreed to come to the table at any time a request is made by either party. While raises have only been specified in the first year of the contract, the governing board has provided all employees with either a one-time bonus or a raise on the schedule every year for the past six years.

During the most recent contract negotiation in April of 2015, the teachers asked the administration for a review of the district's current practice of evaluation and expressed a desire to explore a new teacher evaluation model. The foundation and rationale for conducting the present action research study comes at their request. As such, an evaluation committee was formed to research and study teacher evaluation models. The evaluation committee is comprised of five teachers, a human resource representative, and two administrators. The committee is expected to evaluate current research and best practices in teacher evaluation models, recommend key components of highly effective evaluation models, collect survey data from teachers and administrators, report findings to all stakeholders, and determine the appropriate evaluation model for use by the district in the future.

CVESD at present conducts teacher evaluations the "traditional way" as described by Danielson (2010, 2012). The current process for teacher evaluation is based on the current collectively bargained contract. The current contract requires all probationary teachers to be observed in their classrooms by an administrator three times a year.

Tenured teachers are evaluated every other year. Teachers in California are granted tenure after completing two school years. Teachers can be released without cause any time in the first two-years with the district. Once a teacher receives tenure the district must show cause in order to terminate the teacher.

Evaluations for tenured teachers consist of one classroom observation of one lesson by an administrator. The contract requires the administrator and teacher to have a pre- and post-observation conference. During the pre-conference the teacher and administrator discuss day and time of the evaluation and the lesson to be observed. During the post-conference the teacher receives a lesson summary from the administrator. The administrator and teacher discuss the lesson examining the strengths and areas for improvement.

At the end of the evaluation year, the teacher receives a summative evaluation tied to the California Standards to for the Teaching Profession (2009). Teachers are rated using these four categories: exceeds standard expectations, meets standard expectations, developing practice-consistent with standard expectations, and unsatisfactory-not consistent with standard expectations. Teachers receive a rating on all standards.

A report on teacher evaluation systems published by The New Teacher Project (2011) concluded:

Implementing a new teacher evaluation system is hard work, but the payoff is worth the effort. Better evaluations are critical; not only will they ensure that teachers get the meaningful feedback they deserve as professionals, but that school leaders get the information they need to retain their most effective

teachers, remove consistently low-performing teachers, and help all teachers

reach their full potential in the classroom. (p. 7)

The evaluation committee recognizes how hard the work of designing a new teacher

evaluation system can be. They are aware of the massive time commitment and the hard

work involved. However, nothing should be more important to the stakeholders in the

CVESD than growing and improving annually. An effective teacher evaluation system

allows for teachers to improve and grow professionally.

Statement of the Problem

The identified problem of practice in the Central Valley Elementary School

District (CVESD) is a dysfunctional evaluation system that is not meeting the needs of

teachers or administrators. The current teacher evaluation model has been in place in

CVESD for the past 15 years. The participant-researcher only has access to records of

teacher evaluations for the past 15 years. The forms utilized within the district have

changed, but the overall process has remained the same.

In *Evaluations That Help Teachers Learn* Danielson (2010) describes "a

traditional model of evaluation" and the description matches the current evaluation model

used in CVESD. In this model, teachers are treated as passive participants in the

evaluation process, and it is based upon the idea that teachers should be active

participants in the evaluation process. Additionally, "teacher evaluation has two essential

purposes: ensuring teacher quality and promoting teacher learning" (Danielson, 2007, p.

42). In order for this to happen, teachers must take an active role in their evaluation. The

present study seeks to understand elementary teacher perceptions of the ways in which

they are evaluated using Danielson's Framework for Teaching during the 2017-2018 school year.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the present action research study is to implement Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Module as the model of teacher evaluation in CVESD and find out the teachers' perceptions of it.

Research Question

RQ1: What are elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model?

Action Research Methodology

To conduct this research, the participant-researcher has chosen to utilize action research as the methodological approach. Mertler (2014) defined action research:

> as any systematic inquiry conducted by teachers, administrators, counselors, or others with a vested interest in the teaching and learning process or environment for the purpose of gathering information about how their particular schools operate, how their staff teaches teach, and how their students learn (p. 4).

The primary goal of this action research study is to improve the quality of instruction and professional practice through the alignment of a system for evaluation, feedback, and professional development.

In California, teacher preparation programs fail to teach teacher candidates how to conduct and utilize action research in their classrooms. To make it even more difficult for new teachers to conduct action research, once a teacher has achieved certification his/her access to research databases is terminated and they are limited to Internet searches. For

teachers to access instruction regarding research and action research, one must enroll in a master's program to practice action research methodologies. Vaughan and Burnaford (2015) conducted a review of literature for a fifteen-year period (2000 to 2015) on action research in graduate teacher education. Through their examination of literature, they came to a similar conclusion: "Colleges of education typically do require graduate students to take courses in basic research, but master's students in particular are seldom asked to complete original research studies" (p. 283). Thus, the participant-researcher introduced the teacher evaluation committee to the basics of conducting action research.

The participant-researcher utilized Mertler (2014) to provide the evaluation committee with a model of the action research process. "Action research models begin with a central problem or topic. They involve some observation or monitoring of current practice, followed by the collection and synthesis of information and data. Finally, some sort of action is taken" (p. 14). Teachers during the most recent negotiation session asked to explore other models of teacher evaluations and in doing so started the action research process.

By utilizing action research, the participant-researcher seeks to empower teachers in the methodology while giving them a process they can replicate in their classrooms as problems arise and solutions are sought. "When teachers collect their own data in order to assist in making decisions about their own students and classrooms—which is essentially an action research model of teaching—they become empowered" (Mertler, 2014, p. 24). The action research process gives teachers and administrators a common language and approach to utilize when discussing other applications in their classrooms. This will enable and help to serve as a baseline for a cycle of continuous improvement in CVESD.

Historical Context

California

The Stull Act was passed into law in California in 1971. This is the major piece of legislation mandating teacher evaluations. Probationary teachers and teachers who received an unsatisfactory rating without improvement are required to be evaluated annually, while tenured teachers are evaluated every other year. The law provides for a reduction in frequency for tenured teachers with more than ten years of service. Districts could then choose to evaluate those teachers every five years. Originally, the Stull Act setup only two performance categories: satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

In 1999, the law was amended to require school boards to evaluate teachers based on state test scores where they reasonably relate to the classroom teacher's performance. While technically the law, few districts have successfully negotiated the use of student assessment scores into teacher evaluations. Most local teachers' associations in California school districts are represented by California Teachers Association. Evaluations are traditionally bargained as part of the districts teachers' union contract (Fensterwald, 2016).

In 2009 the creation of the Federal State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) required states to collect data from local education agencies (LEA) on how the LEAs conduct teacher evaluations. In the summer of 2010 the California Department of Education conducted a survey to gather the information. The completed survey was returned by 1,482 of the state's 1,490 LEAs. There were a number of key findings: 61% said their evaluations were based on the California Standards for the Teaching profession,

41% said their local school board approves their teachers evaluation system, 57% included student achievement outcomes or growth data for partial or primary evidence, 96% used evaluations as partial or primary evidence in dismissal decisions, 93% used evaluations for retention decisions, and 54% used evaluations for promotion decisions (Eiler White, Makkonen, Vince, & Bailey, 2012, pp. i-ii).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

When passed, NCLB sought to improve the quality of teachers. "NCLB placed the onus on teachers by requiring that every teacher in schools receiving Title I money be highly qualified" (Shober, 2012, p. 6). While NCLB required all teachers to be highly qualified, the qualifications to be certified highly qualified focused only on training and preparation of teachers. "Under NCLB, a highly qualified teacher was one who had a bachelor's degree, full state certification, and demonstrated knowledge of his or her subject matter" (Shober, 2016, p. 6). Additionally, once one is determined to be highly qualified, he or she is always highly qualified to teach in the areas for which he or she was given highly qualified status.

The law did not link student achievement or teacher performance in the requirements to be highly qualified. "It mandates that states use the qualifications that teachers bring to the classroom—rather than their performance as teachers—as the measure of whether teachers meet the law's standard" (Toch & Rothman, 2008, p. 2). Gordon, Kane, and Staiger (2006) noted there are two fundamental problems with the idea that certification alone makes one highly qualified or an effective teacher: a) the first problem is that the level of certification or method of certification should be directly related to student performance outcomes, and b) the second problem is that districts learn

little, if anything at all about teacher effectiveness after the initial hiring process. If one

believes that the certification process leads to higher student performance outcomes, then

professional development provided after certification would not lead to improved

instructional performance of teachers. Obviously, as the authors point out, there are a

number of flaws with NCLB's requirements for teachers to be highly qualified.

Race to the Top (RTT)

Embedded in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) 2009 was

$4.35 billion in competitive grants for States called Race to the Top (RTT). Specifically,

the grant is "designed to encourage and reward States that are creating the conditions for

education innovation and reform; achieving significant improvement in student

outcomes, including making substantial gains in student achievement, closing

achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, and ensuring student

preparation for success in college and careers" (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, p.

2). A major requirement for receiving an RTT grant is for States to improve the

effectiveness of teachers and principals. Section D. Great Teachers and Leaders in the

selection criteria allocated almost 30% of the overall application points to improving the

effectiveness of teachers and principals (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). The way

to improve the effectiveness based on performance is to ensure there are quality teacher

and principal evaluation systems in place. The U.S. Department of Education was

looking for States that already created new models of evaluation or States that planned to

use RTT funds to implement new models for evaluation.

For States to be eligible to receive funds under RTT, "there must not be any legal,

statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement

... or student growth … to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation" (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, p. 4). Where No Child Left Behind was focused on teacher certification to designate a teacher as highly qualified, RTT went farther and looked the improving the effectiveness of teachers through examining and adjusting the way in which teachers are evaluated. RTT required States to conduct teacher evaluations annually, require timely and constructive feedback, use evaluations to provide coaching, support, and plan for professional development, provide additional compensation for highly effective teachers (merit pay), and develop rigorous standards for teachers (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, p. 9). As a result of the President signing ARRA into law and providing RTT funds through a grant process, a large number of States took steps to reform their teacher evaluation systems.

Since the passage of ARRA and RTT, 36 states have made policy changes regarding teacher evaluations (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2012). In 2009, there were only 14 states who required teachers to be evaluated annually. Whereas by 2012, 23 states had changed their policies and laws to require annual evaluations. Subsequently, by 2012, 43 states now required annual evaluations for all new teachers (Riordan, Lacireno-Paquet, Shakman, Bocala, & Chang, 2015). In 2009, only 15 states had policies requiring the use of student data in teacher evaluations and only four states used student data as the most significant factor. By 2012, that number had increased to 32 and 22 states used student data as the most significant factor of teacher performance (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2012). Race to the Top has surely sparked a national debate on improving the quality of instruction students receive as evidenced by

the number of states making policy changes since be signed into law. Chapter 2 will go into more detail regarding what types of changes have been made.

<div align="center">**Teacher Evaluation Models**</div>

Chapter 2 provides a review of literature and a detailed list of effective evaluation models and evaluation practices that lead to teacher improvement in and out of the classroom. The evaluation committee used these as a starting point for a new teacher evaluation model. The initial review of literature revealed two evaluation models that have been utilized or adapted most frequently by individual states, districts, and schools.

Danielson's Model: Framework for Teaching

Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching was first published in 1996 by Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. This framework and book was the result of Danielson's research and work in the early 1990s for Educational Testing Service (ETS), a New Jersey-based testing company, whose most popular products are the SAT and GRE. Danielson was working on the Praxis III which was designed to be a national system for licensing of beginning teachers (Danielson and Dwyer, 1995, p. 66). Danielson was charged with creating a system for training evaluators to judge teachers' strengths and weakness. Praxis III really never took hold and when it started in 1993 there were only two states that utilized it. Danielson, through her trainings, said that those trained to be evaluators liked the model and saw it as a way to improve teaching. While working for ETS, Danielson took the idea of using the Praxis III for training and evaluating veteran teachers to ETS and ETS passed on this idea, but gave Danielson permission to pursue the project on her own, and as a result, *Enhancing*

Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching was written and published (Toch & Rothman, 2008).

The 1996 publication was a description of good teaching that included four major categories/domains, twenty-two themes/components, and seventy-seven key skills. Danielson also created scoring rubrics with detailed information on what teachers needed to do to score unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, or distinguished. This language helped teachers and evaluators have a common definition and description of teaching. *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* has been republished three additional times in 2007, 2011, and 2013. Updates and clarifications were made each time in order to render the framework more effective. In 2013, it was reprinted to respond to the instructional implications of the Common Core Standards (Danielson, 2014).

The four domains included in *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* are: Domain 1. Planning and Preparation (6 components); Domain 2. The Classroom Environment (5 components); Domain 3. Instruction (5 components); and Domain 4. Professional Responsibilities (6 components). Each of the components defines a distinct aspect of the domain. Each of the components are unique and specific. However, they are all related to each other. How the components are implemented has a direct effect on the other components.

The framework was not designed solely for evaluation purposes and has several alternative applications. Other uses for the framework include: the preparation of new teachers, recruitment and hiring of new teachers, reflection and self-assessment, supervision of student teachers, peer coaching, and promoting professional learning (Danielson, 2007). The Danielson Group was created to provide training and support for

implementation of this Framework for Teaching. Workshops are designed to teach the framework and provide professional development that is essential to implementation. Simply reading and discussion the framework is not enough. Observers, evaluators, and teachers all need to have a common understanding of each of the domains and components so there is a common definition of what effective teaching looks like. This is a fundamental piece to any evaluation system.

TAP^{TM} System for Teacher and Student Advancement

The TAP^{TM} system for teacher and student advancement was created by the National Institute of Excellence in Teaching (NIET). NIET's 2016 TAP^{TM} System Elements of Success webpage lists all of the background information on TAP^{TM} including the fact that the TAP^{TM} System for Teacher and Student Advancement was launched in 1999 as a comprehensive educator effectiveness model by Lowell Milken. The TAP^{TM} System for Teacher and Student Advancement centers around four interrelated key components: multiple career paths, ongoing applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance-based compensation. As a result of the development and implementation of TAP^{TM}, the NIET created the Best Practices Center to provide training, services, and support for states, districts, and schools to develop highly effective educators (National Institute of Excellence in Teaching, 2016, Elements of Success webpage).

The first key element is multiple career paths. NIET believes the implementation of the TAP^{TM} system allows for teachers to pursue different positions during their careers. The TAP^{TM} system creates master and mentor teaching positions that allow for teachers to take leadership roles without leaving the classroom for administrative

positions. Teachers are selected for these positions through a competitive and rigorous process that examines the candidate's qualifications in the areas of curricular knowledge, instructional skills, and one's ability to work with others. Because mentor and master teachers are held to a higher standard, they are compensated appropriately for this and thus leading to advancement for classroom teachers in a system that generally does not make a distinction between teachers and uses a single salary schedule for all. TAP™ provides additional training to administrators, master, and mentor teachers to provide the knowledge and skills to lead professional development activities, as well as conduct effective teacher evaluations (National Institute of Excellence in Teaching, 2016, Multiple Career Paths webpage).

The second key component is ongoing applied professional growth. TAP provides job embedded professional development that is ongoing, collaborative, teacher led, teacher driven, and focused on students. This professional development is always delivered by expert teachers. TAP™ takes the professional development to the next level by restructuring the school day to include time for teachers to meet for collaboration, learn, instructional planning, mentor other teachers, and share experiences and best practices. This time is designed to improve the quality of instruction delivered by teachers and increase their students' academic achievement.

Because the professional development is teacher led and teacher driven, the activities focus on identified needs based on instructional issues teachers are having with their students. Data are examined and utilized to determine some of the instructional issues and struggles teachers and students are experiencing. The professional development is delivered through cluster groups, one on one coaching, and classroom-

based support systems. In a typical TAP™ school cluster groups meet for one to two hours a week during contract time that was restructured for this purpose. Cluster groups can be grade level groups or subject matter departments. As with everything TAP™, the cluster groups are led by the school experts (mentor and master teachers) and the topics are focused on instructional practices that meet the identified needs of their students (National Institute of Excellence in Teaching, 2016, Ongoing Applied Professional Growth webpage).

The third key component is instructionally focused accountability. Teachers are evaluated on the TAP™ Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities Performance Standards. There are 26 indicators and teachers are evaluated using a five-point scale in each of the 26 indicators. Teachers are evaluated three to six times a year through a combination of unannounced and announced observations. Observations are conducted by multiple individuals trained and certified to use the TAP™ Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities Performance Standards. All evaluations are followed with a post conference between the evaluator and the teachers. The announced observations have a pre-conference included.

Teachers are not only evaluated on observations, but also their students' academic performance. Additionally, all teachers are evaluated collectively on the academic learning of all students in the school. TAP™ provides rewards and performance-based compensation for all of the teachers (National Institute of Excellence in Teaching, 2016, Instructionally Focused Accountability webpage).

The fourth and final component in the TAP™ system is performance-based compensation. NIET works with the school district to change how teachers are paid—

from a single salary schedule based on years of service and educational units to one that

is based on performance. The salary schedule also compensates for master and mentor

teachers, hard-to-staff schools, and hard-to-staff subjects. All teachers are eligible for

higher compensation based upon the average scores of their observations, individual

student scores, and the whole school's students' scores. TAP^{TM} uses a value-added model

to help identify the teacher's influence in student scores. NIET recommends performance

rewards be issued based upon 50% teacher evaluations, 30% individual student

performance, and 20% school-wide student performance (National Institute of Excellence

in Teaching, 2016, Performance-Based Compensation webpage).

Components, Attributes, and Skills that Appear Frequently in the Literature

Chapter 2 will go into greater detail and provide the sources of the common

components, attributes, and skills that immerged through the literature review process.

These all contributed to and helped the evaluation committee select an evaluation model

to study during the 2016-2017 school year. The items that appear most often are: having a

common definition of good teaching (10), value added\use of student test scores (13),

training and professional development for teachers and evaluators on the evaluation

model (15), and the use of multiple measures in the evaluation process (16).

Utilizing the Framework for Teaching to Ensure Diversity in the Curriculum

Diversity in schools continues to be an increasing concern for the educational

community. A large number studies, books, and scholarly articles have been written on a

variety of subjects ranging from white teachers teaching minority students (Banks et al.,

2005; Douglas, B., Lewis, Douglas, A., Scott, Garrison-Wade, 2008; Futrell, Gomez, &

Bedeen, 2003; Picower, 2014; Oats, 2003) to multicultural education (Futrell, 1999;

19

Howard, T.C., 2010; Nieto & Bode, 2012; Teach for America, 2011) to curriculum diversity (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999; Howard, G.R., 2006; Lee, 1995; Schramm-Pate, Lussier, & Jeffries, 2008) and this list demonstrates a very tiny representation of topics and authors. Concerns raised in the literature include the narrowing of the cultural diversity of today's teachers and administrators compared the racial identity of students, the lack of training and skills of today's teachers and instructional leaders in the field of curriculum diversity studies as applied to issues in curriculum construction and implementation, and the under-representation of minorities in the curriculum. Through the evaluation process using Danielson's Framework for Teaching as the model, school administrators can ensure diversity in the taught curriculum. This can and should be done through the planning and preparation and instructional elements of the framework.

According to U.S. Department of Education's (2016) report The State of Racial Diversity in the Educator Workforce which included the most recent statistics from the 2011-2012 schoolyear, 82 percent of public school teachers and 80 percent of public school principals were white while only 51 percent of public school students were white. By 2024, the percentage of white students is expected to diminish to 46 percent. This is important because, no matter a white teacher's experience growing up, it is not the same as someone who grew up in a racial minority household. Chris Smith, an African-American male discussed his experiences growing up in a 2015 Ted Talk and describes a story from his childhood through his eyes and perceptions regarding the way his parents raised him and his sibling and "the decisions my parents made about raising a black boy in America that growing up I didn't understand in the way that I do now" (1:45). His parents had to teach Chris how to grow up in a world where racial bias exists leaving the

following impression on him, "I think about how hard it must have been, how profoundly unfair it must have felt, for them to feel like they had to strip away parts of my childhood just so that I could come home at night" (1:55). Chris's stories and his parent's fears were not the same as his peers and it is extremely important for white educators to be aware of these differences.

These experiences are not just limited to African-Americans, but are also the case for number of other minority groups. White educators need to be aware of these cultural differences so that they can be sensitive to them, empathize, and make adjustments to their instructional styles and content. Banks, et al. (2005) stated, "teachers need to develop cultural competence in order to effectively teach students with backgrounds different than their own" (p. 237). He also reports in schools and classrooms where efforts to create cultural connections academic achievement have increased as a result. Picower (2014) pointed out one way to do this is by incorporating the cultural history of the students in the class regardless of race. Teachers need to make sure they understand the makeup of their class and adjust their lessons to reflect it.

Teachers and administrators, through life experiences, teacher preparation programs, or professional development programs, have not been given the skills necessary to teach in a diverse multicultural educational environment. Teach for America (2011) explained, "there really is a body of special knowledge, skills, processes, and experiences that is different from the knowledge bases of most traditional teacher education programs and that is essential for preparing teachers to be successful with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations" (p. 85). Teachers and administrators need to acquire these skills through professional development once in the

profession and teacher and administration preparation programs need to adjust to meet this need. Some of the skills needed for understanding the nexus of cultural influence on one's learning style are the "cultural characteristics of different ethnic, racial, and social groups so they can develop instructional practices that are more responsive to cultural pluralism. Cultural characteristics of particular significance in this undertaking are communication styles, thinking styles, value systems, socialization processes, relational patters, and performance styles" (Teach for America, 2011, p. 86). Teach for America also points out a cultural characteristic would include the fact that minority students do not do as well in lecture format and would prefer to work in a more interactive environment and cooperative groups (p. 87).

Lee (1995) also points out that teachers and administrators need to be aware of the instructional materials, holidays celebrated, and language used could all lead to cultural alienation for minority groups. This behavior engenders the normalizing of white experiences leading students who are not white to feel abnormal for not having the same experiences. Lee (2015) explains, "Oftentimes, whatever is white is treated as normal. So, when teachers choose literature that they say will deal with a universal theme or story, like in childhood when all the people in the stories are of European origin; it's basically white culture and civilization. That culture is different from others, but it doesn't get named as different. It gets named as normal" (p.10). Teachers and administrators need training to examine the materials they use in their schools and classrooms to make sure they include the cultural makeup of the student population. Teachers are required to teach the standards and in most states the standards have nothing to do with the instructional materials selected to teach those standards. Districts do adopt

the curriculum, but teachers are often afforded the ability to supplement those materials with ones they believe would ensure a higher level of learning.

"In far too many schools, Columbus still 'discovered America'. George Washington is still the 'father' of 'our' country. History is still too often the stories of great white males with few 'exceptional' women and people of color added for 'diversity'" (Adrzejewski & Alessio, 1999, p. 2). The taught curriculum too often leaves out examples of underrepresented populations and oppressed groups. Bernard Kinsey drives home the point by saying:

> There are stories that made America and there are stories that America made up and the stories America made up did not include black folks and it works a myth. The myth of absences. You know what the myth of absence says? We were invisibly present…in other words we are there but nobody knows we are there and that is operating today in this country (Smithsonian, 2011, 53:00).

Kinsey is talking about African-Americans but the statement could easily reflect any of the historically oppressed groups in America including women, Hispanics, Asians, religious groups, gays, or lesbians to name a few. As a member of these groups you grow up never seeing the accomplishments of someone like you on America -- stories of great African-Americans or women who were vital to the revolutionary war and the founding of the country. Too often these individuals are left off the pages of our textbooks. Through the Kinsey Collection, Bernard and Shirley are working to make sure African-Americans and all people know about the great contributions and accomplishments of African-Americans like Alaine Locke, the first African-American Rhodes Scholar in

1907 and Carter G. Woodson, the 2nd African-American to earn a Ph.D. from Harvard in 1912. He wants people to know there have always been African-American's doing great things in America from 1679 forward (Smithsonian, 2011).

This is still the responsibility of the teacher and administrator to provide supplemental resources and ensure all groups are equally represented in the taught curriculum. Implementation of a high-quality evaluation model like Danielson's Framework for Teaching can help both teachers and administrators ensure a diversely rich curriculum in which all groups are represented is utilized.

There are areas within Danielson's four domains where administrators can work with teachers to ensure the desired curriculum is being discussed, observed, and implemented. Domain 1a deals with content and pedagogical knowledge as it relates to planning and preparation. For a teacher to be proficient in this area he or she must have plans that "reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline" (Danielson, 2009, p. 8). Administrators through reviewing artifacts of planning and learning will see a teacher's lesson plans and will have the opportunity to discuss the content along with how the teacher is ensuring the desired diversity is being implemented.

Domain 2a focuses on creating an environment of respect and rapport. Here the administrator and teacher have an opportunity to celebrate the diversity of his or her classrooms. The teacher in a K-8 context should be looking at the identity makeup of his or her classroom. To achieve proficiency, the administrator is looking to see "teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate caring and respect" (Danielson, 2009, p. 11). Respect is something students seek from their teachers more than they may know

and is an important part of achieving at the proficient level. These interactions should be genuine, warm, inviting, and appropriate. A teacher in Oakland every year made sure her classroom was vibrant and always displayed student work from floor to ceiling. At the same school their assembly calendar celebrated events honoring Black history, Mexican history, Cambodian history and multicultural art (Picower, 2014). The administration has led by example trying to provide a warm and inviting culturally diverse environment that celebrates all students. It is in these ways that Danielson's Framework for Teaching can be utilized to support teachers and administrators in providing a diverse curriculum for students.

Summary and Conclusion

The identified problem of practice centers on the dissatisfaction teachers and administrators have with the traditional model of evaluation and have expressed a desire to explore other alternatives. This action research study seeks to identify a high-quality evaluation model that engages teachers in the evaluation process and continues the growth and development of teachers' professional practices. The Danielson's Framework for Teaching and the TAP System for teacher evaluation were the models states and districts adopted most frequently across the United States. CVESD teachers and administrators after reviewing the literature have selected Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013) as the evaluation model to pilot during the 2016-2017 school year. Data gathered and collected will be used to make the choice to adopt this model, keep the traditional model, or look for another option to pilot. Using the information gathered the evaluation committee will make a recommendation to all the district's teachers and administrators.

Glossary of Key Terms

Classroom Observations: Are used by evaluators to make judgments of teachers' practice in the classroom.

Effective Teaching: Effective teaching consists of instruction that enables all students to meet or exceed ambitious goals for student learning (adapted from Darling-Hammond & Ducommun, 2010).

Effective Teacher: An individual teacher who produces substantial student outcomes.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): First enacted in 1965 and most recently reauthorized in 2001 as the No Child Left Behind Act, the ESEA is the primary federal law that impacts K-12 public education. The Act emphasizes systematic, comprehensive educational reform through improving academic accountability, as well as curriculum, resources, and teacher quality.

Evaluation Tools: Models, rubrics, instruments, and protocols that are used by evaluators to assess teachers' performances.

Formative Teacher Evaluation: Assessment of teachers' practices for the purposes of supporting or improving teachers' practices.

Highly Effective Teacher: A teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance.

Job Embedded Professional Development (JEPD): Teacher and administrator learning

that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice, conducted during contractual time, and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning.

Multiple Measures of Student Learning: Various types of assessment of students' learning, for example, value-added or growth measures, curriculum-based tests, pre- and posttests, capstone projects, oral presentations, performances, and artistic or other projects.

Non-Tested Grades and Subjects: Grades and subjects that are not required to be assessed under ESEA.

Norm-Referenced Tests (NRTs): A NRT compares a person's score against the scores of a group of people who have already taken the same exam, called the "norming group."

Pre-Test: Assessment administered prior to instruction or intervention which is part of the same system as a post test.

Post-Test: Assessment administered at the end of instruction or intervention which is part of the same system as a post test.

Race to the Top: A $4.35 billion United States Department of Education competition created to spur innovation and reforms in state and local district K-12 education.

Student Learning (or "Student Outcomes," "Student Achievement"): Outcome in which students achieve mastery of content standards, may be measured through standardized exams, formal non-exam-based demonstrations of learning (e.g., a portfolio of student work), or other means.

Student Learning Objectives: Student learning objectives are data-based targets of student growth.

Student Achievement: For non-tested grades and subjects, an alternative measure of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For tested grades and subjects, a student's score on the Smarter Balanced assessments under the ESEA and when appropriate, other measures of student learning that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Student Growth: Increases in student achievement over a period of time.

Summative Teacher Evaluation: A summary of teachers' practice for the purpose of making high stakes personnel decisions.

The Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC): Committee of volunteers in the Central Valley Elementary School District charged with improving the teacher evaluation process and creating a new system of teacher evaluation.

Teacher Effectiveness: The ability of teachers to successfully encourage student learning. Tied conceptually to "outputs;" different from phrases like "highly qualified teacher" - which is linked to "inputs" such as a bachelor's degree—and "teacher quality," which may be ambiguous.

Teacher Effectiveness Measures: Means of determining teacher effectiveness using multiple inputs measures.

Teacher Evaluation: Collecting and using information to critique teacher performance.

Value-Added Model (VAM): A statistical model that primarily uses student achievement on assessments (e.g., standardized state exams) to measure teacher effectiveness.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter two is to provide a comprehensive review of the current literature. The literature review is an important component of a dissertation and research study. The literature review helped to identify topics, review other studies done around the same subject matter, and allowed the participant-researcher to validate the need for this research.

Importance of a Literature Review

The purpose of the literature review was for the participant-researcher to review other research conducted on the topic to be researched. Mertler (2014) stated, "this information is to help the teacher-researcher make informed decisions about the research focus and plan" (p. 40). The literature allowed the participant-researcher to validate the need to conduct this research, helped to establish a theoretical framework and methodological focus, provided an up to date understanding of the subject, helped the participant-researcher to work out how to answer the research question, provided comparisons to the participant-researcher's own findings, and allowed the participant-researcher to demonstrate knowledge in the field of study (The Literature Review-Purpose, Why are literature reviews important?, & Why do I have to have a literature review?).

<center>**Theoretical Base**</center>

The Purpose of Evaluation

Before one can start to look at the components of effective evaluation systems one must first understand why teachers are evaluated. Danielson (2010-2011 & 2012) stated that there are two main reasons for teacher evaluations. The first reason is to ensure the quality of teachers and the second is for professional development and growth.

Ensuring students have access to high quality educators is one of the most simplistic and basic reason for evaluating teacher effectiveness. The education community receives money from individuals either through taxes or tuition paid to private schools and those investing in education should have a right to demand high quality teachers (Danielson, 2012). There needs to be credibility and administrators should be able to tell the public (parents, school board, lawmakers) that the teachers here are good and here is how I know. To do this a high-quality, highly effective, and research based teacher evaluation system needs to be in place. Additionally, public school laws require districts to conduct teacher evaluations on a regular basis (Danielson, 2008).

The most important reason for teacher evaluations is for professional development and growth. The evaluation process should not be about getting rid of teachers who are not producing at a high level, but about working to help all teachers get to level of high quality. To do this it is essential the evaluation process act as a way to improve the practices of teachers. "Rigorous performance measurement and useful feedback are essential…to help teachers improve their practice" (Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, & Haferd, 2012, p. 3). Darling-Hammond (2012) also noted a key purpose of any teacher evaluation system should include professional development stating that,

<center>30</center>

"aligned professional learning opportunities…should link both formal professional development and job-embedded learning opportunities to the evaluation system" (p. ii).

The New Teacher Project (2011) concluded that "better evaluation systems represent a critical first step toward reversing the widget effect—the tendency of school systems to treat teachers as interchangeable parts, not valuable professionals—and ensuring that all students learn from effective teachers" (p. 1). As discussed later this belief comes from more than a decade of No Child Left Behind that looked at teacher qualifications as being the key component of teacher quality. The other notion for evaluations to sort and terminate ineffective teachers.

Traditional Evaluation Systems

One of the main reasons for needing a new system for evaluating teachers is that the traditional system of evaluation in place is outdated and does not reflect what the educational community knows about good teaching. Danielson (2012) points out that traditional evaluation systems lacked rigor and were low stakes because there was little accountability, but today that has changed. Today the stakes are too high and students deserve to have teachers of high quality and who possess contemporary preparation for students to achieve college and career readiness. "Existing systems rarely help teachers improve or clearly distinguish those who are succeeding from those who are struggling" (Darling-Hammond 2012, p. 1). Part of the reason for this is because traditional evaluation systems do not make teachers active participants in their evaluation process.

The traditional evaluation system usually consists of a preconference between the teacher and the administrator, the administrator coming in to observe a lesson, the administrator taking notes on the observation, the administrator the writing up the notes,

and a post-conference between the teacher and administrator. During the post-conference the administrator will share with the teacher the observation notes and write up. The teacher is told the good things he\she was doing and any areas for improvement. The teacher is being talked at and told what happened and what will happen next. The teacher is not an active participant and or learner. This is a common situation that is illustrated throughout the literature by Danielson, Darling-Hammond, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, and the Educational Development Center. Danielson (2010-2011) points out in the scenario described above that the one doing the work is the one doing the learning. In this case the administrator is doing all the work and thus doing all the learning. The teacher in the situation is completely passive. "The process violates everything we know about learning— that learning is done by the *learner* through a process of active intellectual engagement" (p.4).

Components of a New Teacher Evaluation System

In reading the current literature and scholarly works, it is evident that not everyone agrees on the essential components of a high-quality evaluation system. In an early review of the literature three major components/themes are evident. When creating or looking for an evaluation system to use in districts, it is important for them to include a clear definition of good teaching, job embedded professional development, and time for administrators to conduct meaningful evaluations.

Clear Definition of Good Teaching

The large body of scholarly work on teacher evaluation systems indicates that, before a district can start evaluating teachers, a district needs to have a clear definition of

good teaching and those involved must not only know what it is, but be able to identify it. It is no longer good enough for a teacher, mentor, instructional coach, principal, assistant superintendent or superintendent to be unable to define good teaching. "New evaluation systems establish clear and specific definitions of effective teaching, where previously, a common language for discussing instruction often did not exist" (Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, & Haferd, 2012 p. 9). A good evaluation system should have a consistent definition of good teaching. "Teachers and administrators need a common language and vision about what constitutes effective practice" (Minnici, 2014, p. 23). This may take time and a number of observations to calibrate everyone toward the consistent definition of good teaching. But in so doing, educators will be able to keep the focus on what matters and that is the important issues of teaching and learning (Danielson, 2012).

In her 2012 address to a group of Texas teachers and administrators, Danielson tells a story from her teaching days. The story was set in her junior high science classroom, where her students were engaged in a lab activity and the students were actively trying solve a specific problem. Danielson was moving around the classroom helping students and answering questions they might have had. In walked the principal to do her evaluation. The principal took one look around the classroom to locate Danielson. When the principal found Danielson, he explained why he was there and that he would come back when she was actually teaching. Her point of the story was that she and the principal clearly had a different idea of what teaching was; let alone what good teaching was.

"While much of the policy conversation about teachers over the last decade has focused on accountability, teaching quality is fundamentally an equity issue. Currently, federal, state, and local policymakers have advocated teacher evaluation systems as the solution to improving teaching quality and ultimately to addressing equity issues" (Minnici, 2014, p. 22). Knowing how important teacher quality is to the educational process, the way to provide equity between schools and neighborhoods is to ensure that all classrooms in America are led by a highly effective or highly qualified teacher.

 "Over the past decade, teacher quality has become one of the most widely and loudly discussed issues in education" (Jerald, 2002, p. 1). One of the cornerstones of this discussion is the historic 2002 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), better known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). NCLB had a primary goal ensuring that every classroom in America will have a *Highly Qualified Teacher* (*HQT*) by July 1, 2006 (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The nature of what constitutes a "highly qualified teacher" has been debated since the creation of teachers.

The quality of education one receives is directly tied to the quality of the teachers he/she has had. Wright, Horn, and Sanders (as cited in Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001) stated, "…that seemingly more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor" (p. 3). Goldhaber and Anthony (2003) concluded the single most important factor in affecting student outcomes is teacher quality. Goldhaber, Brewer, and Anderson (as cited in Goldhaber and Anthony, 2003) stated, "…teacher effects accounted for approximately 8.5% of the variation in students' tenth grade achievement" (p. 8). Further noted in a Texas study conducted by

Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin (2002) is the idea that, "…teacher effects accounted for a minimum of 4 percent of the variation" (p. 8). Mendro (1998) evaluated different studies on teacher effectiveness and concluded the long-term influence of students who are taught by the least effective teachers need as much as three years of remediation in order to compensate for the negative influence placed upon them. Mendro also found that students with average achievement levels can lose as much as twenty percentile points a year with an ineffective teacher, while students with effective teachers can score as much as fifty percentile points higher than students who have ineffective teachers over a three to four-year period.

Sanders and Horn, Sanders and Rivers and Wright et al. (as cited in Goldhaber and Anthony, 2003) revealed that high achieving students who were taught by the most effective teachers outperformed their high-achieving counterparts who were with the least effective teachers by twenty-three percentile points. For low-achieving students, the gap between students with the most effective teachers and the least effective teachers was thirty-sex percentile points. Darling-Hammond (2000) stated, "…in all cases, the proportion of well-qualified teachers is by far the most important determinant of student achievement: it is highly significant in all equations for both subject areas in all years and at all grade levels" (para. 92).

There are many definitions of a highly-qualified teacher. Kaplan and Owings (2001) believed quality referred to what teachers did to promote and facilitate student learning in the classroom. "Teaching quality includes selecting appropriate instructional goals and assessments, using the curriculum effectively, and employing varied instructional behaviors that help all students learn at higher levels" (para. 2). Kaplan and

Owings conducted a national survey and identified ten characteristics of high quality teachers: (1) verbal ability, (2) content knowledge, (3) education course work on teaching methods in their discipline, (4) scores on state licensing exams, (5) teaching behaviors, (6) ongoing professional development, (7) enthusiasm for learning, (8) flexibility, creativity and adaptability, (9) amount of teaching experience and (10) demonstrated skill in asking higher order questions.

Horace Mann in his Fourth Annual Report (1840) listed his five qualifications for teaching: 1. perfect knowledge of the taught subject matter, 2. aptitude for teaching, 3. classroom management with ability to mold students, 4. good Behavior, and 5. morals (Spring, 2014). These qualifications were important to Mann because he "put his hope in the school teacher, who, by educating children so they would not transgress the law, would replace the police" (p. 83). Mann believed that the education of children and not the punishment of adults was the key to improving the diminishing American society.

Conney and Bottoms (2003) conducted a survey of public school personnel (teachers and administrators) to determine their perceptions of the characteristics of high quality teachers and found the following to be important: (1) ability to maintain discipline and order in the classroom [91% and 88%], (2) a love for kids [91% and 86%], (3) effective teaching techniques [83% and 84%], (4) high standards and expectations for all students [82% and 87%], (5) a talent for motivating students [81% and 81%], (6) an ability to work well with students whose backgrounds are very different from their own [79% and 75%], (7) an ability to establish strong working relationships with parents [67% and 71%], (8) in-depth knowledge of their subjects [67% and 60%], (9) well-versed in

theories of child development and learning [38% and 45%] and (10) knowledge of history and philosophy of education [15% and 10%].

Luis Harris Associates (as cited in Conney and Bottoms, 2003), conducted a national poll on the public's opinion of what constitutes an excellent teacher. Seventy-five percent of the respondents found the following eight items to be important: (1) classroom management [91%], (2) strong subject matter knowledge [90%], (3) understanding of how children learn [89%], (4) training in how to teach [88%], (5) knowing how to monitor and assess student progress [82%], (6) sensitivity to each child as an individual [80%], (7) an ability to communicate with parents [80%] and (8) continued staff development and education [78%]. A discrepancy existed between lawmakers/politicians, teachers, superintendents and principals, and the public as to what constituted a highly-qualified teacher or an effective or excellent teacher. Through NCLB lawmakers have placed an emphasis on subject matter knowledge for classifying teachers as highly qualified. Based on Conney and Bottoms' work teachers, superintendents and principals and the general public believed the most important factor to be classroom management.

Congress approved and the President signed NCLB into law in 2002. NCLB focused its attention on closing the achievement gaps among all students. To do so, NCLB placed an emphasis on the need for all teachers to be certified as Highly Qualified. NCLB stated a teacher was highly qualified when:

(1) (a) the teacher has obtained full State certification as a teacher (including certification obtained through alternative routes to certification) or passed the State teacher licensing examination, and holds a license to

teach in such State, except that when used with respect to any teacher

teaching in a public charter school the term means that the teacher meets

the requirements set forth in the State's public charter school law; and (b)

the teacher has not had certification or licensure requirements waived on

an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis. (2) a middle or secondary

school teacher who is new to the profession, means that the teacher holds

at least a bachelor's degree and has demonstrated a high level of

competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches

by; (a) passing a rigorous State academic subject test in each of the

academic subjects in which the teacher teaches (which may consist of a

passing level of performance on a State-required certification or licensing

test or tests in each of the academic subjects in which the teachers

teaches): or (b) successful completion, in each of the academic subjects in

which the teacher teaches, of an academic major, a graduate degree,

coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major, or advanced

certification or credentialing (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, pp. 4-

5).

"Rather than weaken quality requirements, NCLB enhances them and requires

states to pay greater attention to teacher quality and, in some cases add rigor to their

licensure requirements" (Rothman & Mead, 2003, para. 3). Pursuant to NCLB the

California Department of Education (CDE) adopted the following three federal

requirements for teachers to be certified as HQT: (1) a bachelor's degree, (2) a state

credential or have an Intern Certificate/Credential for no more than three years, and (3) demonstrated core academic subject matter competence (CDE, 2004).

Shaul (2003) found that an estimated 15% of low-poverty districts, 24% of all districts and 45% of high-poverty districts nationally would be unable to meet HQT requirements. Galley (2003) estimated that more than 50% of the teachers nationally would not have met the requirements in 1999-2000.

In response, the CDE developed the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) to assist school districts. Middle/high school teachers who are considered *new* to the profession have several options they can utilize to meet the subject matter requirements:

They may pass a CCTC approved subject matter examination or complete one of these coursework options in the core academic subject area: A) a CCTC approved subject matter program, or B) a major, or C) a major equivalent, (32 semester units or the equivalent) or D) possess a graduate degree (CDE, 2004, p. 5).

Middle/high school teachers *not new* to the profession also have multiple ways they can demonstrate subject matter competency:

They may pass a CCTC approved single subject matter examination (any past or current CCTC approved single subject matter examination will qualify), or they may complete one of the following in each core subject area taught: A) CCTC approved subject matter program, or B) major, or C) major equivalent (32 semester units or the equivalent), or D) graduate degree, or D) hold National Board Certification, or E) complete the California High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) (CDE, 2004)

39

Additionally, it is important that everyone involved know and agree to the evidence and measures that will be used to assess the quality of the teacher (Minnici, 2014). Stakeholder involvement is needed throughout the process to achieve this. Acceptance is dependent upon the level of involvement teachers and administrators have in the process. "Teachers, as the experts in their craft, have much to contribute to the design and implementation of teacher evaluation systems" (Minnici, 2014, p. 24).

Job Embedded Professional Development

"Professional development is regularly associated with the "results" of evaluation, instead of recognized as an integral part of the evaluation process itself" (Coggshall, Rasmussen, Colton, Milton, and Jacques 2012, p. 1). The first thing that should be done when implementing a new evaluation system is to establish a clear definition of what good teaching looks like and how to recognize good teaching. The research is clear that teachers and administrators should be provided with job embedded professional development on the clear definition of good teaching (Coggshall, Rasmussen, Colton, Milton, and Jacques 2012, Danielson 2010-2011 & 2012, and Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, & Haferd, 2012).

Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, and Haferd, (2012), describe the need for job embedded professional development this way; "teachers need support and training to understand the components of these new systems, including new definitions of effective teaching, expectations for professional practice, and processes related to the evaluation. Principals and evaluators also need to become familiar with new definitions of effective teaching and must to be able to consistently evaluate teachers using the tools provided" (p.14). By providing an opportunity for teachers and administrators to learn and identify

examples of good learning this give a common language tor them to discuss instruction. Additionally, in doing so credibility and validation occur in the evaluation process because those being evaluated know the administrator has been provided with job embedded professional development on good teaching.

"If we are to observe real improvements in teaching and learning, then we will likely need to restructure the school day and reallocate existing resources so that teachers have more time for studying and improving their practice with colleagues" (Minnici, 2014, p. 25). Teachers have enough to deal with once they leave after their contractual day is concluded. We need to structure the school day and calendar in such a way the time is provided for teachers to work together and learn from each other. There is little doubt about the dedication of teachers to improving the work they do. Expecting teachers to create their own professional development, outcomes, and evaluation system on their own time is not accounting for their well-being or treating them as the professionals they are.

Teacher evaluations are labor-intensive and require large amounts of time to be done fairly, accurately, and consistently. This can only be made easier with job embedded professional development for all stake holders. Topics could include but not limited to: "overview of the new system, conducting effective classroom observations, analyzing and using student data in evaluations, providing clear, constructive feedback to teachers, managing time and resources to implement the new system, tracking evaluation data, and communicating with teachers" (The New Teacher Project, 2011, p. 4). All of these will help both the administrator and the teacher to better understand the new system of

41

evaluation, but also put in place a common language or definition helping to ensure better collaboration between stake holders.

Time for Administrators to Complete Evaluations

"It is nearly impossible for principals, especially in large schools, to have sufficient time or content expertise to evaluate all of the teachers they supervise, much less to address the needs of some teachers for intense instructional support" (Darling-Hammond 2012, p. 1). Administrators, especially site principals, are responsible for a variety of things from student discipline, budget, scheduling, professional development, and evaluations. All scholars agree the most important aspect of an administrator's job is to ensure all students are receiving high quality instruction. This is often done through formal and informal processes. "Several districts are struggling to find the personnel needed to conduct all of the observations that the new evaluation systems require and to provide timely and effective feedback to teachers" (Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, & Haferd, 2012, p. 17). Principals need time to conduct the pre-conference, conduct observations, write the evaluation, and provide feedback necessary for the teacher to develop professionally.

For a principal with 20 or more teachers, this could pose a significant challenge and require the need for either additional administrators, instructional coaches, or learning directors to help ensure the new evaluation system in implemented correctly. Budgets of late have not allowed for these individuals to be available at the school site level. Shakman, Breslow, Kochanek, Riordan, & Haferd, (2012) point out, "The new systems require considerable capacity at both the school and district levels. Regardless of how districts support these changes, they require significant investments of time and

42

money to train and support teachers and administrators and to build the infrastructure they need to manage the more rigorous systems" (p.19).

Historical Context

"Teacher evaluation in most districts prior to 2008 was perfunctory and did little to help teachers improve" (Minnici, 2014, p. 24). These evaluations were seen as something that needed to be completed for compliance instead of for professional growth opportunities.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

In the 21st Century two important pieces of legislation have sought to improve the quality of teachers and administrators. In 2001, the Bush administration, with bipartisan support in both houses of Congress, passed the reauthorization of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), more popularly known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Then in 2009, the Obama administration and congress passed legislation for Race to the Top as part of a larger piece of legislation, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

"No Child Left Behind dramatically changed the coverage of the 1965 legislation from a specified group of students needing help to all students" (Spring, 2013, p. 441). Title II of NCLB sought to improve teacher quality. The reason for this is "every child in America deserves a high-quality teacher" (NCLB, 2001, p. 12). Title II provided funding to improve teacher and administrator quality through research based professional development. Administrators were charged with improving the quality of instruction student received by ensuring all teachers were highly qualified. Danielson (2007) points

out, "high-level learning by students requires high-level instruction by their teachers" (p. 15).

NCLB focused on certification of teachers as HQT, and in essence, was saying that once certified, there was really little difference in quality between one teacher and another. Teacher quality was defined by the training and experience one had rather than the outcome the teacher would achieve with students. Additionally, one should not make the mistake in linking teacher qualifications to the quality of teachers (Shober, 2012).

Today it is an essential function of school administrators to evaluate teachers. Danielson (2007) states, "schools have an ethical and statutory requirement to ensure teaching of high quality all of their students" (p. 177). Danielson has created a framework for teaching that helps to ensure high quality professional practices of teachers. Administrators are encouraged to have pre- and post-observation conference meetings while also conducting in-classroom observations. The post-conference meetings are extremely important, inasmuch as it requires teachers to reflect upon their practice. Utilization of a framework allows administrators and teachers to have a share definition and concept of what constitutes high quality instruction and professional teaching practices.

Race to the Top (RTT)

Though NCLB sought out to improve teaching and learning it didn't go far enough for the Obama administration. The passage of Race to the Top (RTT) in 2009 allowed for states to compete for $4.3 billion in additional educational dollars. In doing so, states needed to develop policies that included data managements systems that measured student growth, informed teachers and administrators about how to improve

instruction, and improved teacher evaluation by linking student growth to teacher evaluations. "Data collected on student test scores were to be used to evaluate teachers and school principals" (Spring, 2013, p. 446).

"The Obama administration made value added models a de facto policy in 2009 by requiring RTT applicants to use them to measure student achievement" (Shober, 2012, p. 11). The hope and belief was that improvement in instruction and the quality of teachers would increase the quality of education all students receive. "Better evaluation systems represent a critical first step toward reversing the widget effect --the tendency of school systems to treat teachers as interchangeable parts, not valuable professionals --and ensuring that all students learn from effective teachers" (The New Teacher Project, 2011, p. 1). This was an important shift in policy. "The Race to the Top applications requires states to develop teacher evaluation systems that use students' achievement data as a "significant factor" in determining teacher effectiveness" (Learning Point Associates, 2010, p. 3)

Prior to the implementation of RTT, only nine states (22 percent) had a system for including student growth data into teacher evaluations (Learning Point Associates, 2010, p. 2). Linking student data and growth to teacher evaluations does pose several challenges for states, districts, administrators, and teachers. "A teacher's primary professional responsibility is to ensure students learn. Therefore, evidence of student learning should play a predominate role in teacher evaluations." (The New Teacher Project, 2011, p. 3). One of the ways in which states have proposed to include student growth is in a value-added model. The value-added model looks to measure the impact the teacher has on student growth while attempting to control other factors such as

socioeconomic status, gender, previous learning, or class size that also have impacts on student learning.

The passage of NCLB and RTT both sought to ensure a better learning experience for students, and more importantly improve the quality of teachers. According to Danielson, Darling-Hammond, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, and the Educational Development Center this goal can be accomplished through the use of effective evaluation models. There is nothing more important than ensuring all students have access to phenomenal teachers. The New Teacher Project (2011) takes it further by stating, "Better evaluations are critical; not only will they ensure that teachers get the meaningful feedback they deserve as professionals, but that school leaders get the information they need to retain their most effective teachers, remove consistently low-performing teachers, and help all teachers reach their full potential in the classroom" (p. 7).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methodology the participant-researcher will utilize to answer the research question. The purpose of the action research study is to identify an effective evaluation model to replace the traditional model currently used to evaluate the district's teachers. Additionally, this study will analyze teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model (DFTEM) to ensure this evaluation model promotes professional growth and learning by teachers and enables teachers to be active participants in the evaluation process.

The following research question will guide this action research study: **What are elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model?**

Mertler (2014) characterizes action research "as research that is done by teachers for themselves" (p. 4). Therefore, action research is research that engages the researcher in the participation of the research. Hien (2009) adds to this characterization by suggesting there are four distinct characteristics of action research: (1) it is participant driven and reflective, (2) it is collaborative, (3) it leads to change and the improvement of practice, not just knowledge per se, and (4) it is context-specific (p. 99). Additionally,

action research is cyclical in nature with specific steps in the process of one's belief there are four steps or seven steps in the process. Action research models generally contain the same processes which differentiates it from traditional research. Mertler (2014) lists a four-step process of conducting action research: (1) identifying an area of focus, (2) collecting data, (3) analyzing and interpreting the data, and (4) developing a plan of action (p. 4).

Role of the Researcher

My role, as is common in conducting action research, is that of participant-researcher. My role in the Central Valley Elementary School District (CVESD) is that of the superintendent\principal. This action research study is characterized as collaborative action research. Mertler (2014) suggests collaborative action research as "an ideal mechanism for engaging teachers, administrators, and support personnel in systemic, self-initiated school improvement" and "one of the benefits of sharing responsibilities of such a process is that it brings together different perspectives, ideas, experiences, and resources" (p. 23). In this action research study an evaluation committee has been formed to assist with the review of literature, selection of an evaluation model to pilot, collect survey data, and report findings back to all stakeholders affected by this action research study. The participant-researcher led the committee and will be an active participant in all of the activities previously listed.

Research Context

The CVESD is a small rural school district located in the Central Valley of California. The district has 390 students of which 1/3 are inter-district students living outside the district's boundaries choosing to enroll in the district rather than their district

of residence. The district has been affected by a large amount of growth over the past five-years. During this five-year period, the district has increased enrollment every year and has increased enrollment by 100 students since August 2010. The percentage of inter-district transfers has also increased from 20% of enrollment to 33% of enrollment. More and more parents are choosing to bring their students to the district for the following reasons identified in the district's 2015 and 2016 LCAP survey: to benefit from smaller class sizes (K-2 < 24, 3-8 < 28), a small school setting (Upper 255 students and Lower 135 students), and the district's commitment to providing students with a 21st Century education (all students are provided with a Chromebook, digital instructional materials, and 24/7 internet service through a mobile broadband MiFi device).

The ethnic makeup of student is the CBVESD are 53% Hispanic and 32% of students are White. English Learners (EL) make up 33% of the students. Students receiving free and reduced lunch represent 72% of the students. The teaching staff is 90% White and 10% Hispanic additionally, 80% of the teachers are female.

Design of the Study

Action researchers utilize a variety of models when designing their action research studies. Mertler (2014) identifies four phases in the action research process—the *planning, acting, developing,* and *reflecting* stages, and this is the model the participant-researcher has selected to utilize in the design of this action research study to answer the research question.

Planning

The goal and timeline for the committee is to review current literature and best practices by April 1, 2017, create a list of key elements/components and possible

evaluation models to pilot from the literature by May 1, 2017, present these findings to all committee members by June 1, 2017, and select an evaluation model to pilot during the 2017-2018 school year. Data will be collected throughout the school year and adjustments will be made at the end of the school year for the following school year if the pilot model is chosen to replace the district's current evaluation model. It is anticipated by the participant-researcher that the final version of the teacher evaluation model will be completed by the start of 2018-2019 school year. As with any good evaluation model, stakeholders will continue to evaluate the model of teacher evaluations to ensure the model meets the needs and goals of the district and the teachers.

Evolution of the Research Focus

The foundation and rationale for conducting the present action research study comes from the CVESD teachers' request to explore alternative teacher evaluation models to replace the current traditional model. The teachers voiced their desire to have a new model during the last formal contract negotiation in April 2016.

CVESD has been conducting teacher evaluations under a traditional model. Teacher evaluations are based on the collectively bargained contract. The current contract requires probationary teachers to be formally observed by the administrator three times a year. Teachers with tenure are evaluated every other year consisting of one formal observation by the administrator. The administrator is required to have a pre- and post-observation conference with the teacher. During the post-observation conference, the teacher receives a lesson summary from the administrator. At the end of the evaluation year, the teacher receives a summative evaluation tied to the California Standards to for the Teaching Profession. Teachers are given a rating for each standard with one of four

categories selected: exceeds standard expectations, meets standard expectations, developing practice consistent with standard expectations, and unsatisfactory-not consistent with standard expectations.

Because of the district's teachers made a request for a new evaluation model the district formed a committee comprised of teachers, a human resource representative, and administrators to review the current research and literature on best practices and effective evaluation models, select an evaluation model to pilot during the 2017-2018 school year, collect data from participating teachers and administrators, and report findings to all stakeholders effected by the action research study.

The evaluation committee has looked at over 60 sources of information related to teacher evaluations. The committee started by summarizing all of the articles and studies and grouping common themes in the literature. A number common components, attributes, and skills appeared across the research. Some of the key components, attributes, and skills were charted: (1) all good systems of evaluations have a common definition of what good teaching is and what it looks like, (2) evidence must be collected to show the level of teaching that is taking place, (3) use of multiple measure by multiple observers, (4) if the new system of evaluation is expected to work then teachers need to be part of the process, (5) for evaluations to be effective the evaluation and the evaluator need to be seen as a support provider rather than a compliance officer looking to get someone, (6) administrators need to build trusting relationships if a new system is going to take hold and work, (7) utilization of job embedded professional development and training is an important part in the success of any new model, (8) adjusting the hours and times students are in school and in class, thinking outbox to come up with more

collaborative time for teachers to talk, plan, evaluate data on their students, (10) shifting the time demands of principals and other administrators so they can run the school, support teachers in their growth as a professional, (11) use of videotaping to do self-reflections and also have the ability to turn in the teachers best taped lesson for the administrator to watch as the observation for the classroom instructional component, (12) the use of the Danielson Model and TAP System being used in a large number of early adopting districts.

Through the initial literature review the committee felt there was enough information to use Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model (DFTEM) as a pilot with teachers during the 2017-2018 school year. The committee came to this decision based on the format of the evaluation. Specifically, teachers were actively involved in the evaluation process using DFTEM.

Development of the Research Plan

The second stage in the planning phase of the action research cycle involves developing a research plan. The participant-researcher needs to create a plan for the collection of data and what types of data are important to collect and analyze to answer the research question: **What are elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model?**

The participant-researcher will collect data from the teachers using Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). Teachers' sense of efficacy will be measured using the long form of the TSES designed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfok Hoy (2001). The long form consists of 24 questions, including eight items from each of the three subscales: efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management.

Responses to each item is a nine-point Liker scale, with 1 corresponding to "nothing" and 9 corresponding to "a great deal". Higher scores on the scale would equate with greater efficacy beliefs.

The data collected for the research question will be reported in a descriptive manner and utilized to either modify Danielson's Framework for Teaching, to meet the needs of the district by adopting Danielson's Framework for Teaching without any modifications as the new model of teacher evaluation, select a different evaluation model to pilot, or keep the current traditional evaluation model.

Ethical Considerations

When looking at the ethics related to the participant-researcher's identified Problem of Practice the participant-researcher is reminded of what Charlotte Danielson said to a group of teachers and administrators in Oak Park, Illinois on April 17, 2012, "We would be delinquent if we didn't do everything possible to improve the quality of teaching." It is extremely important for the Upper-Lower District's teachers, administrators, and most importantly students to get an evaluation process that enables teachers to grow professionally. Teachers deserve an evaluation model that sets clear expectations and a common definition of good teaching, one that involves them in the process, and one that promotes teacher learning. "This purpose does not exist because teaching, in general, is of poor quality and must be fixed, it exists because teaching is so difficult that it is never perfect; no matter how successful a lesson, it could always be improved in some way" (Danielson, 2008, p. 42).

Dana and Yendol-Hoppy (2014), remind us that "ethical considerations for the conduct of research become muddled when engagement in teacher inquiry is part of

university activities such as coursework or serves as a culminating project for a graduate degree program" (p. 149). This participant-researcher must be very aware and upfront with the participants engaged in this research. While solving a problem within CVESD, the research is also a part of the process to fulfill the requirements for a doctoral degree. Participants deserve to know this fact and be able to object or abstain. It is also important for the participant-researcher to let the Trustees of the Governing Board know all the reasons and potential conflicts that exist with the current research. The participant-researcher being the superintendent\principal could have influence on the process, so full disclosure is extremely important.

The participant-researcher is mindful not to do anything to jeopardize the identities of those individuals participating in the research. Mertler (2014) states, "generally speaking it is unethical and sometimes illegal to conduct research that exposes participants...to harm of any kind, including physical, emotional, and psychological harm" (p. 58). Since teachers, administrators, and coaches will participate on a committee to identify essential elements\components of effective teacher evaluation models the participant-researcher must protect the identity of these individuals. Dana and Yendol-Hoppy (2014), reiterate this by stating, "when sharing your inquiry work with others, it's important to consider removing any student, parent, or colleague identifying information from the discussion of your inquiry and even consider the use of pseudonyms when discussing individual students" (p. 151). There could be issues with disclosing teacher names as participants. There could be political issues with the teacher's union or retaliation by teachers not happy with the new evaluation model.

Moving from a traditional evaluation model, Danielson's Framework for Teaching evaluation model could cause extra stress and ethical problems with teachers afraid of losing their jobs. If the process for selecting and piloting a new evaluation model does not include teachers in the process this could perpetuate the fear of losing one's job. "Teachers must feel they can trust administrators not to abuse their power, but administrators must believe that they can trust teachers to not undermine the school's mission and reputation" (Danielson 2008, p. 19). Additionally, the implementation must include professional development both in what the new expectations look like in and out of the classroom as well as providing professional development when teachers do not receive a good evaluation. Teachers, for some reason, are not afraid to discuss their evaluations with colleagues. Administrators want to ensure the evaluation is supporting teachers and not adding the anxiety and fear of losing one's job.

Danielson (2008) discussed incorporating student and parent surveys into the evidence collected and utilized in the evaluation process. This will add an additional layer of ethical concern and highlights the need to protect students, parents, and the teacher. Identity protection for students and parents is a must. Too often students and parents fear retaliation or mistreatment for speaking honestly about the teachers, administration, or the school in general. These individuals will need to know their identities will be protected. We want teacher evaluations to be meaningful and growth oriented so it is important to get stakeholder feedback.

When looking at the research and the research question this participant-researcher is still compelled by the overall ethics of doing nothing and allowing the status quo to continue in the CVESD around teacher evaluations. The preliminary review of literature

indicates the CVESD is behind and needs to improve their teacher evaluation process. Not doing so puts students and teachers at risk. As the superintendent\principal, now that it has been brought to my attention, this can no longer be allowed to happen. As important as it is to bring teachers in as active participants in the evaluation process, it is also just as important to involve them in the selection and or creation of their new evaluation system. Through involvement in the process, the district is almost guaranteed to have buy-in regarding the implementation of the evaluation model.

Acting

The second phase in Mertler's (2014) action research cycle is the acting stage. During this stage the participant-researcher collects and analyzes the data for study. Qualitative and quantitative data will be collected by the participant-researcher through a series of interviews and surveys utilizing Likert scales to acquire teacher perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model. The participant-researcher will collect data on teacher perceptions of the key components of the Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model.

Sample

Six elementary teachers will be selected by stratified random sampling by grade level to serve as the sample population for this action research study. CVESD has two teachers and only two teachers at every grade level. Each grade level kindergarten through sixth grade will be assigned a number and a random number generator will be use to select three grade levels to participate in this action research study. One of the positives aspects of Danielson's Framework for Teaching is the collaboration between teachers and between teachers and administrators. By selecting participants by grade

level teachers will have the opportunity to collaborate on curriculum and planning while going through the pilot. Since this is action research and designed to solve an issue pertaining to the participant-researcher's situation, convenience sampling will be utilized as the method of sampling. Teachers will have the opportunity to opt-out if selected. The same may contain tenured teachers only, new teachers only, or a combination of tenured and new teachers.

Data Collection

Data will be collected three times during the pilot period. The TSES will be given to the sample population at the beginning and after the completion of the evaluation process. Teachers' sense of efficacy will be measured using the long form of the TSES consisting of twenty-four questions, including eight items from each of the three subscales. Responses to each item is a nine-point Likert scale, with one corresponding to "nothing" and nine corresponding to "a great deal". Higher scores on the scale would equate with greater efficacy beliefs.

The construct validity has been examined by correlating TSES to the well-established Gibson and Dembo Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) Scale. Tschannen-Mran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) reported the validity as $r = .64$, $p < .01$.

Upon completion of the pilot period the participant-researcher will conduct semistructured interviews with each of the participants. Semistructured interviews are interviews where the researcher asks a set of base questions to all of the participants with the flexibility to ask follow up questions as needed (Mertler, 2014). The semistructured interviews (Appendix A) will utilize a series of six base questions for each of the participants.

Data Analysis

The TSES's unweighted means in each of the subscale areas; efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and the efficacy in classroom management will be calculated. The first TSES scores will be compared to the second TSES scores after the post-observation semistructured interviews. The difference in scores will be used to see if teachers' senses of self-efficacy increased or decreased as after being evaluated using DFTEM.

The participant researcher will conduct an inductive analysis of the data from the semistructured interviews. Mertler (2014) will be the framework for the inductive analysis. Data will be categorized and coded according to categories as they present themselves from the participants answers. A description of the main categories will be presented. Finally, the data will be interpreted.

Developing

The third phase of Mertler's (2014) action research process is the developing phase. The data gathered from the research question will be used to guide the implementation of Danielson's Framework for Teacher Evaluation Model for CVESD. An action plan will be developed for the next phase in the selection process of a new evaluation model. The options will be to implement Danielson's model as is, with modifications, find a different model to pilot, or keep our current model for teacher evaluation. Based on the data regarding perceptions of teachers and administrators the

action plans will be developed at the district level. The resulting action plan will have an impact on all teachers and administrators.

Reflecting

The final phase of Mertler's (2014) action research process is the reflecting phase. One of the most important aspects of improvement is the process of reflection of one's practice. Across the research on effective teacher evaluations, reflection is identified as an important tool for growth and development. Action research is cyclical and before starting the next the cycle one must reflect on the process used, the data collected, and the actions taken. "Reflection is about learning from the critical examination of your own practice but also about taking the time to critically reexamine exactly who was involved in the process, what led you to want to examine this aspect of your practice, why you chose to do what you did, where is the appropriate place to implement future changes, and how this has impacted your practice" (Mertler, 2014, p. 258). For the reflection aspect of this action research the participant-researcher plans to examine the research questions in the context of the action research and the sample population utilized for the research.

The participant-researcher will work with the evaluation committee during the reflection process to examine the results of the study and determine if the results are consistent with the literature on teacher evaluation models. Using reflection, the evaluation committee will have the opportunity to see if the action research study was designed appropriately, if the right questions were asked, and if the right data were collected to answer the research question. In doing so the evaluation committee will have the opportunity to make adjustments and recommendations to the district's teachers.

Summary and Conclusion

Chapter Three described the methodology the researcher-participant will utilize for collecting and analyzing data for this action research study. The purpose of this action research study is to assess teachers' sense of their own instructional efficacy after being evaluated and determine if a higher sense of self efficacy of instructional practices exists for teachers who were evaluated utilizing *Danielson's Framework for Teaching*. The participant-researcher will seek to answer the following research question: What effect will the use of Danielson's Framework for Teaching as an evaluation model have on Central Valley Elementary School District's elementary-level teachers' beliefs concerning the efficacy of their teaching? In order to answer the research question the participant-researcher will use Mertler's (2014) action research cycle including the four phases of action research; planning, action, developing, and reflecting.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Four is to present the findings and the implication of the findings for the present action research study, including data analysis techniques, coding and themes. The chapter begins with an overview of the identified problem of practice associated with the teacher evaluation system, purpose statement associated with implementing Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model (DFTEM) that makes teachers "active participants in the evaluation process" and thus, gives teachers a voice in their own professional activity. The secondary goal is therefore, to replace the outdated teacher evaluation model currently used at the Central Valley Elementary School District (CVESD). The following associated research question was investigated and answered: What are elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model? The qualitative and quantitative data were gathered in accordance with the action research methodology described in Chapter Three of this DiP following Mertler (2014). By seeking teacher's perceptions, the participant-researcher can work to form an Action Plan described in Chapter Five that is designed to prepare administrators to implement the DFTEM for the 2018-2019 school year in the CVESD.

Problem of Practice

The identified problem of practice in CVESD is the current teacher evaluation system that is not meeting the needs of teachers or administrators. The current structure for teacher evaluations has been in place in CVESD for the at least 15 years. The evaluation forms utilized by the district for teacher evaluation have changed over the year but the overall process used to evaluate teachers has remained the same and has not kept current with the research on teacher evaluations. CVESD teachers during district start up meetings in Fall 2016 expressed a desire to find a better evaluation model. A district committee was formed for this purpose.

During the 2016-2017 school year the district committee met monthly to research teacher evaluation systems. The district committee consisted of teachers from both schools, the teacher on special assignment/instructional coach, and the superintendent\principal. Current research was reviewed and discussed at each of the monthly meetings. The TAP™ System for Teacher and Student Advancement and Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model were the teacher evaluation models the committee identified from the research. After researching evaluation models the district committee voted to pilot Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model.

In *Evaluations That Help Teachers Learn* (2010) Danielson describes "a traditional model of evaluation" as one where teachers are treated as passive participants in the evaluation process with this description matching the current evaluation model used within CVESD. With DFTEM based upon this premise, teacher evaluation is about improving teacher practice and teachers should be active participants in their evaluation

process. The present action research study implements Danielson's Framework for Teaching as the model for teacher evaluations during 2017-2018 school year.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the present action research study is to implement Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Module as the model of teacher evaluation in CVESD and find out the teachers' perceptions of it.

Data Collection Strategy

The participant-researcher utilized six teacher-participants who were randomly selected to pilot DFTEM as their evaluation model during the 2017-2018 school year. In August 2018, the participant-researcher administered the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Appendix B) to the six teacher-participants. The teacher-participants were asked to think about the traditional evaluation model they were currently using as they answered the questions on the TSES. The TSES was administered a second time at the completion of the evaluation cycle. On the second administration the teacher-participants were asked to think about being evaluated using DFTEM as they answered the questions on the TSES.

In September 2018, the participant-researcher reviewed and coached each of the six teacher-participants on DFTEM. The participant-researcher utilized Danielson's *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* 2013 Edition, *Implementing the Framework for Teaching in Enhancing Professional Practice, The Handbook for Enhancing Professional Practice: Using the Framework for Teaching in Your School*, PowerPoint presentations on implementing DFTEM, and YouTube videos to train and coach the teacher-participants in using and implementing DFTEM. Teacher-participants

were trained individually in their classrooms and each training session lasted approximately two hours.

The DFTEM consists of a structured pre-observation conference, structured observation, informal lesson reflection, a structured post-observation conference and final evaluation conference. The participant-researcher and five teacher-participants completed one evaluation cycle per teacher-participant in a twelve-week time period beginning in the middle of September. One of the teacher-participants backed out of the study and piloting of DFTEM before the start of the evaluation cycle. The teacher-participant was struggling with her instruction and felt that participating in DFTEM pilot would be too much for her.

One structured observation of each of the five teacher participants were conducted by the participant-researcher using Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2014) formal observation form (see Appendix C). "Structured observations typically require the observer to do nothing else but observe, looking usually for specific behaviors, reactions or interactions" (Mertler, 2014, p. 127). The formal observation form is in narrative form from observer notes and there is a column to record the domain and component section that corresponds to the observed behavior. The observer was looking for evidence in the teacher's instructional practices aligned with three of the four domains and sixteen of the twenty-two components.

The structured observations were conducted in each of the teacher-participants' classrooms with the teacher-participants' students. Each of the observations lasted for an entire instructional lesson between 40 and 70 minutes. Lessons observed were conducted either during the English language arts or mathematics instructional time of the day. The

observed lessons were pre-scheduled with teacher-participant input on day, time, and lesson subject being observed. Lesson plans were discussed during the observation pre-conference. Adjustments to the lesson and lesson objectives were made during the observation pre-conference. Immediately following the structured observation, the participant-researcher returned to his office to attach domains, components, and elements of DFTEM to behaviors observed during the lesson and record those on the structured observation form. A copy of the structured observation form was provided to each teacher-participant prior to the conclusion of the work day on the day of the structured observation. This was done so teacher-participants could use the information to complete the informal lesson reflection. Additionally, the teacher-participants would have all of the information prior to the structured post-observation conference. Under DFTEM there should be no surprises and got you moments during the post-observation conference.

At the conclusion of the evaluation cycle all five of the teacher-participants participated in a semistructured interview. The semistructured interview format allowed for consistency with a base set of questions while giving the participant-researcher the ability to ask follow-up and clarifying questions. "When gathering truly qualitative data, interviews are probably best conducted following semistructured or open-ended format" (Mertler, 2014, p. 130). The semistructured interviews consisted of eight open ended questions. Interviews were conducted between ten and fourteen days after the post-observation conference between the participant-researcher and the teacher-participants. Interviews lasted between fifteen and twenty minutes and all interviews took place in the participant-researchers office at CVESD. At the conclusion of the interviews, teacher-participants were given the opportunity to share comments they believed were important

to the process or answers to questions they wished had been asked by the participant-researcher. Interviews were recorded and the videos were transcribed by a professional transcription service. Teacher-participants were assured of anonymity.

Ongoing Analysis and Reflection

Early analysis of the data indicated the teacher-participant's sense of self-efficacy on the first administration of the TSES when asked to answer the questions thinking about their current evaluation system were low. In all three of the TSES subscales: efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management the teacher-participants' mean scores were in the very little to some influence range (between a scale score of 2 and 3). On the second administration of the TSES at the conclusion of the evaluation cycle using DFTEM the scores were higher. All three of the TSES subscales the teacher-participants' mean scores were in the quite a bit range (at the scale score of 7). All of the teacher-participants subscale score increased with the second administration of the TSES.

The participant-researcher completed five formal evaluations using DFTEM over a twelve-week period. This process included a pre-observation conference, a structured formal observation, and a post-observation conference. The participant-researcher broke the process down by each step completing all five of the pre-observation conferences prior to conducting one of the structured formal observations. Additionally, all five of the structured formal observations were conducted prior to the first post-observation conference. This process made the evaluation cycle longer for each of the teacher-participants. After reflecting with the teacher-participants, they would have liked to have

the participant-researcher conduct each of the formal evaluations independently and not simultaneously.

By conducting the formal evaluations simultaneously, it extended the time between each of the steps in the process. Teacher-participants and the participant-researcher were unable to meet in a timely manner. Sometimes there would be a week to ten-days between the pre-conference and structured formal observation and between the structured formal observation and the post-conference. If the participant-researcher had conducted the evaluation cycles independently they should have only taken a week to ten-days to complete the evaluation cycle.

Upon further reflection it was ambitious of the participant-researcher to conduct five formal evaluations in a twelve-week period. The participant-researcher feels he could have done a better job with each of the evaluations had he had longer time or fewer teacher-participants. The original stratified random sample of six teacher-participants represented approximately one quarter of the staff and a good sample to make a decision regarding which evaluation system would be used in the future. However, it was very difficult on the participant-researcher to do each of the evaluations while also running a school district with two schools.

Reflective Stance

Reflection during the course of the study revealed few changes. The study initially had six teacher-participants with one teacher-participant dropping out prior to the evaluation cycle. The teacher-participant did complete the initial administration of the TSES. Her scores were not calculated into the results nor was she interviewed at the

conclusion of the evaluation cycle. The loss of this participant would likely not have changed the study results drastically in one direction or another, but it must be noted.

Data Analysis and interpretations

The participant-researcher, in conjunction with the teacher-participants, principal, and instructional coach, reflected on the findings of this action research study to determine the significance of the results of this study for the teachers in the Central Valley Elementary School District. The present research study examined teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching as a model of teacher evaluation.

Two sources of data were collected for data analysis and interpretation. The first data source was the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). The TSES was administered twice; once at the beginning of the data collection process and at the conclusion of the evaluation cycle. The second source of data was a semistructured interview. Each of the five teacher-participants were asked a series of six questions (Appendix A) and follow up questions were asked for clarification or to expand on specific topics. The semistructured interviews were recorded and professionally transcribed.

Quantitative Data

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

The Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale long form was used to collect teachers' perceptions of their efficacy as it related to CVESD's traditional evaluation model and DFTEM. TSES long for consists of 24 questions, including eight items from each of the three subscales: efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management. Responses to each item are in a nine-point Liker scale, with 1

corresponding to "nothing", 3 corresponding to "very little", 5 corresponding to "some influence", 7 corresponding to "quite a bit" and 9 corresponding to "a great deal". Higher scores on the scale would equate with greater efficacy beliefs.

Five teacher-participants completed the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and after the post-evaluation semistructured interviews. The unweighted means in each of the subscale areas; efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and the efficacy in classroom management were computed and the first TSES scores were compared to the second TSES scores after the post-observation semistructured interview.

Table 4.1

Difference in mean scores from 1st administration to 2nd administration TSES

TSES Subscale	Mean 1st Administration	Mean 2nd Administration	Difference in Means
Efficacy in Student Engagement	2.400	6.900	4.500
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	3.030	7.650	4.620
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3.350	7.325	3.975

These comparisons showed an increase in teachers' sense of efficacy on all subscale areas from the first administration to the second administration of the TSES. The

difference in means showed a 4.5-point increase in the subscale efficacy in student engagement, a 4.62-point increase in the subscale efficacy in instructional strategies, and a 3.975-point increase in the subscale efficacy in classroom management.

Table 4.2

Individual teacher differences in mean scores from 1st administration to 2nd administration TSES

TSES Subscale	Mrs. Parker	Mrs. Davis	Mrs. Jones	Mrs. Hill	Mrs. Smith
Efficacy in Student Engagement	6.124	1.500	3.375	5.375	4.875
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	5.625	4.375	2.500	5.000	5.000
Efficacy in Classroom Management	5.250	0.025	2.750	5.125	5.250

Individual teacher scores also showed all teacher with an increase in efficacy across all three subscales. Mrs. Parker having the greatest gains and Mrs. Davis having the least gains in efficacy of teaching practices after being evaluated using DFTEM.

Table 4.3

Difference in mean scores by question from 1ˢᵗ administration to 2ⁿᵈ administration

TSES Question	Mean Score 1ˢᵗ administration	Mean Score 2ⁿᵈ Administration	Difference in Mean Scores
1	2.400	7.000	4.600
2	2.600	7.200	4.600
3	4.600	7.800	3.200
4	2.600	6.400	4.000
5	4.000	7.800	3.800
6	3.200	7.400	4.200
7	3.200	7.600	4.400
8	4.000	7.800	3.800
9	2.400	7.200	4.800
10	3.400	7.600	4.200
11	3.600	6.800	3.200
12	2.600	6.200	3.600
13	3.800	7.600	3.800
14	2.600	7.400	4.800
15	3.400	7.000	3.600
16	3.000	7.400	4.400
17	2.800	7.800	5.000
18	2.600	7.400	4.800
19	3.400	6.600	3.200
20	3.200	7.600	4.400

21	3.600	6.600	3.000
22	2.000	6.400	4.400
23	3.000	8.000	5.000
24	2.600	8.400	5.800

Table 4.3 shows the differences in means scores by question from the first administration to the second administration of the TSES. The mean scores for every question increased after being evaluated using DFTEM. Increases ranged from 3.2 to 5.8 points on a scale of 1 to 9.

Qualitative Data

Semistructured Interviews.

Following the evaluation cycle and second administration of the TSES semistructured interviews were conducted by the participant-researcher with all of the five teacher-participants individually. All teacher-participants are identified with a pseudonym, demographic data are described, and teacher-participant responses to the interview questions. A summative analysis of the data collected during the semistructured interviews is provided.

What follows is a description of each of the five-teacher-participants:

Mrs. Parker. Mrs. Parker is a 42-year-old white, non-Hispanic female with fourteen years of teaching experience in grades kindergarten through second. She has a Master's Degree in education with an emphasis in reading. Mrs. Parker holds a California clear multiple subjects credential and is a licensed reading specialist. She has taught first grade in the CVESD for the past six years.

Mrs. Parker believed being evaluated under the DFTEM was a positive experience for her. She liked the reflective nature of DFTEM. When I asked her thoughts on DFTEM she said "I like definitely the pre-discussion, thinking through the planning, and then I think the powerful part is definitely the end, reflecting on what was done". Additionally, the planning of lessons made her think about what it was she was going to teach and taking the time to reflect on the needs of all of her students. It forced her to think about who would need modifications to access the curriculum and what those modification would be. Going through the process made her realize that she does this all the time. It might not be in the formal manner that was asked of her during the evaluation cycle but that she was doing this as she was planning for all of her lessons.

When asked to talk about her experience with DFTEM and how it made her feel Mrs. Davis talked about the collaborative nature of DFTEM. Stating, "it's a positive thing as far as being able to have somebody else talk things through with". The DFTEM allowed for collaboration between the administrator and teacher during the pre and post-observation conferences. This gave Mrs. Parker the opportunity to bounce ideas off the administrator, especially the thought of "something could have gone better, what do you think?". She also liked having the additional eyes looking for specific things during her lesson observation stating, "sometimes another set of eyes and talking about that is also helpful". The collaborative nature and her feeling comfortable with the process of DFTEM allowed Mrs. Parker to ask the administrator to watch for specific behaviors during the lesson observation. "I just thought it was an interesting thing to be able to have that discussion with you prior and say, 'I really want you watching how just the smallest things are going to be an issue for some kids".

With DFTEM there is a level of transparency that is not achieved during the traditional evaluation model used in the CVESD. Mrs. Parker felt comfortable during the evaluation cycle that she didn't have under the traditional evaluation model especially when you know what is going to be expected of you. When asked specifically, Mrs. Parker said, "you don't feel like someone's coming in and looking at something other than what you've already discussed". She had a feeling that though DFTEM there was no one playing gotcha and trying to find you doing something wrong.

Mrs. Parker also felt that the observation process was very student focused. That the administrator wasn't just looking at what the teacher was doing but what the students were getting out of the lesson. In the traditional model she felt that it was more about coming in and watching the teacher then the administrator reporting back to the teacher. Most importantly the lesson observation "should be about the instruction and what the kids are getting from it".

Moving forward toward implementation of DFTEM, Mrs. Parker felt it was important to stress the benefits of the outcomes with the rest of the staff. She believes there will be some people who are going to be nervous because it seems like there is a lot involved in the process compared to the traditional model.

Mrs. Davis. Mrs. Davis is a 38-year-old white, non-Hispanic female with thirteen years of teaching experience in grades five through seven. She has a Bachelor's Degree in business administration with a minor in political science and is currently working on a Master's Degree in education curriculum and instruction. Mrs. Davis holds a California multiple subjects credential with a supplemental authorization in government. She has taught grades five, six, and seven in the CVESD for the past nine years.

Mrs. Davis's feelings regarding DFTEM were that it was a more complete observation that the traditional model used in CVESD. Teachers and administrators do a lot more together. There is more of a collaborative feel under DFTEM. In the traditional model there is very little mutual conversation. In the traditional model it is the administrator asking, "what day do you want to do your evaluation?" "what will you be teaching ELA, math, science, or social studies?" When do you want to do your post-observation conference?" Then at the post-conference it is just the administrator telling the teacher what he saw. The teacher doesn't know going into the post-conference if it is going to be good or bad regardless of how the teacher felt the lesson went. The teacher didn't know what the administrator was looking for. "This always made me very nervous and uneasy."

Under DFTEM there is the collaborative nature of a pre-conference where there are a set of questions for the teacher and administrator to discuss before the formal lesson observation. After the formal lesson observation, the administrator hands the teacher his notes for the teacher to review prior to the post conference. "Giving me your notes from the observation made it so that I knew what you saw during my lesson and what it was that we would be talking about during my post-conference meeting." During the post-conference instead of the administrator saying here is what I saw, here is the good and the bad, let's move on, there is conversational back and forth between the administrator and teacher around the notes from the formal observation.

Mrs. Davis felt that the questionnaire used to plan lessons was a great thing. It included all of the pieces that make a well-rounded lesson. "It also reminds you of some of the things that maybe you've let slip and that you don't put so much focus on." Mrs.

Davis felt that she can get so focused on content that she doesn't always include all of the parts of a lesson that DFTEM requires you to think about. She also felt that her planning had improved because of the evaluation process under DFTEM.

For implementation of DFTEM as the teacher evaluation method Mrs. Davis believes the district should make sure the teachers have buy-in and know upfront what the expectations are going to be. For the district to layout the model and process for the evaluation cycle. "Teachers know, here's where we start, here's where we end up and however long it takes you to get there." It is also important for teachers to know why we are doing this. Additionally, it is important for the teachers to know where the district plans to go with it. Mrs. Davis would like to see the process broken up and chunked for teachers in the first year and then especially for new teachers after that. Maybe even the possibility of having multiple observers to provide additional input. Because multiple observers will see different things and this can give the teacher additional information to improve.

Mrs. Jones. Mrs. Jones is a 39-year-old white, non-Hispanic female with three years of teaching experience in fifth grade. She has a Bachelor's Degree in liberal studies. Mrs. Jones is a university intern working on her California multiple subjects teaching credential. She has taught fifth grade in the CVESD for the past three years.

Being a university intern Mrs. Jones is observed multiple times each semester by her advisor from the university. Mrs. Jones felt comfortable with DFTEM because it was very similar to the process used by the university when they conduct lesson observations. When asked her thoughts on DFTEM she stated "I liked it". She thought it was more of a conversation between the teacher and the administrator. There was input that was

provided by both the teacher and the administrator. "I thought it was beneficial for both of us because I was able to, maybe, see things that I didn't necessarily see. You could point things out." With DFTEM Mrs. Jones felt like there was a lot of reflection throughout the process.

Being evaluated under DFTEM Mrs. Jones felt that she knew what to expect of the process compared to the traditional model used in CVESD. During the process of DFTEM "With all of the paperwork and everything you've given me, it's like you said, 'lay it out for me', and I'm able to know what you're looking for." This helped her feel more comfortable than being evaluated under the other process. The old process made her extremely nervous having someone come in and observe her. This was because she didn't know what the administrator was looking for or what the administrator wanted to see.

If the district is going to move forward with the implementation of DFTEM Mrs. Jones felt as if the process she just went through was fine for others to do. She didn't feel any additional pressure to perform. Additionally, Mrs. Jones wasn't overwhelmed with the process.

Mrs. Hill. Mrs. Hill is a 33-year-old white, non-Hispanic female with six years of teaching experience in grades three, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve. She has a Bachelor's Degree in liberal studies. Mrs. Hill holds a California multiple subjects credential. She has taught third grade in the CVESD for the past four years.

Mrs. Hill's early thoughts and impressions of DFTEM were that it was a much more comprehensive evaluation model than the traditional model used in CVESD. In the traditional model an evaluator would come in and watch a staged lesson and say here is my critique. The administrator would discuss what he saw and move on from there. In

77

Mrs. Hill's opinion DFTEM is more involved and requires more from teacher than the observer or administrator. It forces teachers to "really evaluate their own lesson and figure out where they're going with instruction from there. Which I think makes it more relevant." The relevance extends to the classroom, improving instruction, and to the evaluation process.

Mrs. Hill felt that the traditional model was always nerve-wracking for her because under the traditional model she had no say in the evaluation process. She knew that the evaluator was coming in but didn't have an idea of what the evaluator was looking for.

With DFTEM she knew right from the beginning what was happening. "Knowing that there was that follow up piece and that I had a voice in that made it less nerve-wracking". Mrs. Hill believed her lesson didn't go well and during the follow up (post-conference) she was able to discuss that and what she did differently afterwards so that the students got it. In the traditional system it would have been the evaluator telling her "it wasn't good and let's just move on".

The DFTEM is a more transparent process where teachers know what is expected of them and what it is that the evaluator will be looking for. There was no transparency in the traditional system. "I know you were coming in to evaluate me as a teacher and how well I interact with my students, but I didn't see what you were looking for or what your check boxes were until the end." DFTEM created a system where Mrs. Hill was more comfortable with the process because she knew upfront what was going to happen and what the administrator observing her was looking for. This process looks at the overall teacher. Specifically, "Are you addressing your students? How well are you questioning?

How well are you responding to their needs?" Additionally, there was no support from the administrator. In DFTEM there is that support from the start. The support starts with the pre-conference and the ability to talk about the lesson plan and the needs of the teacher and classroom.

Moving toward implementation of DFTEM in the CVESD Mrs. Hill thought it was important for the district to strategically map out the process for the teachers. Letting them know the timelines and what is expected of teachers. This should be done for all teachers before DFTEM is implemented and a single evaluation cycle is started. Not having all of this information and knowledge can lead to teachers being overwhelmed. Teachers also need to know the level of supports that will be provided with the new model. Mrs. Hill would also like to see multiple evaluators to provide additional support for teachers.

Mrs. Smith. Mrs. Smith is a 28-year-old white, non-Hispanic female with five years of teaching experience in third grade. She has a Bachelor's Degree in liberal studies and is working on a Master's Degree in educational counseling. Mrs. Smith holds a California multiple subjects credential. She has taught third grade in the CVESD for the past five years.

Mrs. Smith liked the process of being evaluated under DFTEM because "it makes sense because you're really thinking about why you're doing that lesson and what's the point of it, and what you want to get out of it." For Mrs. Smith it reassured her that what she was doing was the right way to do things. These are the same things she thinks about or the same process she goes through as she plans for her lessons. She doesn't do it in the same formal way that DFTEM asks for but she still doing the steps. This allowed her to

be comfortable and not overwhelmed with the process. Mrs. Smith was really nervous about being a part of the pilot group because she was working on her Master's program and afraid the new process would overwhelm her.

Mrs. Smith didn't think the old evaluation system was very transparent. Believing that it was almost a secret as to what the administration was looking for. "The admin comes in, they have their sheet of paper. It's not like we get that sheet of paper ahead of time or anything like that." Because the teacher is unsure of what the administrator is looking for, the teacher then in his or her head is asking "oh is this what they want to see? Is this the kind of thing they want to see?" With DFTEM Mrs. Smith knew exactly what the administrator was looking for and that it had be previously discussed during the pre-conference. The biggest difference is that DFTEM is transparent and the old system is not.

When Mrs. Smith was shown her TSES scores and asked what she thought the biggest reason for the difference in scores she believed it to be because of the discussions between the teacher and the administrator. These were not one-sided discussions but collaborative discussions with the administrator asking clarifying questions to help with the planning of the lesson or for understanding during the post-conference. It is an opportunity for someone else in education to see what you are doing and to validate your process and thinking.

When asked what does the district need to be aware of if DFTEM is implemented, Mrs. Smith wanted the district to be mindful of the timing of each of the components, pre-conference, formal observation, and post-conference. Mrs. Smith is one of those teachers that had to wait a little longer between her pre-conference and her formal

observation because of the process the researcher-participant used to do all five of the evaluation cycles. She wants the evaluator to do one teacher at a time so that there isn't a larger than needed gap between the pre-conference and formal observation, because teachers have planned to give specific lessons on a specific day or sequence and if that is pushed backwards it can mess up things for the teacher.

Coding

An inductive analysis of the content of the semistructured interviews data were coded using methods delineated by Mertler (2014) as major trends and themes emerged. Through the inductive analysis of the interview data the main themes that emerged were; collaborative, transparent, and reflective. An analysis and detailed summaries of each of the identified themes are presented in the following section.

Themes

Collaborative. The first major theme that appeared in the semistructured interviews was the collaborative nature and process associated with DFTEM. DFTEM offered opportunities for the teacher-participants and the researcher-participant to collaborate during the pre and post-observation conference. The teacher-participants saw this as a positive approach that was very different than the traditional model of evaluation that had been used. Mrs. Parker commented, "As a teacher, I think it's a positive thing as far as just being able to have somebody else to talk things through with." The pre-observation conferences gave the teacher-participants and the researcher-participant time to discuss the lesson planning process, making sure the teachers had included the

necessary modifications and supports for all of the students to access the lessons. Mrs. Smith further stating, "I like definitely the pre-discussion, thinking through the planning."

The formal structured observation also offered an opportunity for collaboration. Teacher-participants were able to ask the researcher-participant to look for and/or watch for certain aspects of the lesson to be discussed during the post-observation conference. For Mrs. Smith she was able to say "I really want you watch how just the smallest things are going to be an issue for some kids and I want you to watch for it." The teacher-participants would then receive a copy of the researcher-participant's observation notes after the observation. This way the teacher-participants could see the feedback they were asking for right away.

The post-observation conference gave the final opportunity for the teacher-participants and the researcher-participant to collaborate. Using the data gathered from the participant-researcher's observation notes the two would discuss where each believed the teacher-participant performed using Danielson's Framework for Teaching. As Mrs. Jones explained, "I felt I was able to have more input…give you more how I felt about the lesson. Rather than you just telling me. Okay, this is what happened, this is what I saw, this is what you need to change, this is what you did well".

Transparent. Every teacher-participant in the semi-structured interviews talked about DFTEM as being open and transparent. Teacher-participants knew the expectations associated with each of the different parts of the evaluation process. Mrs. Smith explained, "With this model (DFTEM) I knew what you were looking for and we had previously discussed it." With DFTEM teachers are provided with a copy of the questions the administrator is going to ask during the pre and post-observation conferences prior to

the conferences taking place (Appendix D and E). Having the questions ahead of time allowed the teacher-participants to come to the conferences prepared to answer those guiding questions. Mrs. Parker stated, "there's definitely a comfortableness as far as in relation to knowing these are the things that are expected. Nothing's hidden. No one's trying to catch you doing something wrong. You (the administrator) wants to come in and see me doing it well."

During the pre-observation conference the teacher and the administrator have the opportunity to discuss what the focus of the formal observation will be. What it is that the administrator will be looking for and what the teacher would like the administrator to look for. Mrs. Davis explains "with Danielson it's there from the beginning like, here is our checklist. Here is what we are looking for. Plus, it gives the teacher and opportunity to say, 'here is what I want you to focus on so that the transparency is on both sides.'"

The formal observation has the administrator taking copious notes making sure to write down everything taking place during the lesson using Exhibit D. Immediately following the formal observation, the administrator codes the notes from the formal observation. Each of the teacher's actions are coded and associated with a domain and component from Danielson's Framework for Teaching. Once completed the administrator makes a copy and gives it to the teacher. The teacher is to receive a copy of the administrator's notes on the same day as the observation. This helps with the open and transparent process. As Mrs. Davis explained, "There is nothing hidden. Here's all of my notes. Take the time to look at what I say and what I observed. Then comeback and have a discussion about those notes".

Finally, the post-observation conference offers another opportunity for transparency in the evaluation model. Not only are the teachers provided with a copy of the administrator's notes, but also provided with the follow up questions the administrator and teacher will discuss during the post-observation conference. Teachers go into the post-conference ready and prepared to discuss the contents of the lesson. Mrs. Hill stated, "knowing that there was a follow up piece, I had the questions, and that I had a voice made it made it extremely open and transparent process".

Reflective. DFTEM allowed the teacher-participants to be reflective in their instructional practices. "Danielson really made me think about my lesson more in depth. Whether it was during the lesson planning, observation, or post-observation I really had to reflect and think about my lesson" stated Mrs. Smith. Mrs. Jones added, "Danielson made me think about the instruction and what the kids are getting from it." Mrs. Smith also said, "I love the idea of thinking through what it is that I'm going to be teaching, taking the time to think about what all my students know, what they need to know and those kids that are going to need modifications, how am I going to do that." The processes in place under DFTEM provided each of the teacher-participants to be reflective in their lesson planning, lesson delivery, and after lesson delivery.

Answering the Research Question

The purpose of the research was to answer the Research Question: *What are elementary teacher's perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model?* By comparing the TSES results with the answers from the semistructured interview questions it is evident that teacher-participants are positive in their perceptions of DFTEM. The teacher-participants were asked to rate their sense of efficacy under a

traditional evaluation model and then the teachers were asked to again rate their sense of efficacy after being evaluated under DFTEM on the TSES. 100% of teacher-participants showed an increase in their perceived sense of self efficacy on the TSES in all subscale areas after being evaluated using DFTEM.

This positive perception of DFTEM is reinforced by the answers to the semistructured interview questions where all of the teacher-participants had a positive perception of DFTEM. All of the answers to the semistructured interview questions were positive and there were no negative responses to any of the questions by any of the teacher-participants. When asked to describe what they thought about DFTEM all of the teacher-participants had positive answers. Mrs. Jones stated, "I like it." Mrs. Hill added, "I think it's a lot more comprehensive than the traditional model…it's definitely more involved and puts a lot more back on the teacher…to really evaluate their own lesson…Which I think makes it more relevant." And Mrs. Smith concluded, "it makes sense because you're really thinking about why you're doing that lesson and what's the point of it, and what you want to get out of it. I think it's easier".

Conclusion

This action research study was designed to examine elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model (DFTEM). The acting phase of action research involved the analysis of qualitative data in the form of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale and qualitative data presented through semistructured interviews by the participant-researcher. Both sets of were analyzed and showed a positive perception of DFTEM by elementary teachers in the Central Valley Elementary School District (CVESD).

A summary and discussion of the research is presented in Chapter Five of this dissertation, which uses the final two stages of action research, developing and reflecting to finalize the present action research study. The superintendent\principal (participant-researcher), in conjunction with the teacher participants, principal, and instructional coach utilized the results of this study to form an action plan for the Central Valley Elementary School District in selecting an appropriate teacher evaluation model. Chapter Five will also present reflections on this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, ACTION PLAN, AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the present action research study as well as an action plan that details the ongoing study of elementary teachers' perceptions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation Model (DFTEM). This Chapter begins by providing an overview of this action research study and an emphasis on why this study was important to the teachers and administration at Central Valley Elementary School District (CVESD). This action research study examined CVESD elementary teachers' perceptions of DFTEM.

This action research study began in April 2015 when CVESD teachers asked district administration to examine the evaluation procedures used to evaluate CVESD teachers. A committee comprised of five teachers, a human resources representative, and two administrators was formed to research and study teacher evaluation models. The committee examined current research and selected DFTEM to pilot during the 2017-2018 school year. Six teachers (two teachers from each grade; first, third, and fifth) were selected at random by grade level at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year to pilot DFTEM. One first grade teacher dropped out of the study prior to the pre-conference meetings with the teacher-participants.

Teacher-participants were given the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) at the beginning of the evaluation process. They were asked to fill out the TSES while considering being evaluated under their traditional model of evaluation. After completing the TSES the participant-teachers went through an evaluation cycle using DFTEM. This included a pre-observation conference, a structured observation, a post-observation conference, and a final evaluation conference. At the conclusion of the evaluation cycle the teacher-participants were administered the TSES again, but this time they were asked to complete the TSES thinking about being evaluated under DFTEM. All of the teacher-participants participated in a semistructured interview with the participant-researcher after the evaluation cycle. Teacher-participants were asked the same six questions with follow-up questions for clarification.

Summary of Findings

Creswell (2005) states that "mixed methods designs are procedures for collecting, analyzing, and linking both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study" (p. 53). This action research study used two sources of data. The first source of data was the long form of the TSES designed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfok Hoy (2001). The long form consists of 24 questions, including eight items from each of the three subscales: efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management. Responses to each item are on a nine-point Liker scale, with 1 corresponding to "nothing" and 9 corresponding to "a great deal". Higher scores on the scale would equate with greater efficacy beliefs. The second source of data were the semistructured interviews.

The data revealed a positive perception of DFTEM. On the TSES the teacher-participants rated their sense of self efficacy substantially higher in all areas after being evaluated using DFTEM compared to their sense of self efficacy when thinking about being evaluated under their traditional model of teacher evaluation. The scores showed increases in self efficacy on all three subscales; instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management. In the subscale instructional strategies had a difference in mean scores of 4.62 points from 3.03 to 7.65. Subscale student engagement had a difference in mean scores of 4.5 points from 2.4 to 6.9. Lastly, subscale classroom management had a difference in mean scores of 3.975 points from 3.35 to 7.325. Additionally, all of the teacher participants scored each of the 24 questions on the TSES higher after being evaluated using DFTEM. The mean score increases per question ranged from 3.0 to 5.2 point increases after being evaluated using DFTEM.

From the teacher-participant semistructured interviews three themes were identified from their responses. The teacher-participants described DFTEM as being collaborative, transparent, and reflective. All of the teacher-participants expressed that DFTEM provided multiple opportunities for teachers and administrators to collaborate during the evaluation process. This opportunity to collaborate was appreciated and the teacher-participants believed it made the evaluation process more meaningful. The teacher-participants also discussed the transparency associated with DFTEM. Teacher-participants knew the expectations associated with each process in the evaluation. This is something they did not feel was a part of the traditional model of teacher evaluation previously used by the CVESD. Finally, the teacher-participants expressed that DFTEM forced them to be reflective in their professional practices. Teacher-participants felt that

this was a major difference between the traditional model and DFTEM. All of the teacher-participants' responses to the questions were positive and there were no negative responses regarding DFTEM.

<p align="center">**Action Plan**</p>

Mertler (2014) states "action research is built on the premise that some type of action will result from your action research project" (p. 210). In April 2018, the findings from Chapter 4 were presented to the evaluation committee. The teacher-participants and the participant-researcher presented the findings. After the presentation of the data the participant-researcher reminded the evaluation committee of the problem of practice that led to the development of the research question and ultimately the research itself. The identified problem of practice in the CVESD is a dysfunctional evaluation system that is not meeting the needs of teachers or administrators. Additionally, the participant researcher reviewed the purpose of this action research study. The purpose of this action research study was to determine if DFTEM is the appropriate evaluation model to replace the district's current teacher evaluation model.

The first step in developing an action plan required the evaluation committee to answer the question: Based on the findings from Chapter 4 do you recommend moving forward with DFTEM as the next evaluation process in the CVESD? Each of the committee members were given an opportunity to state their position and their reasoning behind their decision. All of the committee members stated that they wanted to move forward and develop an action plan to move forward with implementation of DFTEM as the evaluation process for CVESD teachers.

The evaluation committee met three times during the month of April 2018 to develop this action plan. Everyone was in agreement that an action plan needed to be developed before taking it to the teaching staff for final approval. The following steps were identified:

1. Present action plan to teachers for approval.

2. Create memorandum of understanding between the CVESD and CVESD teachers' association outlining the new evaluation procedures.

3. Develop a plan for professional development of teachers and administrators.

4. Develop a plan to implement DFTEM.

5. Develop a plan to monitor and evaluate the implementation of DFTEM.

Presentation of Action Plan to Teachers

In May 2018 the evaluation committee presented their recommendation to all teachers in the CVESD for final approval to move forward with DFTEM as the evaluation process for CVESD teachers. The committee presented the findings from Chapter 4 as well as the action plan to implement DFTEM. After the presentation the evaluation committee to questions from the teachers and tried to answer them the best they could. Teachers were concerned with what happens when they receive a poor evaluation, what happens when they receive a positive evaluation, how much time and effort would be expended on this new evaluation process, how would administrators and teachers be trained in the process, does the evaluation process measure our current goals, how will teachers receive support in the process?

After answering these and other questions the teachers were released and told they would receive a Google Form to vote to proceed with DFTEM as the evaluation process

for CVESD teachers. The following day the teachers were sent the Google Form electronically and they were able to vote anonymously on whether to proceed with DFTEM. 90% of teachers voted to move forward with DFTEM as the process for evaluation for the 2018-2019 school year.

Memorandum of Understanding

In May 2018 after the CVESD teachers voted to move forward with DFTEM a memorandum of understanding (MOU) was created between the CVESD teachers' association and the CVESD. The MOU was created to replace the contract language regarding teacher evaluations. The MOU would stay in place until the next round of contract negotiations at which time the language in the MOU would be added to the CVESD teachers' association contract.

Professional Development

In trying to develop a plan for professional development for teachers and administrators on DFTEM it was decided that the CVESD should contract with the Danielson Group to provide the professional development. The district will utilize start up days at the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year to provide teachers and administrators with the initial training. The district will also contract with the Danielson Group to provide onsite coaching of teachers and administrators throughout the school year. The district will utilize Title I, Title II, and LCAP dollars to pay for the professional development.

The evaluation committee will meet at the end of the 2018-2019 school year to develop a plan for future professional development based on the needs of the teachers and

administrators. The committee will create a survey in April 2019 for teachers and administrators to fill out to help the committee identify the districts needs.

Development of Implementation Plan

Under the traditional model of evaluation permanent teachers were evaluated every other year and probationary teachers every year. Utilizing the information collected during the literature review the evaluation committee recommended that all teachers be evaluated on an annual basis. The belief was that the purpose of evaluation was for continuous improvement. This could not happen on a every other year basis. The committee felt it was important for all teachers to go through the process in year one while the Danielson group provided the professional development. Teachers and administrators will be surveyed in April 2019 for their opinions regarding how often teachers should be evaluated using DFTEM.

The district hired an additional administrator (vice principal) for the 2018-2019 school year. The addition of the vice principal will allow for the three administrators in the district to divide the teachers up and not overload any one evaluator. The vice principal had served as a teacher and teacher on special assignment for the district. The committee wanted to make sure that the administrators were not doing more than one evaluation at a time. As discussed in Chapter 4 the participant-researcher found it difficult to do more than one evaluation at a time and that it was not fair to the teachers being evaluated. It is important to focus on one teacher at a time.

Plan to Monitor and Evaluate DFTEM

The evaluation committee agreed to meet after the initial professional development by the Danielson Group to develop a plan to monitor and evaluate DFTEM.

The committee felt they needed more information in order to create a plan to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of DFTEM. The committee wanted to utilize the consultants from the Danielson Group to help them create a tool for this process.

Future Research

The participant-researcher began this action research study because of an identified need of teachers and administrators in the CVESD. Teachers were selected to participate based on grade levels and only elementary teachers were selected to participate. The CVESD is comprised of grades transitional kindergarten through eight. The study did not get the perceptions of the middle school teachers. Additionally, the stratified random sample of teachers represented only one third of the teaching staff and was comprised of a single gender. The stratified random sample did not include any first- or second-year teachers. All of the teacher-participants were veteran teachers.

In reflecting on this action research study, it will be important in the future to gather the perceptions of all the teachers. All of the teachers will need to complete the TSES and from there semistructured interviews conducted based on their responses. This information should help guide the evaluation committee in its implementation of DFTEM as the evaluation process for the CVESD teachers. This process should guide the evaluation committee toward changes if needed in year two.

This action research study sought to gather the perceptions of elementary teachers regarding DFTEM. The study did not look at the effects on professional practices of the teachers. According to Danielson (2007, 2010, 2012) one of the main purposes of teacher evaluation is for teachers to improve and get better. It will be extremely important during the first year to evaluate and study the effects that DFTEM has on individual teacher's

professional practices. Through the implementation of DFTEM, do the teachers feel they are going professionally? In what ways have you grown as a result of implementing DFTEM as your evaluation process? What are the effects on new teachers? These are all questions the evaluation committee should seek to answer after the first year of implementation.

Conclusion

This action research study was conducted to gather elementary teachers' perceptions of DFTEM with the purpose of seeing if DFTEM was the right evaluation process to replace the outdated evaluation process currently in place in the CVESD. Six elementary teachers were selected at random by grade level to participate. One teacher dropped out leaving five teachers to pilot DFTEM. The teacher-participants filled out the TSES prior to beginning the evaluation process. Participant-teachers participated in pre-conferences, classroom observations, post-conferences, and a final evaluation meeting. Teachers also filled out the TSES again at the conclusion of the evaluation process. Scores from the first and second administration of the TSES were compare against each other. The comparison showed significant gains in each teacher's sense of self efficacy after being evaluation using DFTEM.

Additionally, each of the five teachers participated in a semistructured interview with the participant-researcher. The responses were all positive and there were not any negative comments made about DFTEM. Three themes emerged as a result of the semistructured interviews. The participant-teachers described DFTEM as being collaborative, transparent, and reflective.

Based on the findings in Chapter 4 the evaluation committee met, reviewed the data, presented the data to all teachers in the CVESD, and created an action plan to move forward with implementing DFTEM. Over the course of the next year the evaluation committee will need to develop an evaluation tool to help with the implementation of DFTEM. The data collected should be presented to all teachers and administrators in the CVESD. This will help the evaluation committee develop and action plan for year two.

REFERENCES

Andrzejewski, J. & Alessio, J. (1999) Education for global citizenship and social responsibility. *Progressive perspectives, monograph series. John Dewy project on progressive education.* College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont. 3(5).

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should know and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009). Standards for the teaching profession. Retrieved March 10, 2017, http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/CSTP-2009.pdf

California Department of Education. (2004a). *NCLB teacher requirements resource guide.* Sacramento, CA.

Cooney, S., & Bottoms, G. (2003). *A highly qualified teacher in every middle grades classroom: What states, districts, and schools can do.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved September 24, 2015, http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED478007

Coggshall, J. G., Rasmussen, C., Colton, A., Milton, J., & Jaques, C. (2012). Generating teaching effectiveness: The role of job-embedded professional learning in teacher

evaluation. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

    Retrieved September 24, 2015, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED532776

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating*

    quantitative and qualitative research. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Merrill,

    Prentice Hall.

Dana, N.F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2014). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom*

    research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry

    (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*.

    Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2008). *The handbook for enhancing professional practice: Using the*

    framework for teaching in your school. Alexandria, VA: Association for

    Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2010). Evaluations That Help Teachers Learn. *Educational*

    Leadership, 68(4), 35-39.

Danielson, C. (2012). *Making Teacher Evaluations Meaningful* [Video file]. Retrieved

    Oct. 10, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KzDcYuSsU2E.

Danielson, C. (2013). The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument. Retrieved

    Oct. 6, 2015, from https:// www.danielsongroup.org./download/?download=448

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of

    state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *8*(1). Retrieved

    February 13, 2016, from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/392/515

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ducommun, C. E. (2010). Recognizing and developing

    effective teaching in all schools: What policymakers should know and

    do. *National Education Association and the American Association of Colleges of*

    Teacher Education. Retrieved January 18, 2016, from

    http://www.aacte.org/pdf/Publications/Reports_Studies/Effective%20Teaching%2

    0-%20Linda%20Darling-Hammond.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Creating a Comprehensive System for Evaluating and

    Supporting Effective Teaching. *Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in*

    Education. Retrieved October 3, 2015, from

    http://www.smmcta.com/uploads/9/9/4/2/9942134/evaluation_research_stanford_

    2012.pdf

Douglas, B., Lewis, C.W., Douglas, A., Scott, M.E., & Garrison-Wade, D. (2008). The

    impact of white teachers on the academic achievement of black students: An

    exploratory qualitative analysis. *Educational Foundations* (Winter-Spring), p. 47-

    62.

Fensterwald, J. (2016, April 13). Districts, unions innovate to evaluate teachers.

    Retrieved April 15, 2016, from http://edsource.org/2016/districts-unions-

    innovate-to-evaluate-teachers-stull-act/562703

Futrell, M. (2000). The challenge of 21st century: Developing a highly qualified cadre of

    teachers to teach our nation's diverse student population. *Journal of Negro*

    Education, 68(3), p. 318-334.

Futrell, M., Gomez, J., & Bedden, D. (2003). Teaching children of the new America. *Phi*

    Delta Kappan, 84(5), p. 381-385.

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2003). Teacher quality and student achievement: Urban

    Diversity Series (Report No. UDS-115). Washington DC: Department of

    Education. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2015, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED477271

Hien, T. (2009). Why is action research suitable for education? *VNU Journal of Science,*

    Foreign Languages, (25), 97-106. Retrieved March 5, 2016, from

    http://tapchi.vnu.edu.vn/nn_2_09/b4.pdf

Hill, H., & Herlihy, C. (2011, November). Prioritizing teaching quality in a new system

    of teacher evaluation. Retrieved February 24, 2016, from

    http://www.aei.org/publication/prioritizing-teaching-quality-in-a-new-system-of-

    teacher-evaluation/

Howard, G. R. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial*

    schools. NY: Teachers College Press.

Howard, T. C. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement*

    gap in America's classrooms. NY: Teachers College Press.

Jerald, C. D. (2002). All talk, no action: Putting an end to out-of-field teaching. Retrieved

    February 13, 2016, from https://eric.ed.gov/?q=ED468741

Kaplan, L.S., & Owings, W. A. (2001). Teacher quality and student achievement:

    Recommendations for principals. *National Association of Secondary School*

    Principals, 85(628), 64-73. Retrieved February 28, 2016, from ProQuest

    database.

Learning Point Associates. (2010, May). Emerging Trends Reflected in the State Phase 1:

    Race to the Top Applications. Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness. An Emerging

Trends Report from Learning Point Associates, Learning Point Associates, 2010-
May. Retrieved February 22, 2016, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509942

Lee, E. (1999) Taking multicultural, anti-racist education seriously. In Levine, D., Lowe,
R., Peterson, B., & Tenorio, R. (Eds.), *Rethinking schools: An agenda for change.*
p. 9-16. New York: The New Press.

Marzano, R.J., Pickering, D.J. & Pollock, J.E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works:
Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA:
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Melrose, M. J. (2001). Maximizing the Rigor of Action Research: Why Would You Want
To? How Could You? *Field Methods, 13*(2), 160-180.
doi:10.1177/1525822x0101300203

Mendro, R.L. (1998). Student achievement and school and teacher accountability.
Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, *12*(3), 257-267.

Mertler, C.A. (2014). *Action research: Improving schools and empowering educators* (4th
ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications.

Minnici, A. (2014). The mind shift in teacher evaluation where we stand and where we
need to go. *American Educator, 38*(1), 22-26. Retrieved February 22, 2016, from
http://www.smmcta.com/uploads/9/9/4/2/9942134/evaluation_research_stanford_
2012.pdf

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2012). State of the States 2012: Teacher
Effectiveness Policies. NCTQ "State Teacher Policy Yearbook" Brief Area 3:
Identifying Effective Teachers, National Council on Teacher Quality, 2012.
Retrieved February 22, 2016, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED536371

National Institute For Excellence in Teaching. (n.d.). Elements of Success. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from http://www.niet.org/tap-system/elements-of-success/

National Institute For Excellence in Teaching. (n.d.). Instructionally Focused Accountability. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from http://www.niet.org/tap-system/elements-of-success/instructionally-focused-accountability/

National Institute For Excellence in Teaching. (n.d.). Multiple Career Paths. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from http://www.niet.org/tap-system/elements-of-success/multiple-career-paths/

National Institute For Excellence in Teaching. (n.d.). Ongoing Applied Professional Growth. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from http://www.niet.org/tap-system/elements-of-success/ongoing-applied-professional-growth/

National Institute For Excellence in Teaching. (n.d.). Performance-Based Compensation. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from http://www.niet.org/tap-system/elements-of-success/performance-based-compensation/

Oates, G. L. (2003). Teacher-student racial congruence, teacher perceptions and test performance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(3), 508-525.

Picower, B. (2004). *Teaching outside one's race: The story of an Oakland teacher.* Retrieved on January 20, 2017, from https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/scmsAdmin/uploads/000/743/teaching%20outside%20published.pdf

Q & A with John Trainer, MD. (2015, July 31). Retrieved June 12, 2016, from http://lllofjax.org/live-love-latch/tag/children-are-not-a-distraction-from-more-important-work/

The New Teacher Project. (2011). Smart Spending For Better Teacher Evaluation

    Systems. Retrieved February 22, 2016, from

    http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_Smart_Spending_2011.pdf

Rothman, A.J., & Mead, S. (2003). Teacher quality: Beyond No Child Left Behind. A

    response to Kaplan and Owings. *National Association of Secondary School*

    Principals, 87(635), 65. Retrieve January 28, 2016, from ProQuest database.

Schwarzenegger, Arnold. (n.d.). BrainyQuote.com. Retrieved June 25, 2016, from:

    http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/arnoldschw168332.html

Schmoker, M. J. (1996). *Results: The key to continuous school improvement*. Alexandria,

    Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Setting the Pace: Expanding Opportunity for America's Students under Race to the Top.

    (2014). Retrieved September 24, 2015, from

    https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/settingthepacerttreport_3-

    2414_b.pdf

Shakman, K., Breslow, N., Kochanek, J., Riordan, J., & Haferd, T. (2012). Changing

    cultures and building capacity: An exploration of district strategies for

    implementation of teacher evaluation systems. Waltham, MA: Education

    Development Center, Inc. Retrieved October 3, 2015, from

http://www.ltd.edc.org/sites/ltd.edc.org/files/District%20Strategies%20for%20Implement

    ation%20of%20Teacher%20Evaluation%20Systems.pdf

Shaul, M.S., (2003). No child left behind act: More information would help states

    determine which teachers are highly qualified. Report to congressional requesters

(Report No. SP 041695). Washington, DC: General Accounting Office Retrieved

February 13, 2016, from https://eric.ed.gov/?q=ED479904

Shober, A. F. (2012, August 8). From teacher education to student progress: Teacher

quality since NCLB. Retrieved February 22, 2016, from

https://www.aei.org/publication/from-teacher-education-to-student-progress-

teacher-quality-since-nclb/

Smith, C. (2015, April). How to raise a black son in America. Retrieved August 27, 2016,

from

https://www.ted.com/talks/clint_smith_how_to_raise_a_black_son_in_america

Spring, J. H. (2014). *The American school: A global context: From the Puritans to the*

Obama administration. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education.

United States Department of Education. (2002). Meeting the highly qualified teachers

challenge. The secretary's annual report on teacher quality. Washington, DC: U.S.

Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education.

United States Department of Education. (2009). Race to the top program executive

summary. Retrieved April 14, 2016, from

http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

Why are literature reviews important? (n.d.). Retrieved February 16, 2016, from

http://www.researchproposalsforhealthprofessionals.com/why_are_literature_revi

ews_impor.htm

Why do I have to have a literature review? (n.d.). Retrieved February 16, 2016, from

https://www.uq.edu.au/student-services/phdwriting/phfaq23.html

APPENDIX A:

SEMISTRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following questions were used as an outline for the semistructured interview

questions. Where appropriate, the interviewees were asked to expand upon their answers.

1. What are your impressions of Danielson's Framework for Teaching Evaluation

Module (DFTEM)?

2. How did the experience with DFTEM make you feel as a teacher?

3. How was DFTEM different from the traditional model of evaluation?

4. Show teachers their TSES scores. What do you think is the biggest reason for the

change in scores from the first administration of the TSES to the second administration?

5. What should we be mindful of as we transition toward implementation of DFTEM?

6. After being evaluated using DFTEM, how has it changed the way you lesson plan and

deliver your lessons?

APPENDIX B:

TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE LONG FORM

Teacher Beliefs - TSES

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.

Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.

Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your *current* ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.

Response scale: None at all (1) — Very Little (3) — Some Degree (5) — Quite A Bit (7) — A Great Deal (9)

#	Question	Response (1–9)
1.	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
2.	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
3.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
5.	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
6.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
7.	How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
8.	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
9.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
10.	How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
11.	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
12.	How much can you do to foster student creativity?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
13.	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
14.	How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
15.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
16.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
17.	How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
18.	How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
19.	How well can you keep a few problem students form ruining an entire lesson?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
20.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
21.	How well can you respond to defiant students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
22.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
23.	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
24.	How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨

FORMAL OBSERVATION FORM

Electronic Forms and Rubrics for Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching

Formal Classroom Observation—*Continued*

Notes from the Observation

Time	Actions and Statements/Questions by Teacher and Students	Component

APPENDIX D:

PRECONFERENCE QUESTIONS

Questions for discussion:

1. To which part of your curriculum does this lesson relate?

2. How does this learning fit in the sequence of learning for this class?

3. Briefly describe the students in this class, including those with special needs.

4. What are your learning outcomes for this lesson? What do you want the students to understand?

5. How will you engage the students in the learning? What will you do? What will the students do? Will the students work in groups, or individually, or as a large group? Provide any worksheets or other materials the students will be using.

6. How will you differentiate instruction for different individuals or groups of students in the class?

7. How and when will you know whether the students have learned what you intend?

8. Is there anything that you would like me to specifically observe during the lesson?

APPENDIX D:

POST CONFERENCE QUESTIONS

1. In general, how successful was the lesson? Did the students learn what you intended for them to learn? How do you know?

2. If you were able to bring samples of student work, what do those samples reveal about those students' levels of engagement and understanding?

3. Comment on your classroom procedures, student conduct, and your use of physical space. To what extent did these contribute to student learning?

4. Did you depart from your plan? If so, how and why?

5. Comment on different aspects of your instructional delivery (e.g., activities, grouping of students, materials and resources). To what extent were they effective?

6. If you had an opportunity to teach this lesson again to the same group of students, what would you do differently?