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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Study Context

This study examined a model of peer coaching used to evaluate tenured teachers in a regional high school district as an alternative to traditional evaluation conducted by a certified supervisor. New Jersey Administrative Code requires the following:

Boards must adopt comprehensive policies and procedures concerning the evaluation of tenured staff. These policies and procedures should be developed by the chief school administrator in consultation with the tenured working staff members. An annual written performance report for each tenured teaching staff member must be prepared by a certified supervisor.

(N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3)

The New Jersey State Board of Education adopted code for an equivalency and waiver process in 1995. The Commissioner of Education granted the regional high school district under study an equivalency to "permit evaluation of tenured staff
members through peer coaching" (Klagholz, personal communication, March 4, 1996). Tenured teachers volunteered either to work with partners and be evaluated using a model of peer coaching or to work alone and be evaluated using the traditional model of evaluation by a certified supervisor.

The district applied for the equivalency because it was implementing an intensive block schedule in the 1996–1997 school year to replace the traditional eight period day. The district moved to an intensive block schedule on the assumption that "intensive block scheduling is more engaging for students, increases student retention rates, encourages and requires alternative instructional strategies and assessments, and fosters student/teacher relationships" (Equivalency Application, 1995). The district’s move to a structure associated with more active engagement of students in learning was consistent with assumptions outlined by Schlechty (1997) supporting the connection between learning and activity:

Learning involves action and requires experience.
Most of what students learn comes from what they do.
Regardless of the mode or style of learning, it is what students do and the meaning they give to what they do that determines what they learn. What teachers
do is much less important than what they are able to
get students to do. (Schlechty, p.42, 1997)

The district applied for the equivalency to employ an
alternative evaluation model of peer coaching to facilitate
the implementation of the intensive block schedule. The
equivalency would allow teachers to work with a partner and
focus on improving instruction and taking risks using the
alternative evaluation model of peer coaching. The
assumption underlying the district's request for the
equivalency was that the people more closely involved in
the day to day change resulting from intensive block
scheduling would be most helpful to their colleagues in a
model of peer coaching. The request for the equivalency
indicated that participation in peer coaching would enable
teachers to practice new strategies learned in the
district's academy and/or training classes. The peer
coaching team would select a strategy that had been
introduced in a training program and support each other as
they used the strategy in the classroom (Equivalency
Application, 1995).

The district based its move to an alternate model of
teacher evaluation on the assumption that teachers who
participated in peer coaching would take risks to expand
their competence in requiring a variety of student directed
activities, utilizing technology resources, increasing interdisciplinary activities, and employing a new range of assessments. The district further indicated that the equivalency was necessary to remove the perceived threat that the results of traditional observation/evaluation could be utilized in a negative manner. The perceived threat could then inhibit the risk taking that would be encouraged. The district also assumed that a peer coaching model would be more consistent with the collegial atmosphere that was being fostered through a district initiative for shared decision making.

Purposes of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the use of two different models of teacher evaluation, peer coaching and traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor, employed in one New Jersey regional high school district over a 3 year period. This study will analyze the effect that each model has on the following variables: (a) collegiality among teachers, and (b) change in instructional practice. This study will also examine the role of trust in the evaluation process as a means of improving instruction.
Problem Statement

This study proposes to determine the effect of a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation used by tenured teachers in a regional high school district on a voluntary basis in place of the traditional model of teacher evaluation required under New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6.

The first subproblem will be to determine whether tenured high school teachers who selected peer coaching as an alternative model of evaluation will exhibit norms of collegiality that are different from the norms of collegiality that are exhibited by tenured high school teachers who selected to be evaluated under the traditional model of evaluation.

The second subproblem will be to determine whether tenured high school teachers who selected peer coaching as an alternative model of evaluation will demonstrate changes in instructional practices that are different than the changes in instructional practices demonstrated by tenured high school teachers who selected to be evaluated under the traditional model of evaluation.

The third subproblem will be to explore whether the removal of the perceived threat that the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor could be
used in a negative manner builds greater trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study examined the independent variable of method of teacher evaluation, peer coaching versus traditional evaluation, and the dependent variables of collegiality, changes in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction in one regional high school district in the state of New Jersey with a tenured staff of 150 teachers. At the time of the study, this was the only high school district that had applied for and received an equivalency to use peer coaching as an alternative means to traditional evaluation. The uniqueness of this equivalency provided an opportunity for study. The findings of this study may, however, be unique to this particular regional high school district.

The district applied for the equivalency to support its move to block scheduling based on the district’s belief that implementation of block scheduling would increase student engagement in learning and increase rates of student retention of learning. This study did not examine student achievement. This study was limited to an exploration of change and improvement in instructional
practices by teachers that may be associated with increases in student achievement. Joyce and Showers (1982) indicated that the main purpose of teacher learning, growth, and change has been to help benefit students.

The district’s Equivalency Application indicated that block scheduling would require a variety of student directed activities, the utilization of technological resources, interdisciplinary activities, and a new range of assessment strategies. For the purposes of this study, "change in instructional practices" was defined as the use of instructional activities that were student-directed and the use of a new range of assessments. The utilization of technological resources and interdisciplinary activities as specified in the district’s Equivalency Application were not measured and were considered beyond the scope of this study.

The study was completed during the 1998-1999 school year, the 3rd year that the district was permitted to use peer coaching under the terms of the waiver. During those 3 years, teachers who originally opted to be evaluated using peer coaching were subsequently permitted to select the traditional method or the additional option of evaluation using portfolio assessment offered in the 2nd and 3rd years. Conversely, teachers who originally opted for the
traditional method of evaluation were subsequently permitted to select peer coaching or portfolio assessment. The variability in the length of time that peer coaching was selected by tenured teachers was addressed in this study by limiting the statistical analysis to those teachers who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for all 3 years and those teachers who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 of the years that the waiver was in effect. If there were not sufficient participants in each treatment in the 3rd year for appropriate statistical analysis, then the researcher anticipated making comparisons based on the first 2 years of the waiver when there were sufficient participants in each treatment group for appropriate statistical analysis. After receiving the survey results, there were sufficient responses to for three evaluation classifications described in Chapter IV.

There were differences in the sample whether teachers who selected peer coaching also participated in formal training in a professional development academy. Participation in monthly peer coaching meetings through the district’s professional development academy was optional during the 1st year of the equivalency. Teachers who selected peer coaching agreed to submit at least two peer
coaching reports by December and February of the current school year. They also agreed to prepare an Annual Professional Summary by April 30. Lack of uniform training for those who selected the alternative, peer coaching model is a limitation of this study.

Teachers were not randomly assigned to either the alternative model of peer coaching or the traditional method of evaluation by a certified supervisor. Tenured teachers were permitted to select either the traditional method or the alternative model of peer coaching. Without random assignment to the two methods of teacher evaluation under consideration, differences within each group such as the years of teaching experience, subject area, experience and training in peer coaching, personality characteristics, or gender could account for any differences found in collegiality and in changes in instructional practices.

Peer coaching is only one of the many innovative reform movements at this regional high school that could account for any measured differences in collegiality or changes in instructional practices.

The study employed a single questionnaire that combined two sections, Collegiality Index and Department Community Index, of the Summary, CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) and 26 survey items from the Bay Area School Reform
Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) developed by the Center for Research on the Context of Teaching (CRC). The reliability for the two sections from the Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) was statistically strong (α = .84 and .90, respectively).

The Department Community Index was developed to assess collegiality within the boundary of a high school department. The Department Community Index was used in this study to assess collegiality within the boundary of model of evaluation. The utilization of the Department Community Index for a different purpose may have compromised the validity of the instrument.

The scales and reliability coefficients for the 26 items from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) were the property of the underwriters of the Bay Area study and were not permitted to be published. In the absence of the reliability data, the 26 items were reviewed by the members of the dissertation committee and accepted on face validity. The absence of the reliability data for the 26 items is a limitation of the study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are presented to clarify their use in this study.
Annual professional summary. This is the annual written report required under New Jersey Administrative Code for all tenured teachers. The report shall include performance areas of strength, performance areas needing improvement, an individual professional improvement plan, and indicators of pupil progress and growth (N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3).

Change in instructional practices. This is the movement from traditional teacher directed activities to a variety of student directed activities, and/or the utilization of technological resources, interdisciplinary activities, and a new range of assessment strategies (Equivalency Application, 1995). For the purposes of this study, “change in instructional practices” is defined as the use of instructional activities that are student-directed and the use of a new range of assessments.

Collegiality. This is the presence of four types of interactions between and among teachers: (a) Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice; (b) Teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful critiques of their teaching; (c) Teachers plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together; and
(d) Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching (Little, 1982).

Peer coaching. This is an alternative evaluation process through which new teaching skills/strategies being implemented in the classroom can be supported by one or more trusted colleagues. The process involves using one's peers to observe and reinforce those skills/strategies. Participants pair with a colleague of their selection with whom they believe they can work productively (Equivalency Application, 1995); and this is also a set of nonjudgemental practices built around a planning conference, observation, and a reflecting conference that is referred to as peer coaching when established between peers (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

Peer coaching report. This is the form used for documenting the plans for implementing skills/strategies; recording the observations by the peer coaching partner, and describing the processes that will be used to reinforce, enhance, or modify the skills/strategies that were observed (Equivalency Application, 1995).

Assumptions

The first assumption of the study is that the tenured teachers evaluated under the traditional model of
evaluation and the tenured teachers evaluated under the alternative model of peer coaching are competent teachers who have received satisfactory evaluations in the past and are capable of planning and implementing lessons that result in students learning while exercising acceptable standards for classroom decorum.

The second assumption is that survey instruments that are valid and reliable can measure collegiality and changes in instructional practice.

The third assumption is that the use of semi-structured interviews can explore trust in the evaluation process as a means of improving instruction.

Theoretical Perspective

The context within which the district described the rationale for adopting an alternative model of evaluation was consistent with current thinking in the field of education. Barth (1990) indicated that having the people most closely involved in the day to day change working together was an enabling rather than controlling view of the leadership role that teachers could play. “A key to improving schools from within, then, lies in improving the interactions among teachers and between teachers and principals” (Barth, 1990, p. 28).
McLaughlin (1993) indicated that there have been six major approaches to school reform that have included examinations of effective schools research, organizational restructuring, teacher incentives and motivation, teachers' qualifications, curriculum content standards, and study of the school workplace. The Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching (CRC) has been engaged in multiyear research to examine the diverse contexts in which teachers work and their significance for teaching and learning. The CRC has employed a "bottom-up, teacher's eye perspective on teaching within particular kinds of embedded contexts" (McLaughlin, 1993, p. 81). This study proposes to take a similar look at an alternative model of evaluation that may form a different context or boundary within the secondary school.

This study is based on a central premise that participation in peer coaching may be one way in which to build greater collegiality among teachers. Little (1982, p. 331) indicated that collegiality existed when teachers engaged in precise talk about teaching practice; were observed and provided with useful critiques; planned, designed, researched, evaluated, and prepared teaching materials together; and taught each other the practice of teaching. Little (1993) also indicated that attention has
not been given to providing opportunities for teachers to learn within the salaried workday.

The secondary premise of the study is that if greater collegiality exists among teachers as a result of participation in peer coaching, then there will be greater changes in instructional practice and greater faith in evaluation as a means of changing teaching. Little (1982) reported that in successful schools more than in unsuccessful ones, teachers valued and participated in norms of collegiality and continuous improvement. Talbert and McLaughlin (1994) concurred that teacher communities that promoted collegial discourse and collaboration set conditions for shared professional standards to emerge and to be enforced. Talbert (1991) suggested that researchers should take a more serious look at the interactive conditions of teachers' work and experience. "Schools as workplace show the greatest promise where there are expectations for shared work, a norm of collegiality, and expectations for analysis, evaluation, and experimentation, a norm of continuous improvement" (Little, 1982, p.339). Smylie (1988) concurred that greater collegiality gave rise to greater experimentation. Santa Rita and Donanangelo (1996) suggested a relationship between collegiality and experimentation through peer coaching. "Continuous
professional development appears to be most surely and
thoroughly achieved when collegiality exists" (Little,

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study were stated as null
hypotheses to facilitate statistical analyses (Witte &
Witte, 1997). The researcher will attempt to determine
whether a difference between a mean of the treatment group
and a mean of the non-treatment group was due to chance
error or the effect of the treatment (Krathwohl, 1998, p.
460).

The first hypothesis of this study is that there is no
relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and
levels of collegiality.

The second hypothesis of this study is that there is
no relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and
changes in instructional practices.

An additional area of inquiry will be to explore the
relationship between removal of the perceived threat that
the results of evaluation by a certified supervisor could
be utilized in a negative manner and trust in evaluation as
a means of improving instruction.
Significance of the Study

The importance of an examination of the central and secondary premises is based on the relationship of the premises to student learning. McLaughlin (1993, p. 85) found that teachers’ responses to contemporary students fell into three general patterns: (a) maintain traditional standards, (b) lower expectations for coverage and achievement, and (c) adapt practices and pedagogy.

McLaughlin (1993) indicated that teachers within the same school or even within the same department developed different patterns of responses to similar students depending on the character of their collegial environment. Teachers who worked in highly collegial environments reported a high level of commitment to teaching and to all students with whom they worked. "Collegiality, our survey data show, indicates a professional community with norms of innovation and learning in which teachers are enthusiastic about their work and the focus is on devising strategies that enable all students to prosper" (McLaughlin, 1993, p. 94). The investigation of the effects of an alternative model of evaluation on collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation would appear to be significant given the research that points to the effect the dependent variables have on the way teachers
are willing to adapt practices and pedagogy to ensure success for all students.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This study proposed to examine the effects of the model of teacher evaluation, traditional or peer coaching, selected by staff members at one regional high school on collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement of instruction. The literature review was designed to examine the research related to the independent variables, a traditional model of teacher evaluation and a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation, and the research related to the dependent variables of collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. The literature review also entailed an examination of related studies and the applicability of those studies to the questions framed in this study.

The Purposes and Models of Teacher Evaluation

There has been much discussion and many varied points
category addresses the need for accountability. The second category addresses the need for professional development.
The two categories of evaluation purposes, accountability and professional development, provide the basis for the two major models of teacher evaluation, summative and formative evaluations.

Summative evaluations are typically conducted by an administrator or outside evaluator. This type of evaluation is a tool for accountability or for checking teacher competence (Egelson, 1994). Summative evaluation models typically rate teachers against a fixed scale of standards that are convenient for ranking teachers for promotion or for dismissal. Summative evaluations are often the result of a need to document minimal acceptable standards.

Formative evaluations are designed to promote growth in teachers. In a system of formative evaluations, teachers often set improvement goals and meet with the evaluator over the course of the school year to assess progress toward those goals. Formative evaluations where the teacher has greater responsibility in the process often take place with more experienced staff members who have had acceptable evaluations. This formative process can also include working with a peer evaluator (Egelson, 1994). Formative
evaluation models focus on the identification of strengths and weaknesses with the development of strategies to improve performance. The majority of formative evaluation models incorporate a mechanism for providing feedback based on multiple observations (Glass, 1995). Formative evaluation is seen as a growth or development model. Tinkham (1994) suggested that teachers would be more motivated to participate in a formative evaluation model because they had involvement in its development. Tinkham (1994) further suggested that the teacher would also be more willing to seek feedback and implement the recommendations for improvement within a formative evaluation model.

In summary, the following definitions of summative and formative evaluations help contrast the two models of evaluation. "Formative evaluation is a system of feedback for teachers that is designed to help them improve on an ongoing basis. Summative evaluation is a system of feedback for teachers that is designed to measure their teaching competence" (McCloskey & Egelson, 1993, pg. 2). The vast majority of school systems employ an evaluation model that is a combination or integration of both summative and formative evaluation models. Teachers participate in a formative process throughout the school year that often
becomes the basis for an annual summative evaluation (Glass 1995).

The Traditional Model of Teacher Evaluation

McHaney and Impey (1992) indicated that historically the role of evaluation has moved along a continuum of inspection and control of the teachers and the classroom to the accountability movement of the 1980's with its attempts to emphasize the professional growth of the teachers using research-based effective teaching practices.

The traditional model of evaluation is primarily a summative, accountability approach that is reflective of a direct instruction model (Searfoss & Enz, 1996).

Traditional evaluation is a "process that compares a set of predetermined standards (established by experts residing outside the evaluation process) with a set of practices (performed by the teacher)" (Gitlin & Price, 1992, p.65).

The model of evaluation prescribed in New Jersey Administrative Code is primarily a traditional model of summative evaluation. Teachers are assessed against predetermined standards by a certified supervisor. "Every district board of education shall adopt policies and procedures requiring the annual evaluation of all tenured teaching staff members by appropriately certified
personnel" (N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3(a)). The policies and procedures for evaluation require the "development of job descriptions and evaluation criteria based upon district goals, program objectives and instructional priorities" (N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3(C)2.).

The model of traditional evaluation in New Jersey has the following stated purposes: "(a) promote professional excellence and improve the skills of teaching staff members; (b) improve pupil learning and growth; and (c) provide the basis for the review of performance of tenured teaching staff members" (N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3(b)). Searfoss and Enz (1996) suggested that teacher evaluation has served two unequal purposes, accountability and professional development, and that the latter has received less support in schools.

Glickman (1990) summarized the importance of the role of the certified supervisor in the evaluation process with the following position:

Regardless of how or where the responsibilities reside, no school or school system can hope to improve instruction if direct assistance is not provided to teachers. To leave classroom teachers alone and unobserved in their classrooms, without professional consultation and without school resources tailored to
their unique needs, is a statement (intended or not) that teaching is unimportant. (p. 301)

The question is whether there are differences when "professional consultation" comes from one's certified supervisor or from one's professional colleagues.

Transition Between Models of Teacher Evaluation

Millman and Darling-Hammond (1991) indicated that teacher professionalism and school restructuring are two major concepts that characterize the educational reform movement of the 1990's:

These efforts rely on teacher evaluation for a wide variety of purposes, including selection, training, improvement, and advancement. They often envision broader roles for teachers in evaluation and for evaluation of schools. As schools are asked to define their own improvement strategies, agendas for individual evaluation and organizational renewal are increasingly intertwined.

In the past, teacher evaluation has not been a high-stakes activity, in part because improving the quality of teachers has not been seen as critical for improving the quality of education. Instead, school improvement efforts over the past several decades have
focused on improving the curriculum, altering school management methods, and developing new programs. Thus, teacher evaluation, where practiced, was often an exercise to which few resources and little organizational attention were devoted. As a consequence, teacher evaluation has often had little influence on decisions about personnel, staff development, or the structure of teaching. As more attention is being devoted to evaluation and its results are used in a greater range of decisions, its role in shaping teaching will increase. (p.17)

Traditional models of evaluation often do not match the goals of restructuring. Teachers are being asked to move from more traditional teaching methods to methods that entail increased student participation and more complex student outcomes, yet the traditional model of teacher evaluation has not kept pace with these changes (Brandt, 1996). It appears that the summative models of evaluation are the greatest source of mismatch. Egelson (1994) reported great dissatisfaction with the summative evaluation instruments by teachers involved in a voluntary project to develop a formative evaluation process for the Richland School District Two in Columbia, South Carolina that entailed a strong peer conference or interaction
component. The major complaints by teachers entailed issues regarding the supervisor's expertise in the subject area, the infrequency and artificial nature of the classroom observations, and perception that the evaluation does nothing to improve the performance of the teacher. The major teacher statements in support of the alternative method of the formative evaluation entailed issues regarding less stress and intimidation, greater control, empowerment, and greater reflection on the teaching process and methodology.

Restructuring of school organizations has changed how we teach and how students learn. Elmore (1992) suggested that restructuring depended on practices that promoted conceptual understanding. Fullen (1996) discussed restructuring and reculturing where new values, beliefs and norms were established. Those norms included changes in instruction "(e.g., teaching for understanding and using new forms of assessment) and new forms of professionalism for teachers (e.g., building commitment to continuous learning and to problem-solving through collaboration)" (p. 422). Leithwood (1992) indicated that there were three fundamental goals were related to restructuring: (a) helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture; (b) fostering teacher
development; and (c) helping teachers solve problems together more effectively. Black (1993) concurred and suggested that many school districts were changing their teacher evaluation process to match the fundamental goals that related to restructuring.

Hanson (1992) reported a similar peer evaluation program in Dade County, Florida that was implemented as part of the county’s school-based management pilot. Hanson (1992) suggested that the methods of evaluation must be changed because teachers needed to be seen as professional decision makers as opposed to technicians. The change to alternative methods of teacher evaluation was also suggested in light of the restructuring and rethinking of the sharing of authority among professionals and increased teacher involvement and responsibility within restructuring.

Brogan (1995) questioned the use of current evaluation methods that were based solely on data as opposed to requiring teachers to search for meaning in the experience. In presenting arguments for an alternative method of evaluation, in this case, portfolio assessment, ten characteristics for successful teacher development were proposed: (a) Collegiality and Collaboration; (b) Experimentation and Risk Taking; (c) Incorporation of
Available Knowledge Bases; (d) Appropriate Participant Involvement in Goal Setting, Implementation, Evaluation, and Decision Making; (e) Time to Work on Staff Development and Assimilate New Learning; (f) Leadership and Sustained Administrative Support; (g) Appropriate Incentives and Rewards; (h) Designs Built on Principles of Adult Learning and the Change Process; (i) Integration of Individual Goals with School and District Goals; (j) Formal Placement of the Program within the Philosophy and Organizational Structure of the School and District (pp. 5-8).

More recently, the work of Costa and Garmston (1994) suggested that there was no single formula for teacher effectiveness, but a process for improving the thinking that underlies effective teaching.

Peer Coaching

The purpose of this section will be to: (a) define peer coaching and its relationship to cognitive coaching as implemented in the high school under consideration, (b) outline the major components of the peer coaching model, and (c) examine the claims of peer coaching and the relationship of those claims to the dependent variables of this study.

Cognitive coaching is an alternative, formative
method of evaluation that has its roots in clinical supervision. Costa and Garmston (1994) proposed that the "coach" in cognitive coaching was akin to the stagecoach which is a conveyance as opposed to an athletic coach. Willerman, McNeely, & Hoffman (1991) concurred that the coaching metaphor was misleading because the relationship is collaborative and not the superior-subordinate relationship found when coaches give direction. In cognitive coaching, the process is reflective and nonjudgemental. Anyone in the educational setting can become the cognitive coach, and when the cognitive coaching takes place between two colleagues, it is referred to as "peer coaching" (Costa & Garmston, 1994). For the population being studied, cognitive coaching was conducted between two colleagues in a model of peer coaching. In cognitive coaching, teachers work in pairs using reflective techniques. Cognitive coaching was designed to help teachers search for meaning that is often missing in daily practice and to increase their awareness of the thinking that underlies their practice through collegial, professional dialogue (Brandt, 1987; Brogan, 1995; Cogan, 1973; Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993; Glatthorn, 1987; Goldhammer, 1969). Peer coaching was utilized in this study as an alternative form of teacher evaluation. Showers and
are becoming more involved in planning and monitoring their own evaluations, no longer accepting 'one judge, one jury' evaluations" (p. 39). The increased role that teachers play in such areas as staff development, curriculum, and shared decision making has been growing as part of school reform. Very few districts, however, give over authority in a personnel area such as evaluation (School-Based Reform – Lessons from a National Study, 1995)

The following outline is presented to provide an understanding of the peer coaching model employed in the study:

Planning Conference

I. Planning: Coaches mediate by having the teacher:

1. Clarify lesson goals and objectives.
2. Anticipate teaching strategies and decisions.
3. Determine evidence of student achievement.
4. Identify the coach’s data gathering focus and procedures.

Lesson

II. Teaching: Coaches gather data by observing:

1. Evidence of student achievement.
2. Teacher strategies and decisions.

Reflecting Conference

III. Reflecting: Coaches mediate by having the
teacher:

1. Summarize impressions and assessments of the lesson.

2. Recall data supporting those impressions and assessments.

3. Compare planned with performed teaching decisions, and student learning.

4. Infer relationships between student achievement and teacher decisions/behavior.

IV. Applying: Coaches mediate by having the teacher:

1. Synthesize teacher learning and prescribed applications.

2. Reflect on the coaching process; recommend refinements

(Costa & Garmstrom, 1994, p. 18).

The researcher refers the reader to Gottesman and Jennings (1994), Robbins (1991) and to Another Set of Eyes (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988) and Opening Doors: An Introduction to Peer Coaching (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1989), which are videotaped materials with accompanying instructional guides, as additional resources for the understanding of peer coaching.

The claims of cognitive coaching are that cognitive coaching fosters collegiality, deepens reflective skills and develops cognitive autonomy. The reflection learned
through cognitive coaching helps teachers develop problem solving skills in order to look at their experiences, generate alternatives, and evaluate their actions. The act of teachers reflecting on their own practice is associated with teachers increasing their expertise (Haertel, 1993). The presence of a colleague or peer in the classroom facilities greater reflection on the part of the teacher (Sparks, 1986). Cognitive coaching leads to being bicognitive, an ability to attend to both relationship and task. Cognitive coaching is also in keeping with reform movements that foster collaboration (Garmston, et al. 1993).

Costa and Garmston (1994) reported that cognitive coaching is organized around three major goals:

1. establishing and maintaining trust, an assured reliance on the character, ability, or strength of someone or something;

2. facilitating mutual learning, which is the engagement and transformation of mental processes and perceptions;

3. and enhancing growth toward holonomy, which we define in two parts: individuals acting autonomously while simultaneously acting interdependently with the group (p. 3).
These claims are related to the dependent variables of collegiality and trust in the evaluation process.

Costa and Garmston (1994) further suggested that organizations that adopt cognitive coaching would derive the following benefits:

1. Developing holonomy will become the school’s new mission.

2. The overburdened curriculum will be selectively abandoned and new curriculums will be judiciously adopted for their contributions to one or more of the five states of mind—efficacy, flexibility, craftsmanship, consciousness, and integrity. Interdependence will produce teacher, student, and organizational growth.

3. Evaluation of teachers, students, and organizational effectiveness will change from performance review to the assessment of development toward greater holonomy.

4. Staff developers will devote their efforts to enhancing teachers’, administrators’, parents’, and support staff’s leadership skills in a variety of areas.

5. Systematic and sustained energies will be directed to making each school and each district a learning
community where the culture of the workplace itself
- the intellectual ecology - is continually
evolving. (p. 9)

These claims are related to the dependent variable of
change in instructional practice.

Collegiality

The teaching profession has been characterized by
independence, isolation, and a lack of shared norms of
professional practice. Teachers often operate in school
cultures where strong privacy norms prevail (Barth, 1990;
Lieberman, 1992; Little, 1990a, 1990b, 1992; Lortie, 1975;
McLaughlin & Talbert, 1990a). While exceptions exist,
Little (1990b) reported that it was more common for norms
of collegiality to prevail in elementary schools and less
common for those norms to prevail at the secondary level.
Little (1990b) further indicated that where collegiality
did exist, such collegiality can be fragile and short
lived. The fragility of collegiality may be related to its
reliance on organizational structure to facilitate it and a
culture of shared values to effect it (Boyer, 1995; Miller,
1988; Sergiovanni, 1996).

The concept of collegiality in education has moved
from a soft, nice notion of people interacting in a
congenial manner to an operational definition that is associated with the process of peer coaching (Barth, 1990). Judith Warren Little (1982) has provided the most commonly accepted operational definition of collegiality in schools. Collegiality is related to the presence of four types of interactions between and among teachers: (a) teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice; (b) teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful critiques of their teaching; (c) teachers plan, design, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together; and (d) teachers teach each other the practice of teaching (Little, 1982).

Barth (1990) suggested that better decision making, greater trust and morale among adults, increased and energized adult learning, and even, higher motivation among students who are taught by teachers who share, were outcomes of collegiality. Little (1990b) indicated that "the reason to pursue the study and practice of collegiality is that, presumably, something is gained when teachers work together and something is lost when they do not" (p. 166). Little (1990b) also indicated that teachers gain their greatest reward from the teacher-student relationship and that the teacher-student relationship is enhanced through building the professional relationship
between teachers. Little (1990b) suggested that teachers' work as colleagues held great promise for greater coherence and integration of daily teaching as well as promoting steady improvement in schools. Lortie (1975) proposed that greater collegiality helped build a common technical culture that would strengthen teachers professionally enabling them to meet the demands of teaching. Lichtenstein, McLaughlin, and Knudsen (1991) concurred that breaking down isolation through collegiality was a means toward building shared professional knowledge. Fullen (1995) suggested that collaborative work cultures were needed to change the direct learning situation.

One of the claims of the peer coaching model is that peer coaching promotes "holonomy." Costa and Garmston (1994) defined holonomy as "individuals acting autonomously while simultaneously acting interdependently" (p.3). In the discussion of collegiality, Little (1992) called for teachers keeping autonomy without abrogating legitimate, institutional interests. There exists a delicate balance between "the liberating potential of participation" and "the legitimate need for leadership" (Evans, 1996, p.68). The importance of interdependence, which is built through collegiality among teachers, has been supported in the
literature (Covey, 1992; Hargrove, 1998; McLaughlin & Talbert, 1990b; Wheatley, 1994).

Change in Instructional Practices

The high school district where the study was conducted applied for a waiver to use peer coaching to assist in the implementation of block scheduling. The district proposed that block scheduling would facilitate a move toward more "student directed activities and new methods of assessment" (Equivalency Application, 1995). The movement toward student directed learning was not a new concept, but one that was based on a more progressive view of education. Dewey (1993) indicated that progressive education entailed the expression and cultivation of individuality, learning through experience, and learning for opportunity of present life as opposed to learning as preparation for the future. A change in instructional practice from more traditional teacher directed learning to more student directed learning is a common recommendation of most school reformers (Costa & Liebmann, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Lieberman, 1992; Little, 1993; Schlechty, 1997; Sizer, 1992).

Lieberman (1992) suggested that most teaching methods have been passive for the students, impersonal, and print-bound. The teacher has been the transmitter of knowledge
with the student as the passive recipient (Schlechty, 1997). Conversely, student-centered teaching creates conditions to engage students in learning. Sizer (1992) summarized the distinction between teacher directed learning and student directed learning by indicating that the former requires students to display knowledge and the latter requires students to use knowledge. Costa and Liebmann (1997) proposed a process curriculum that focused on thinking skills, self-assessment, and students constructing knowledge. The teacher then serves as the facilitator, promoting problem solving and an interdisciplinary approach (Heck & Williams, 1984).

The move to more student directed activities and assessments that would critique those more authentic activities has relevance in terms of students becoming lifelong learners (Sizer, 1992). Schlechty (1997) proposed that schools of the future needed to engage students in knowledge work that is "purposeful intellectual activity that calls upon them to master and use ideas, propositions, facts and systematic thought process" (p.133).

Elmore (1992) challenged an assumption that restructuring the organization of schools alone would not produce instructional change. This study proposes to examine the relationship between a peer coaching model of
evaluation and change in instructional practice. Darling-Hammond (1997) indicated that "lone ranger teaching cannot enable students to become competent thinkers and decision makers as well as constructive human beings" (p.107). Talbert, McLaughlin, and Rowan (1993) suggested that the contexts of teaching have greater effect on instructional practice than previously thought. Departments, for example, can "support members' capacity for effective practice" (p.55). McLaughlin and Talbert (1990b) further suggest that effective teaching is the product of "the setting in which teachers work and learn" (p.2). This study will attempt to examine if the model of teacher evaluation employed may form an additional context or boundary in a high school that is associated with change in instructional practice.

Trust in Evaluation

Ham, Achenbach, Miller, Blanchette, and Waldron (1994) indicated that adult learners had individual characteristics, and educational and environmental demands just as student learners did. Ham et al. (1994) further indicated that the evaluation process needed to take adult learner characteristics into account if instruction was to improve through teachers becoming more reflective and
flexible. Ham et al. (1994) further suggested that the higher stages of adult development required "greater adaptability, tolerance, empathy, and overall effectiveness" (p. 5). Brandt (1996) suggested that "adults respond primarily to positive reinforcement, that they want to be involved, that they prefer to operate in a collegial and collaborative environment. And traditional teacher evaluation violates many of these new standards" (p. 30). Facilitating learning in adults involved the following points: "(a) understand and reduce anxiety, (b) elicit and incorporate expectations, (c) acknowledge and utilize experience, (d) provide and encourage active participation, (e) identify and incorporate relevant content, and (f) facilitate change and growth" (Brogan, 1995, p. 8).

Brogan (1995) indicated that the purpose of teacher evaluation was to improve teacher performance and to measure accountability. There is an inherent conflict between the two purposes. The push toward accountability may hamper the move toward improvement of teacher performance. Accountability may create an environment where there is little risk taking or experimentation. Given the number of new teaching strategies outlined in the previous section that were described as necessary for preparing students for the 21st Century, a model of teacher
Leithwood (1992), that is, helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture, fostering teacher development, and helping teachers solve problems together.

New Jersey Administrative Code Title 6 requires that boards of education adopt policies and procedures for the evaluation of tenured staff. The Code further specifies that the annual written performance report must be prepared by a certified supervisor (N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3). The district where the study was conducted received approval from the New Jersey State Department of Education for an Equivalency Application requesting the use of a model of peer coaching in place of the traditional evaluation conducted by a certified supervisor. The application indicated that the district would be implementing a program of intensive block scheduling during the 1996-97 school year that would challenge teachers to utilize a variety of student directed activities, technological resources, interdisciplinary activities and a new range of assessment strategies. Under the traditional evaluation model, "it is less likely that risks will be taken by teachers to expand competence in these new areas. A peer coaching model would appear more appropriate in the collegial atmosphere which is being
fostered through shared decision making" (Equivalency Application, 1995). The district’s Equivalency Application (1995) further indicated that “the equivalency is necessary to remove the threat of the results of traditional observation/evaluation being utilized in a negative manner. Instead, staff members will team with a partner and the focus for improved instruction and risk taking will be peer coaching” (p. 1).

Related Studies

The purposes of this section will be to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables of this study in light of the related research. The review of the related studies indicated that there are numerous frameworks for peer coaching as both a model for evaluation and a model for professional development. The majority of these proposed frameworks have been evaluated using qualitative analysis of data self-reported by teachers involved in piloting a model of peer coaching. The more detailed studies related to the dependent variables have employed both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis. Most of those studies have not examined the dependent variables and their association with model of teacher evaluation, but mainly examined the
relationship of the dependent variables and contexts of secondary school teaching. The most common context or boundary for examination has been the high school department. This study will attempt to examine the dependent variables within a new context of high school culture for this study population, that is, method of teacher evaluation. Conceptualizing the relationship between method of evaluation and the dependent variables of collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement of instruction will hopefully build upon the related studies and match variables that may not have been examined in the same light. Peterson, McCardhey, and Elmore (1996) suggested that restructuring alone does not necessarily change schools and that changing instructional practice may be a matter of teacher learning.

Askins and Blide (1996) reported the success of a peer coaching model, Peer Coaching for Educators, that removed the supervisory, judgmental, and evaluative aspect from the process by giving complete control over the journal and any other material to the two teachers participating in the peer coaching; employed feedback in place of coaching; considered all professionals to be on the same level; and took less time to implement. The model was developed
primarily as an independent staff development model to support specific teaching skills presented in other staff development activities. The model did not replace teacher evaluation as in this study.

Askins and Blide (1996) indicated that the program, "Collegial Coaching: Transfer of Learning Through Reflective Practice" was effective in "assisting teachers to transfer new knowledge into practice" (p.6). There was also the secondary benefit of greater dialogue among teachers that was generated through use of a model of cognitive coaching. Teachers observed that the peer feedback increased interactions and relationships among staff and became an effective forum for discussing the diversity issues that were experienced at the Estacado High School in Lubbock, Texas.

Hanson (1992) and Gray (1992) reported similar findings for a peer assessment program, Peer Intervention and Assessment Program (PIAP) was piloted in Dade County, Florida. The peer assessment program was designed to replace the district's Teacher Assessment and Development System (TADS) that included a list of skills linked to school improvement initiatives. The study examined any qualitative differences between peer evaluation and evaluation conducted by administrators in terms of teaching
practice. The research question was addressed through an analysis of records of the participants and interviews with the teachers and principals in the pilot. The results indicated a general improvement in staff attitudes and rapport. Ham et al. (1994) reported a similar program with both administrative and collegial consultation. The study was a work in progress, but its relevance to this study was that a peer coaching component of teacher evaluation was implemented with the desired goals of adapting to new contexts of instruction. A similar framework of peer coaching was presented by Glass (1995). Unlike most peer coaching studies that permit peer coaching as an alternative model for tenured teachers with acceptable evaluations, this study reported the use of peer coaching in support of a marginal teacher. Pelletier (1994) described an alternative model of evaluation employed in Boston, Massachusetts. The evaluation method employed was formative. The use of portfolio assessment served as the major component of the evaluation with an emphasis on working with a peer as well as reflective entries in journals. In this study, the implementation of the portfolio assessment and the use of the peer sharing and observation took the place of the traditional evaluation conducted by the principal.
Garmston et al. (1993) presented a case study on the effects of implementation of cognitive coaching conducted as peer coaching. Two teachers in the Marina Village School in Dorado Hills, California participated in peer coaching. The study indicated that while there were different reactions to the mechanics of the process, there was agreement with the benefits of using the cognitive coaching model, that is, "changes in teaching style, expanded teaching repertoire, greater power in planning lessons, greater student accountability, and greater consciousness of teacher behaviors and options" (p. 59).

Costa and Garmston (1994) cited several studies that had resulted in positive changes through the employment of cognitive coaching. Improvements were reported in the areas of classroom instruction, teachers' cognitive development, and relationships with others in the school. Some of the specific results related to these studies entailed: (a) improvements in expanding teaching repertoire, (b) changes in teaching skills, (c) talking more to colleagues about teaching, (d) more positive perceptions about collegiality, staff development, and the climate of the work site, (e) more collegial relationship between administrators and staff, and (f) increased likelihood of trying something new. (pp. 155-58)
Egelson (1994) conducted a study of a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation that was developed by a team of seven teachers and two administrators. Tenured teachers are on a 3 year cycle of teacher evaluation. Twenty out of the 24 tenured teachers due for evaluation opted to employ the peer coaching model of evaluation. Teachers reported new relationships with colleagues and improved classroom instruction. McCloskey and Egelson (1993) reported similar results of a voluntary, formative evaluation model entailing peer coaching and a component of self-reflection in two North Carolina and one South Carolina school districts. The study revealed "greater collegiality among faculty members, an increased sense of professionalism among teachers, a willingness on the part of teachers to discuss and improve weaknesses, and improved classroom instruction" (p. 28).

Tinkham (1994) investigated the impact of an alternative method of teacher evaluation with a strong peer coaching component on teacher perception of organizational climate, teacher instructional practices, and teacher self-perception. The alternative method of evaluation was utilized in place of the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal System (TPAS). The alternative option of evaluation was made available to teachers with more than 3
years experience. Forty-four teachers participated in this alternative model. Organizational climate was measured using an Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and a school climate checklist. Teacher instructional practices were measured using a rubric for analyzing lesson plans and a log of observations of lessons. Teacher self-perception was measured by interview questions and an analysis of the summative evaluations.

The OCDQ consisted of four subtests for Teachers’ Behaviors, that is, disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy, and four subtests for Principal’s Behaviors, that is, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration. There was a significant difference in the teachers’ behavior area of intimacy ($p = .029$) which was defined as “the teachers’ feelings about the warmth of human relationships” and in the principal’s behavior area of aloofness ($p = .041$) which was defined as “the impersonal behavior of the principal” (Tinkham, 1994, pp. 110-111). There were no statistical differences on the school climate checklist. A statistical difference was reported between the points assigned for the lesson plans of the teachers who chose to be evaluated by the alternative method as compared to those who chose to be evaluated by the traditional TPAS ($p = .045$). The results
favored the treatment group. While the teachers who chose the alternative method received higher scores on the Observation of Lessons Log than those in the traditional group, the difference was not statistically significant. The interviews of the teachers in the alternative and traditional groups produced interesting anecdotal information that was not measured. The review of the Summative Evaluations also did not yield statistical information, but showed that those in the alternative group were more likely to comment on the summative evaluation (Tinkham, 1994).

Sparks (1986) examined the relationship between the types of professional development activities and changes in teaching behaviors with a sample of 19 teachers. The peer observation intervention was not an evaluation model as employed in this study, however, the effects of peer observation treatment were examined. The 19 teachers were divided into three groups with one group using a model of peer observation to assist in the implementation of a new teaching behavior. The other two groups used either participation in workshop training only or the assistance of a trainer. A pre and post test analysis using t-tests indicated significant gains in exceeding criterion for the peer observation group. The major conclusions regarding
the effectiveness of peer observation surrounded hypotheses that "just having a colleague teach may be a powerful learning experience" and that that experience "may have helped them analyze their own behavior more accurately and enable them to make more significant changes in their own teaching" (Sparks, 1986, p.223). Sparks (1986) also indicated that knowing that a peer was not present to judge may have fostered a team spirit.

McLaughlin (1993), McLaughlin and Talbert (1993), and Talbert (1991) reported the results of ethnographic research conducted from 1987-1992 at 16 high school sites in California and Michigan gathering primary data which included field data obtained through interviews, site records, school and classroom observations, survey data from all teachers in each school, and quantitative and qualitative data for 48 students. The results of the teacher qualitative and quantitative data were released. Approximately 800 teachers from the 16 high schools participated in the survey. The researchers investigated the relationship between the collegial environment and the pedagogical responses of the teachers. Collegiality was measured using a survey instrument developed by the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching (CRC). Within the same high schools, teachers were observed
exhibiting three general patterns of classroom responses, “maintain traditional standards, lower expectations for coverage and achievement, and adapt practices and pedagogy” (McLaughlin, 1993, p. 85). One of the major findings of the study was that a higher level of collegiality was associated with teachers adapting their classroom practices and pedagogy.

Talbert and McLaughlin (1994) reported additional analyses based on the ethnographic studies described above. The researchers concluded that teacher professionalism was an outcome of collegial interaction in the local school context. The independent variable was “teacher community” which was a context within which collegiality may or may not be present. The dependent variables were related to variables of teacher professionalism that included shared technical culture, service ethic, professional commitment, and job satisfaction. The data suggested that there was a link between “active learning communities” and professionalism in teaching. For the purposes of this study, the survey instrument developed by the CRC for obtaining a department community index was added to the collegiality index as an additional dimension of the measurement of collegiality.

Little (1982) studied the relationship between norms
of collegiality and experimentation and the workplace conditions of successful schools. This qualitative study entailed interviews with 105 teachers and 14 administrators. The interviews were supplemented by observations. The findings suggested that where norms of collegiality prevail, schools were more successful as measured by aggregate standardized achievement scores over a 3-year period. This seminal research generated the operational definition used to define "collegiality" for this study.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

This study explored and interpreted ways to assess and compare the effects of a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation and a traditional model of teacher evaluation on collegiality among teachers, changes in instructional practices, and trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement of instruction.

Data

Background

This study examined the independent variable of method of teacher evaluation, peer coaching versus traditional evaluation, and the dependent variables of collegiality, changes in instructional practices, and trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction in one regional high school district in the state of New Jersey with a tenured staff of 150 teachers. At the time of the study, there was only one public school district in the state of New Jersey that had applied for and received an equivalency to use peer coaching as an alternative model to the traditional model of evaluation by a certified supervisor.

The equivalency granting permission to use a peer
coaching model was in effect during the 1996-1997, 1997-1998, and 1998-1999 school years. During that time period, the district allowed teachers to select the evaluation model of their choice (see Table 1). In 1997-1998, the district also permitted teachers to select portfolio assessment as a second alternative model of teacher evaluation. The district viewed portfolio assessment as an extension of peer coaching (see Danielson, 1996 and Wheeler, 1993).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Peer Coaching</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Total Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Method

The primary data. Data were obtained through the use of a combined survey instrument designed to measure the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instructional practice. This study attempted to survey the entire population of the tenured teachers in the regional high school district rather than employ a method of random sampling because the manageable size of the total population and the willingness of the school district to
assist in the efficient collection of the data made it practical to attempt to obtain data from the entire population with a high rate of participation. Survey instruments were completed by 152 teachers in the regional high school district. Their responses to the survey instruments constituted one source of data for this study. Data from the school population were coded to allow for correlational analysis of sub-populations within the total school population as well as to capture data for the entire school that could be compared to nationally normed data for collegiality.

The secondary data. The Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) constituted the secondary data for this study. Both scales are teacher survey scales that have been employed by the Center for Research on the Context of Teaching (CRC) as part of its research on educational reform. The CRC, located at Stanford University, was founded in 1987 with a 5-year National Center grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. McLaughlin and Talbert (1992) reported that the CRC conducts longitudinal research combining intensive case studies of public and independent schools and teachers with analyses of national
survey data to assess factors that either constrain or enable the best work of teachers and students.

**Interviews**

Data were obtained through semi-structured, open-ended interviews to explore whether the removal of the perceived threat of the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor builds greater trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were conducted with a sample of those teachers who had volunteered to participate in the peer coaching model of evaluation for all 3 years and who had also participated in the peer coaching classes that met once a month throughout the school year through the district's professional development academy. The researcher determined that if fewer than 10 teachers from this group of teachers who opted for peer coaching volunteered to participate in the interviews, then all of those who volunteered would be interviewed individually. If ten or more teachers from this group of teachers who opted for peer coaching volunteered to participate in the interviews, then teachers from this volunteer group would be interviewed in randomly assigned groups of three to five teachers.
Methods

This study employed a dominant-less dominant design with the single dominant paradigm being a quantitative research design and a secondary component of the overall study drawn from the alternative paradigm, a qualitative research design (Creswell, 1994, p. 177). A descriptive, quantitative research design and a case study, qualitative research design were combined to assess the effects of peer coaching.

Creswell (1994) reported that the advantage of a dominant-less dominant design was that the study was presented according to one consistent paradigm while still gathering limited information to probe one aspect of the study. This study was driven theoretically by a quantitative design that incorporated a complementary qualitative component.

The combination of methodologies in this study was employed to achieve simultaneous triangulation of methodologies (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989). Creswell (1994, p. 174) indicated that the combinations of methodologies in a study would help neutralize any bias inherent in particular data sources, investigators, and methods. Mathison (1988) expanded the underlying rationale
for methodological triangulation with the following observation:

Researchers often end up with data that occasionally converge, but frequently are inconsistent and even contradictory. This conception shifts the focus on triangulation away from a technological solution for ensuring validity and places the responsibility with the researcher for the construction of plausible explanations about the phenomena being studied. (p.17)

The dominant phase of the study employed a descriptive, quantitative research design to identify the relationship between the two treatments, peer coaching and traditional evaluation, and the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instructional practices. A quantitative approach was used in this study to show the relationship among measured variables. Leedy (1997) indicated that the non-experimental quantitative research design relied largely on a statistical investigation of the data. The prime aim of the statistical investigation was to determine how closely the data of the study approached ideal data as established by the normal curve and whether the divergence, if any, was significant within certain prescribed statistical parameters(p.111). The research design for this study was considered non-experimental
because the participants were not randomly assigned to either one of the two treatments, peer coaching or traditional evaluation. Participants were permitted to select which method of evaluation would be utilized in each of the 3 years that the equivalency waiver was in effect.

The less dominant aspect of the study employed a case study research design to explore the effect of removing the perceived threat of the results of traditional evaluation on building greater trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement of teaching. The purpose of the case study research design was to couple the survey measurements with descriptions of the teachers' experiences elaborated in their own words and with the kind of situational detail that surveys are not designed to capture. A case study method was utilized to understand the phenomenon of peer coaching more clearly and to explore the experience of peer coaching from the participants' points of view. Patton (1990) indicated that the more a program aimed at individualizing outcomes, the greater the appropriateness of a case study method. The uniqueness of the equivalency granted by the New Jersey State Department of Education to use peer coaching in place of traditional evaluation by a supervisor was consistent with a case study approach "to examine a single 'case' in-depth in order to understand the
person and the phenomenon” (Leedy, 1997, p. 166). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sample of teachers who had participated in peer coaching for 3 years and who had also participated in the peer coaching class through the district’s professional development academy. Leedy (1997) indicated that purposeful sampling was done “to increase the utility of the information obtained from the small samples. Participants were chosen because they were likely to be knowledgeable and informative about the phenomenon the researcher was studying” (p. 162). This researcher attempted to study the phenomenon of peer coaching used as a model of teacher evaluation.

Procedures

The procedures for data collection in this study involved the distribution and administration of survey instruments for the descriptive, quantitative aspects of the study and the conducting of semi-structured interviews for the case study, qualitative aspects of the study.

After approval from the Institutional Review Board at Seton Hall University was received, a letter was sent to the superintendent of the school district using peer coaching as an equivalency to evaluation by a certified supervisor (see Appendix A). This letter requested
permission to administer a survey to all tenured teaching staff and to conduct semi-structured interviews with staff members who had elected to be evaluated using the peer coaching method for a period of 2 or more years, had participated in peer coaching classes through the professional development academy operated by the regional high school district, and had volunteered to participate in the interview. Participation in the survey and the interview was voluntary.

After formal permission was received from the superintendent of the regional high school district, the survey instrument designed to measure collegiality and change in instructional practice was reviewed with the district’s principal. Permission was requested and obtained from the principal for a teaching staff member to present the survey at one of the district’s joint faculty meetings. This same teaching staff member also read the directions for completing the survey and placed the completed survey results in sealed envelopes. A cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey was included with the surveys that were distributed. The cover letter also indicated that participation in the survey was voluntary and that the results would be confidential (see Appendix A). Every staff member was asked to complete the
survey openly and honestly and to return the completed surveys at the end of the meeting at which time the surveys would be placed in sealed envelopes. Each participant was asked to indicate the method of evaluation that he or she had selected for the 1996-1997, 1997-1998, and 1998-1999 school years. If a teacher had selected the peer coaching method of evaluation, he or she was asked to indicate if he or she had participated in the peer coaching classes offered by the district. Participants also indicated their gender, their teaching assignments, grade level(s) taught, and the total number of years that they had been teaching. Each participant was asked to write his or her name on a cover page that was coded with a random number that matched the code listed on the survey. The cover page also listed instructions asking staff members who had participated in peer coaching for 3 years and who had also participated in training to indicate if they were willing to be interviewed as part of this study.

The sealed envelopes containing the surveys were given to an independent third party who removed the cover pages listing the teachers' names, compiled a master list of the teachers' names, background information, and matching survey codes, and created a list of those teachers who indicated that they would be willing to participate in the
for the teacher and the researcher with permission from the administration but without the knowledge of which teachers were being interviewed.

The following steps were adapted from Leedy (1997) and used for interviewing those teachers who met the criteria and who had volunteered to participate in the interview:

1. The interview was set up well in advance of the interview.

2. The questions that were asked in the interview were sent to participants in advance of the interview.

3. Permission to audiotape the interview and a statement indicating a willingness to participate in the study were obtained from the participants (see Appendix A).

4. The date of the interview was confirmed in writing in advance of the interview.

5. A reminder with the list of questions was sent to the participants 10 days before the interview.

6. The interviews were held on time and followed the questions that had been forwarded to the participants.

7. Following the interview, a typed transcript of the interview was submitted to the participant. Either a written acknowledgement or a corrected copy of the interview was obtained.

8. After the transcript was included in the written
report of this study, that section of the report was sent to the participant for final approval and written permission to use the data in this study (Leedy, 1997, p. 201).

The use of human subjects for data collection in the study necessitated adherence to strict ethical standards (American Educational Research Association, 1992). The guidelines employed in the study included the following:

Considerations of fairness, honesty, openness of intent, disclosure of methods, the ends for which the research was executed, a respect for the integrity of the individual, the obligations of the researcher to guarantee unequivocally individual privacy, and an informed willingness on the part of the subject to participate voluntarily in the research activity. (Leedy, 1997, p.116)

Instruments

This study employed a single questionnaire that combined two subsections of the Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) and 26 survey items from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) (see Appendix B). The two subsections of the Summary CRC
Teacher Survey Data (1991) were utilized to measure the dependant variable of collegiality. The 26 survey items from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) were utilized to measure the dependent variable of change in instructional practice.

The Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) was derived from survey data collected as part of a 3-year study of 16 public and independent secondary schools in California and Michigan conducted by the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching (CRC). Each survey questionnaire concentrated on different aspects of high school teaching. Many of the questionnaire items used in the CRC survey were drawn from ongoing national surveys of high school teachers to provide national comparisons. The Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) provided CRC school means and standard deviations on replicated and new measures of school climate, classroom instruction, professional growth and commitment, department climate and policies, and system context (CRC Teacher Survey, 1991).

This study utilized the subsection on Collegiality and the subsection on Department Community Index from the CRC Teacher Survey, 1991 to measure the dependent variable of collegiality. Those two subsections have been reported in the literature as part of the measures of professional
community dimensions (Talbert, 1991; Talbert & McLaughlin, 1994). The Collegiality Index contained a 5-item scale where respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the five items. Respondents circled a number 1 through 6 to correspond with a continuum of "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The range for responses was weighted from 5 to 30. The Alpha Reliability equaled .84. This 5-item scale was taken from the 1984 Administrator and Teacher Survey (ATS). A national mean and standard deviation existed for the Collegiality Index. The Department Community Index contained a 16-item scale where respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the 5 items. Respondents circled a number 1 through 6 to correspond with a continuum of "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Within the 16-item scale there was a 3-item subscale for Shared Technical Culture and a 4-item subscale for Privacy Norms. The Alpha Reliability equaled .90. No national norms existed for the Department Community Index. Means and standard deviations were available for each of the 16 schools that participated in the CRC study.

The CRC Survey Scales (1997) and corresponding Alpha Reliability coefficients that will accompany the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) were
not available for publication by the CRC at the time of this study. Dr. Joan Talbert granted permission from the CRC to utilize the 1991 scales and selected items from the 1997-1998 teacher survey, but the scales for the 1997-1998 teacher survey are confidential until they become published (see Appendix C). In the absence of statistical data supporting the construct validity of the questionnaire, this researcher included items from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) that were associated with the dependent variable, "change in instructional practice." For the purposes of this study, "change in instructional practice" has been defined to mean the use of "instructional activities that are student-directed and the use of a "new range of assessments." This definition is consistent with the Equivalency Applications submitted by the district.

This study utilized 26 questions from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) to measure the dependent variable of change in instructional practice. The survey used in this study included a section of 11 questions related to student-directedness of instruction and two sections of 15 questions related to methods of student assessment. The 11 questions associated with student-directedness employed a 6 point Likert scale
rating the frequency with which an instructional activity was employed. The questions associated with methods of assessment were divided between two sections also employing Likert scales. Eight of the questions from the first section employed a 5-point Likert scale rating the importance of the type of assessment to the teacher. Eight of the questions from the second section employed a 5-point Likert scale rating the emphasis that the respondent placed on the particular type of assessment.

The researcher submitted the 26 questions from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) to the dissertation committee for their assistance in verifying the appropriateness and face validity of the items for assessing change in instructional practice as defined in this study.

This study also utilized six open-ended questions to be used in interviewing the purposeful sample of teachers who had volunteered to participate in the peer coaching model of evaluation for a period of 3 years and who had also participated in the peer coaching classes that met once a month throughout the school year through the district's professional development academy. Patton (1990) indicated that the use of standardized open-ended questions would increase the comparability of responses and reduce
interviewer bias. The questions are based on the presupposition that as a result of participating in peer coaching, judgements can be made and change has occurred. Patton (1990) further indicated that presuppositions increase the likelihood that the person being interviewed will have something to say.

The six open-ended questions used in the semi-structured interviews were related to the goals of the study: (a) to understand the phenomenon of peer coaching more clearly by exploring the experience of peer coaching from the participants' points of view, (b) to examine trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement in instruction, and (c) to analyze the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instructional practice through a combination of methodologies (see Appendix D). The researcher developed the questions and submitted drafts to the dissertation committee for their review and analysis. The dissertation committee assisted in the revision of the questions and verified the appropriateness and validity of the questions for the purpose of the dissertation study. Two questions were presented alone, and four questions were presented in two sets.

The first open-ended question was designed to elicit descriptions of the "experiences, behaviors, actions, and
activities that would have been observable had the observer been present" (Patton, 1990, p.290).

1. How would you describe your experiences with peer coaching to someone who has never observed or participated in peer coaching?

The second question addressed the issue of trust in evaluation and was "aimed at understanding the emotional responses of people to their experiences and thoughts" (Patton, 1990, p.291).

2. How do you feel about the issue of trust in teacher evaluation when evaluation is conducted with a peer?

The third and fourth questions examined the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instruction and was designed to capture "the cognitive and interpretive processes of people" (Patton, 1990, p.291).

3. Based on your participation in peer coaching, how would you characterize your relationships with other teachers?

4. Based on your experience with peer coaching, how would you evaluate peer coaching as a model for improving instruction?

The fifth and sixth questions were also designed to capture the opinions of the teachers regarding their selection of peer coaching and reasons teachers either
remain with the peer coaching model of teacher evaluation or opt out. The primary purpose of these two questions was to provide greater insight into the phenomenon of peer coaching and to gather data for further research.

5. What attracted you to peer coaching?

6. Why have you continued to participate in this model of teacher evaluation?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses in this chapter are written as alternative or research hypotheses. These hypotheses represent relationships that the researcher suspects based on the review of the literature.

The first hypothesis of this study is that there is a relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and levels of collegiality.

The second hypothesis of this study is that there is a relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and changes in instructional practices.

An additional area of inquiry will be to explore the relationship between removal of the perceived threat that the results of evaluation by a certified supervisor could be utilized in a negative manner and trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction.
The two hypotheses will be tested using a one-way Analysis of Variance discussed in the next section, Treatment of the Data. The additional research question will be examined using semi-structured interviews.

Treatment of the Data

The purpose of this section will be to review the specific treatment of the data for each of the three subproblems of this study.

Subproblem One

The first subproblem was to determine whether tenured high school teachers who selected peer coaching as an alternative model of evaluation exhibited norms of collegiality that are different than the norms of collegiality that are exhibited by tenured high school teachers who selected to be evaluated under the traditional model of evaluation.

The data needed to address subproblem one were the responses to the survey questions ranked along the 6 point continuum for the subsection on "Collegiality" and the subsection on "Department Community Index" from the CRC Teacher Survey (1991). The responses were gathered at a joint faculty meeting where the surveys were completed and
collected. The data were analyzed using a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the null hypothesis for two population means by classifying the variability on the "Collegiality" and "Department Community" survey sections into two independent components, variability between treatment groups and variability within treatment groups (Witte & Witte, 1997, p. 370). The independent variable or treatment was the model of teacher evaluation: traditional or peer coaching. The results of the subsection on "Collegiality" were also compared to the mean scores for the national sample of public school teachers, the peer coaching model of evaluation mean, and the traditional model of evaluation mean.

Data were collected from the teaching staff regarding gender, teaching assignment, grade level(s) taught, and total number of years of teaching experience. This background data were collected in the event they should appear useful in subsequent analyses. For example, a two-way ANOVA could be performed to test the null hypothesis and to analyze the effects of either gender, teaching assignment, grade level(s) taught, or years of teaching experience.
Subproblem Two

The second subproblem was to determine whether tenured high school teachers who selected peer coaching as an alternative model of evaluation demonstrated changes in instructional practices that are different than the changes in instructional practices demonstrated by tenured high school teachers who selected to be evaluated under the traditional model of evaluation.

The data needed to address subproblem two were the responses to the survey questions ranked along the various Likert Scales for the 26 questions from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) that contained three subsections used to measure the dependent variable of change in instructional practice. The responses were gathered at a joint faculty meeting where the surveys were completed and collected. The data were analyzed using a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the null hypothesis for two population means by classifying the variability on the questions related to student-directedness of instruction and methods of assessment sections into two independent components: variability between treatment groups and variability within treatment groups (Witte & Witte, 1997, p. 370). The independent variable or treatment was the model of teacher evaluation:
traditional or peer coaching. Data were collected from the teaching staff regarding gender, teaching assignment, grade level(s) taught, and total number of years of teaching experience. This background data were collected in the event they should appear useful in subsequent analyses. For example, a two-way ANOVA could be performed to test the null hypothesis and to analyze the effects of either gender, teaching assignment, grade level(s) taught, or years of teaching experience.

Subproblem Three

The third subproblem was to determine the impact of removing the perceived threat of the results of traditional evaluation used in a negative manner on building greater trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement of teaching for tenured high school teachers who selected peer coaching for 2 or more years that the equivalency was granted and who participated in peer coaching classes through the professional development academy.

The data were gathered through semi-structured, face-to-face interviews of the tenured teachers who met the criteria for interview and volunteered to participate in the interview with the researcher. Each interview was audiotaped and transcribed by the researcher. The data
were analyzed based on methods of reduction and interpretation. Creswell (1994) reported that “the researcher takes a voluminous amount of information and reduces it to certain patterns, categories, or themes and then interprets this information using some schema” (p.154). Leedy (1997) indicated that for case study research, the data analysis is interpretational with a search for themes and structural with a search for patterns. The dominant mode for the case study aspect of this study was a search for patterns by comparing the results with patterns predicted from theory and the research literature and explanation building where the researcher looks for causal links, explores plausible or rival explanations, and attempts to build an explanation about the case (Creswell, 1994, pp. 156-157).
Chapter IV
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS AND QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to present (a) the results of the descriptive, quantitative research design that analyzed survey data; and (b) the results of the case study, qualitative research design employed to examine the data obtained through semi-structured interview questions. The results of the data gathered from the sections of the CRC Teacher Survey, 1991 and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) designed to assess the dependent variables will be presented in the next section of this chapter. The transcriptions obtained from the recorded interviews with 12 tenured teachers who participated in peer coaching for 2 or more years and who volunteered to be interviewed are organized according to the six interview questions asked of each teacher. The responses of each of the 12 teachers will be listed immediately after each of the six interview questions. The transcriptions will follow the presentation of the survey data.
This study captured the entire population of high school teachers who were permitted, over the past 3 years, to employ peer coaching in place of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor. The study was conducted in the 3rd year of the equivalency waiver granted by the New Jersey Department of Education. During the 1996-97 and 1997-98 school years, the district, in which the study was conducted, was the only public school district to have been granted a waiver to use an alternate model of teacher evaluation. Additional waivers were granted to other public school districts by the New Jersey Department of Education for the 1998-99 school year.

The researcher wrote to the superintendent of the regional high school district where the waiver had been granted to obtain permission to administer a survey to all staff members and to conduct semi-structured interviews with tenured teachers who selected peer coaching for 2 or more years, participated in peer coaching classes through the district’s professional development academy. Participation in the survey and the interview phases of the study was voluntary.

The district superintendent gave written permission on November 4, 1998 for the researcher to conduct the study (see Appendix E). The researcher then met with one of the
district's assistant superintendents and the president of the local teacher's association to review the survey instrument, the open-ended questions, and the procedures for conducting both phases of the study. After careful review of the survey, the district personnel requested that the following statement, "this study will examine differences in model of evaluation and will not compare the results between and among departments," be included at the introduction of the Department Community Index section of the survey. The district personnel were concerned that teachers may be inhibited if they perceived that their departments were being compared. The president of the local teacher's association supported the study, presented the survey to the district's staff, and encouraged the staff to participate. As a result, 152 surveys were distributed on November 16, 1998 and returned to drop boxes in sealed envelopes. The sealed envelopes and drop boxes were employed to protect the anonymity of the participants and to ensure the voluntary nature of the study by removing any pressure to participate. The study analyzed only the results from tenured teachers who either participated in the traditional model of evaluation for all 3 years or peer coaching for 1, 2, or 3 years. The survey data for non-teaching staff such as aides, counselors, or supervisors,
non-tenured teachers, and teachers who participated in a combination of traditional evaluation and teacher evaluation through portfolio assessment were not included in the study. If a respondent omitted only one or two items of the 47 item survey, the omissions were considered to be an oversight, and the average score for that section was applied to that missing item. This decision was made to include the maximum number of responses given the small sample sizes. This formula was applied in only two cases. If more than two items were omitted, the survey was considered incomplete and not included in the study. Four surveys were considered incomplete. Table 2 lists the distribution of the 152 staff members who completed the survey.

Table 2

**Distribution of Survey Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional - 3 years</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer - 1 year</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer - 2 or more years</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional and Portfolio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An independent third party coded the surveys and created a master list that was not shared with the researcher or the school administration. The researcher scored the surveys, tabulated the data on electronic spreadsheet, and contracted with an independent statistician to perform the ANOVA's and other statistical analysis using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 1996, computer software.

The survey instrument contained eight questions designed to gather background data from the respondents. The ninth question asked those teachers who participated in peer coaching and who had opted to return to traditional evaluation to comment on their reasons for not continuing in the peer coaching model. The tenth question asked those teachers who participated in peer coaching if they would be willing to participate in interviews conducted by researcher. There were 32 teachers who participated in peer coaching who volunteered to be interviewed. There were 19 volunteers who had participated in peer coaching for only 1 year. There were 13 volunteers who had participated in peer coaching for 2 or more years. The study called for interviews with those tenured teachers who participated in peer coaching for all 3 years because those teachers would more likely be "knowledgeable and informative about the
the letter of informed consent, and forward the six interview questions to the 13 teachers who volunteered to participate by electronic mail more than 10 days in advance of the interviews. Any changes in the interview schedule were also made by electronic mail. Several of the teachers commented on the benefit of having the interview questions well in advance of the actual interview. A reminder of the interview date was sent just prior to the interview. The letter of informed consent was signed immediately before the interview was conducted and audiotaped. After the interviews, a copy of the transcription was sent to each volunteer by electronic mail as an attached document. Each participant acknowledged receipt of the transcription. All requests to edit the transcriptions were honored and confirmed in writing.

Results of the Survey

The purpose of this section will be to present the results of the survey for the 98 staff members whose profiles of teacher evaluation met the criteria for statistical analysis. This section will be organized with an explanation of the items used to measure the dependent variables, the decision rules for establishing the classifications of the independent variables, the results
of the ANOVA's performed to test the hypotheses, supplemental analyses performed, and a presentation of background information of the respondents.

This study employed a single questionnaire that combined two subsections of the Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) that consisted of 21 items and three sets of survey questions from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) that consisted of 26 items. The two subsections of the Summary CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) were utilized to measure the dependent variable of collegiality. The collegiality index was obtained by calculating the raw score total of items a, b, c, d, and e under section 1. The Department Community Index was obtained by calculating the raw score total of items a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, and p under section 2. Items b, d, f, h, j, m, and o were reverse coded. The 26 items from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) were utilized to measure the dependent variable of "change in instructional practice." The third section of the survey addressed the dimension of "student directed activities" and the fourth and fifth sections addressed the dimension of "new range of assessment." Student Directed Activity was measured by calculating the raw score total of items a, b, c, d, e, f,
g, h, i, j, and k under section three. Items a, g, and h were reverse coded. New Range of Assessment was measured, in terms of importance placed on various types of assessments, by calculating the raw score total of items a, b, c, d, e, f, and g under section four. Items a and f were reverse coded. New Range of Assessment was also measured, in terms of emphasis placed on various types of assessment tool, by calculating the raw score total of items a, b, c, d, e, f, g, and h under section five. Items a, e, and g were reverse coded.

The survey data were organized by evaluation classification outlined in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 yrs. Traditional</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 yr. Peer</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 or 3 yrs. Peer</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Class 1 + 2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis of this study was that there is a relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and levels of collegiality. The second hypothesis of this study
was that there is a relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and changes in instructional practice. The statistical procedure for analyzing the relationship between independent variables, traditional evaluation and peer coaching, and the dependent variables, collegiality and change in instructional practice, was an analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of the ANOVA's are reported in Tables 4 - 9 (see Appendix F). The level of significance for this study was set at $\alpha = .05$. The hypotheses were answered by comparing two groups, those teachers who had participated in the traditional model of teacher evaluation for 3 years (evaluation classification 0) and those teachers who had participated in a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation for either 2 or 3 years (evaluation classification 2).

The Collegiality Index for the ANOVA for two groups, those teachers who had participated in the traditional model of teacher evaluation for 3 years (evaluation classification 0) and those teachers who had participated in a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation for either 2 or 3 years (evaluation classification 2), was the only variable that approached significance ($p = .052$). A one-tailed t-test (see Table 10) for independent means was conducted for the Collegiality Index. The results of this
analysis were significant at $p < .05$.

Table 10

One-tailed t-test for Collegiality - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sign. Of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.068</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.786</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.736</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Data

The purpose of this section will be to present the analysis of the data for evaluation classifications other than those used to answer the research hypotheses. A z-score analysis of the evaluation classifications as compared to the results on the Collegiality Index for the National Sample of Public Schools will also be presented. Additional ANOVA's were conducted for two groups: (a) those teachers who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years (evaluation classification 0) and those teachers who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year (evaluation classification 1); and (b) those teachers who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years (evaluation classification 0) and every teacher who participated in the
peer coaching model of evaluation for either 1, 2, or 3 years (evaluation classification 3). A further ANOVA was conducted for three groups: (a) those teachers who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years (evaluation classification 0); (b) those teachers who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 years (evaluation classification 2); and (c) those teachers who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year (evaluation classification 1). Rather than list the results of the ANOVA’s for each of the dependent variables, only those ANOVA’s that were significant or approached statistical significance will be presented in Tables 11 - 20 (see Appendix G).

This study also conducted z-score analysis for the three evaluation classifications using the mean score (19.20) and standard deviation (2.3) obtained from the Administrator and Teacher Survey, 1984 for the Collegiality Index for a national sample of public high schools. The five items used to determine the Collegiality Index were the same five items used in the CRC Teacher Survey Data, 1981 and in this study to measure collegiality. The z-score results for the group of teachers who participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years were significant (p = .023). The mean collegiality score for the group using the traditional
model of evaluation was actually higher than the group that had participated in peer coaching for 1 year as illustrated in Table 21.

Table 21

Z-score Analysis for National Collegiality Index - Traditional (0), Peer (1) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sign. Of Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.068</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.308</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.786</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Data

The results of the background, descriptive data for each of the survey participants was organized by evaluation classification and reported by actual number and percentage of participants in each background category. This study gathered background data for the subject area taught, the grade level(s) taught, the years of teaching experience, and gender. A regression analysis indicated that none of the background data were statistically significant. The numbers and percentages for the background categories of years of teaching experience and gender were disproportionate to the numbers and percentages for the
total school population and are presented in Tables 22 and 23 (see Appendix H). For example, the percent of female teachers who participated in peer coaching 2 or 3 years (82.1 %) was disproportionate to the percent of female teachers that comprised the survey respondents (64.3%).

The final supplemental finding was an organization of the reasons that those teachers who participated in peer coaching for 1 year only opted out of the peer coaching model of teacher evaluation. The data came from the responses on the survey instrument by the teachers who had participated in peer coaching for 1 year, but did not continue. Most teachers indicated that the time required for reports, observing, conferencing, and attending the peer coaching classes was the main reason for not continuing to participate in the peer coaching model of teacher evaluation. The data were organized by the major themes expressed by the teachers (see Table 24).
Table 24

Reasons Given by Respondents for Not Continuing with Peer Coaching Model of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Surrounding Partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Traditional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already Involved in Team Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Questions – Transcription

This section will present the responses of the 12 tenured high school teachers who participated in the semi-structured interviews. The responses of the 12 participants are organized according to the six questions that were asked of each volunteer by the researcher.

Question 1

How would you describe your experiences with peer coaching to someone who has never observed or participated
Teacher A: Very direct and useful. Things like, the remarks that were made were more teacher oriented. Things like I noticed you have the kids grouped according to ability, and I noticed that you had one student who was more able than the others and each time you changed the lesson you changed the groups. You know, things like that were noticed. That took me a lot to put together those therapeutic learning groups. I had never had something like that noticed.

Interviewer: So you got feedback?

Teacher A: Somebody noticed that I actually planned that part. Even though my lesson plan is different. In all fairness to my supervisor, she's coming in in a vacuum pretty much, and she's got this written information, and she's responsible to read all this and then comment on what she has in the lesson plan. Comment on it. So if my lesson plan, really I felt it was more of an evaluation on my lesson plan rather than on my teaching. If I write good lesson plans then I get a good evaluation. If I teach poorly but write a good lesson plan, it still looks good in the evaluation. It never varied. I was always getting these glowing evaluations, and yet I felt as though my kids weren't really doing that well. What can I do differently? Show me something. Give me an idea.

Interviewer: You mentioned the kind of feedback you wanted in relationship to dyslexic students?

Teacher A: The learning disabilities teacher that I worked with had been trained specifically in reading. So since I'm teaching a reading class, and I don't have a graduate degree in teaching reading. I'm trained as a special educator. Of course, I had to take three reading classes. They were very difficult, and I have good notes which I study, and I prepare for my classes, so I felt on that level that I was as prepared as I could be, but yet there was stuff I didn't know. I could sense that, I could feel that when I'm working with the kids. There's
stuff I’d come across with the kids that I didn’t exactly know how to address it. You know. Would I just be outright and explain to them what I saw or do I save that part for me and then just change an activity in the middle so that one kid that isn’t getting success suddenly they are feeling success. It’s just like a funny balance that you have to strike with these kids. And they have a lot of negative messages going on anyway cause they’re in a little room with the small class.

Interviewer: The peer coach could give you feedback on that?

Teacher A: She gave me specific situations. And one situation my grouping wasn’t the best grouping I should have been using. In another situation I was doing a phonics lesson with the kids, and she had a suggestion for a different way to end the lesson that it wouldn’t have been as difficult at the end. Like I think I was building like you would do in a regular ed. classroom, you would build into the hardest, most difficult thing would be toward end and then you could let them down a little bit, and her suggestion was why don’t you move that difficult thing up more in the lesson so that as you’re working and you see, o.k., now this is difficult and everybody is bombing it, now you have a little more time at the end to wrap it back up and bring them back up into that hard thing so that maybe when they left, they might feel like they had mastered it, even if they hadn’t. They left the room feeling as they had a sense that I can really do this. And then the next day you could start on that difficult thing. So it’s timing. I had some timing things going on.

Interviewer: Those questions or thoughts of timing, when you talked, did they carry with you when the peer coach wasn’t there?

Teacher A: With the peer coaching, what we were doing was, you meet with the coach and go over the stuff, you compare notes, and of course, I would have the option to either take the
suggestions or leave the suggestions. I choose to use the suggestions because I had picked her as my coach. So I felt like I would want to use what she told me and so incorporated. I don’t know if that answered your question?

Interviewer: No, it did. It’s very interesting.

Teacher B: I’d have to answer in two different veins. The actual experience of peer coaching, having the input of one of my peers in watching my classroom was a very good experience. The thing that you don’t always realize when you participate in peer coaching is that there is a lot of paperwork that goes along with it. So, I think that sometimes, in hoping to promote peer coaching, the proponents don’t always tell you all that you are getting involved in. So I would say it was a worthwhile experience, but there is more to it than just physically observing your partner’s classroom.

Interviewer: So if I were to summarize, the good experience was working with the peer in the classroom, and maybe, the down sides were not knowing all that was going to be entailed (interrupted).

Teacher B: The time that it took to do all of the paperwork and submit all of the forms.

Teacher C: I find that peer coaching is a more valid evaluation. Because you look for specific weaknesses or specific areas of interest. And having someone else there who has been there and taught what you taught makes it easier to see where you need improvement or where you are strong. A department chair generally will come in and evaluate you in general, but it’s not as valuable as looking for specific things that need improvement.

Interviewer: Did you pick your partner?

Teacher C: Yes, I did. My partner is someone in the department that complements me.
Teacher D: My first reaction to that is that it’s empowering. You are in control of what you are working on. It is very non-judgmental. For me, peer coaching has meant getting away from that mode of someone higher up in the department coming down and trying to find something wrong with what you’re doing. There’s a certain mind set with that. I’m on faculties where I’ve had a supervisor say to me, “How are you going to improve if I don’t find at least one thing wrong with your lesson?” As positive as the administrator may intend that to be, for the faculty member, it’s still a difficult situation to find yourself in where there’s someone who feels it’s his job to find something wrong with what you’re doing. Peer coaching really liberates you from that model.

Teacher B: It a very positive experience. It is going enable you to be the best teacher you can be because you are trying to work with each other to help each other. It’s more of a helping situation than having someone come in and look at numerous, numerous things. You try to focus on maybe a weakness you might have, say well how can I improve on this, how can I do this better, how can I keep my students on task better, or how can I make sure everyone is participating? It’s definitely more a helping kind of situation than having an evaluator, an administrator coming in and looking at the classroom climate and looking at how you are presenting material and how the students are responding, you are focusing in on one specific thing. So that it is much more helpful to know how you are dealing with this one particular thing rather than numerous things.

Interviewer: Do you pick the thing?

Teacher E: And we pick the thing. Yes. What’s nice is that we may say to ourselves, well, you know, I have a feeling that I’m not calling on everybody but I’m not really sure because when you’re teaching you can’t be conscious of every single thing you’re doing. So you have someone else who can take a seating chart, and they can say you called on x, y, z, and you never called
on this student who is in the corner of the room. You never ever called on them. So that helps you to focus in on I have to call on every child. I have to give everyone an opportunity, and I can’t be picking on the same individuals all of the time. You tend to pick on the same individuals because they’re the ones who volunteer. But that’s not good because you want everyone to be participating, so this way you now have a feeling about something, or I think my students are not all on task. I’m not sure, but if someone else is there they can say to me, “Oh, yes, so and so, they were never on task.” Then we work on, o.k., well, if they are not on task, how do we get them all to be on task. We can come up with strategies and plans that we can try to implement.

Interviewer: Did you select your partner?

Teacher E: Yes. My partner is the same partner as last year. And I don’t know if that’s good or bad because it’s only the second time I’m doing it. But our schedules last year were, we taught only two blocks the same semester and then three blocks the next. This year it’s different because I’m teaching three now, and she’s teaching two. So that makes observations much more difficult. I need the classroom coverage. I had to speak with someone and had to get coverage. But I don’t feel guilty about leaving my class for half a block with somebody else so I can observe a teacher. I don’t think it will be detrimental for my own students for one block. But I think we know each other very well. You know. It’s very comfortable, maybe it would be better to choose somebody else next time, I don’t know. It’s really hard to say.

Interviewer: There may be some benefit to the same person. You establish something. It may take longer than one year.

Teacher E: Right. Right.

Teacher F: The first thing that I thought of was that I think it depends a lot on (pause) Well,
o.k., first of all, it’s more work. It’s easier to just sit and be observed. Just have your supervisor tell you what you doing right and what you doing wrong and respond. So it’s more work to observe someone else and to be observed and to think about it. But that’s OK. The other thing is that it depends a lot on you and your partner. Like it depends on whether you’re willing to do the work. And it depends on how much you each put into it and whether or not you have a rapport. I’ve had three different partners. So my experiences have been different every year. The 1st year I did it, I did it with someone in a different department. But we both taught lower level students, and so I thought that would be a good opportunity to see how another subject deals with the same type of students. We were friends with each other, and we were both conscientious. We both put into it a lot of work and thought. Followed the procedures, think about what we were doing. The 2nd year I did it with someone in my own department.

Interviewer: The 1st year? How did that work, you went out of the department? You were working with similar type students? Did that work out for you?

Teacher F: We both taught other classes too. But the reason for partnering with her was because we both taught lower level students. We observed each other, not just the lower level classes. We also observed each other in the regular classes. The reason was (pause)cause sometimes lower level students, you have behavioral issues or if they’re motivationally not there, it was kind of my goal to see how they were in other subjects. Are they the same in other subject? Do different strategies work better with them, you know, to teach math as opposed to teach history? So that was the reason. I think that was beneficial, but it was also beneficial because we worked together well. We were both interested in improving what we were doing.

Interviewer: You worked the 2nd year with someone different?
Teacher F: The 2nd year, I worked with somebody within my department. And it was completely different because of the partnership. Because I didn’t think that my partner took it as seriously. A later question asks about something that relates to this, and I think there is a lot of room to not take this seriously, to sort of not put a lot into it. So I think I didn’t get as much out of the 2nd year because you have to have someone who is into it with you.

Interviewer: In what way would someone not really be participating in it?

Teacher F: Well, just do the bare minimum. Well, and we had to take a class along with this, the 1st year. I don’t think you have to take it the 2nd year. And we weren’t even in the class together at the same time because my partner would miss the meetings and make them up. So we weren’t making plans together. We did the bare minimum.

Interviewer: Did that affect how you saw the effectiveness of it in that year?

Teacher F: Sure. I didn’t get as much out of it. There were still benefits to it because I watched, for me personally, I was able to observe another teacher and see how they are in good ways and bad ways. For the other teacher, you know, I really couldn’t say cause I didn’t know if they were putting anything into it or if they wanted to.

Interviewer: And now you are into the 3rd year.

Teacher F: The 3rd year, I have a teacher in another department, too. And this is someone I actually co-teach with. So I had some reasons for wanting to work with this person because I just thought that, I think that this person could actually use, I mean so could I, but this person could use some direction. And as a co-teacher, I found it difficult to be that way, a leader type. I’m taking this as an opportunity to refine our
working relationship because I will probably work together again. We aren’t this year. We aren’t working together this year.

Interviewer: Am I summarizing it correctly if I say when you co-taught with this person, there were things that you saw but you didn’t really feel you could enter into that, but by doing peer coaching together (interrupted).

Teacher F: I’m hoping to be able to. I feel like there will be more of an opportunity to raise them by doing an observation. Whereas as a co-teacher, I didn’t feel comfortable. Now, I certainly think that I can benefit too from working with her or I wouldn’t do it. When you say to describe my experiences, they’ve been so broad. It doesn’t fit one (pause) It’s kind of a situation where you have an opportunity to watch someone else teach, and you have an opportunity for a peer to tell you what they think about your teaching and it’s more active. That’s the broad explanation of the experience, but it’s so dependent, I think, on who you’re partnered with and how much you both put into it and how well you work together.

Teacher G: Peer coaching is a rather unique way where you can actually get into someone else’s classroom and (pause). The benefit is actually two fold. You are in someone else’s classroom which we don’t very often get a chance to do because we are very busy, and teachers tend to be isolated in what they are doing and very often there is not a whole lot of back and forth. You know, we may talk with each other in the faculty room, but that’s a whole lot different than being in the classroom. But your main goal while you’re in the classroom is to help the classroom teacher. You’re another pair of eyes, another pair of ears to kind of focus in on something they wish to refine or focus on, and it’s really up to that classroom teacher to decide what your role is going to be at any given time. So that’s your job. You’re there to objectively, you know, collect information and then to share it. You’re not there to do any kind of evaluation. You’re
there to provide feedback to the classroom teacher.

Interviewer: Is there any kind of feedback that you can share that you asked for or your partner asked for?

Teacher G: My partner and I, we asked for a couple of different things. Sometimes we would be working on maybe a new activity we were trying to use where the kids would be working more independently, we wanted to see if the kids are on task or not. Sometimes one teacher in a class of 25 or more, it’s very difficult to keep track of that. So we’ve used it in that way. We’ve also used it to gage in a classroom discussion how we kind of work our way around the room and get everyone involved, and that’s another thing when there are so many kids in a room. My peer coach would tell me things like, well, you tended to concentrate more on these kids, or this side of the room, or something like that, or your wait time wasn’t long enough. You know, things that I may know about and be consciously aware of, but maybe not while I’m doing the discussion, so.

Interviewer: Was your consciousness any different when the person was in the room, when your partner was in the room?

Teacher G: Sure. Oh, sure. Because you know what they’re there for. You decided what they’re there for. With that experience, that experience changes you in the future, too. Even though they’re not in the room in the future, you still remember that particular interaction that particular day, the feedback you got, and it’s helped a lot.

Teacher H: Peer coaching gives me the chance to work with someone else who I may or may not have worked with before. It lets me evaluate someone else as far as purely for their benefit. It takes some of the pressure off knowing that it’s not a supervisor. I know myself and other teachers I’ve talked to felt as though they weren’t defensive, and we were able to say more
truthful things without having them get upset by it. Also, we were able to suggest things that worked for us in the classroom and also there is more collaborating, working together with other teachers.

Interviewer: Did that go both ways? Did people say things to you that maybe the supervisor wouldn’t say? And vice versa?

Teacher H: Yes. And I know myself a lot of the comments I made I said, "I’m just telling you from something that I notice, you know, don’t get offended.” And then I would give a comment. And the people involved felt more comfortable with me saying it than a supervisor because then they felt that it was too defensive or something wrong. Or that’s the impression it seems like we felt a lot.

Teacher I: I would say that it’s very different from the traditional mode of evaluation. What I was accustomed to was a supervisor from the department coming in twice a year to observe and then writing a mid-year evaluation and then, a summary evaluation at the conclusion of the academic year. It is very, very different in certain senses. My experience overall has been positive. What I like most about it, there are a couple of things. One of the aspects I like most about it is that I have the opportunity to work with someone in my department who I would normally do not interact with, and the nature of schools today is such that teachers are very isolated, and unless you have that opportunity, I find for myself, I would never get a chance to see how another teacher teaches, as well as to have other teachers see how I teach. And it’s all something that prior to this, when I began teaching nine years ago, it is something that is an ideal to have, that I would want to go into other classes and see other teachers, and they would want to come in and see me. But the reality of the situation does not lend itself to doing this time. So when our school offered this, I think that that was very positive that now we get to interact with other teachers and see how
their styles are. So for collegiality purposes, that in and of itself, I know has really added to my relationship with this particular teacher. My other experiences are (pause) I'm finding it, what I guess more of a difficult part of this is that there isn't a lot of time. We're only required to do (pause), I'm trying to think now, two observations and then an end of the year. One of the problems we find for each other is that there is not a lot of time to meet in advance. And there's just not a lot of time. So I guess what I'm saying is that I think it could be better. So I continue to do it, and my experience has been overall positive, but there are some areas that I'm not comfortable with that I would like to see improved upon. Another part of my experience is being a little bit reluctant to, how much do I say to this teacher, whereas if it's a supervisor, they just tell you how it is, and there's that distinct line between supervisor and teacher, whereas teacher to teacher, I find myself a little more reticent to say to my peer coach, "Well um, do you think that maybe you tried to do too much in the lesson or did you allow enough wait time or are you trying to push things ahead enough. Whereas I'm watching for those things, I'm a little reticent to point them out. Because I'm not sure sometimes. There's still a little bit of a blurry line and confusion as to what we're actually supposed to be doing there.

Interviewer: When you do it, do you have someone look at one particular thing or do they kind of look at things in general?

Teacher 1: Pretty much we were told to look at one particular aspect that you want to improve upon. But going back to all of the positives, another great positive is that the teacher I work with, we complement each other very well in the sense that we're sort of opposites. She's very, very, very efficient and extremely organized and hence, her classroom is, if she's on day five, if she says she's going to be on this, you'd better believe that she's going to be on this. For myself, I am not organized. I'm organized. I
shouldn't say that. But it's more of a struggle for me. And I'm also not someone who has to be on a certain thing at a certain day. So therefore, (pause) but yet my skills that she loves are I'm excellent in discussions. I'm excellent in the nurturing aspect as well as the aspect of really causing students to reflectively think and get them (pause). I'm really good at bringing them in. Where she's really good at the efficiency aspects so the two of us really help each other. She helps me, I guess, to be more accountable for my time. I help her to relax a little. So in that aspect, it's really good. I think that's pretty much what I want to say.

Interviewer: Any ideas on ways to change the negatives?

Teacher I: We had a course the 1st year that we did this. And although, just recently this year, they added a Peer Coaching II for those who've already done it. My schedule really didn't allow myself (pause). My partner and I talked about doing it and then decided against it. But it's something that I think would certainly help. The other thing is, I think, maybe, I don't know, more ideas, more help in how to do this.

Teacher J: My experience was not really successful. I did it for 2 years, and the 1st year I did it with a teacher who really didn't want to do it. And every time we got together, he'd reminded me of that. So I didn't feel like it was an equal, give and take, type of thing. And because he didn't really want to do it, he didn't spend a lot of time and interest in it. So that was not a good experience. Second year that I did it, I did it with a teacher who was actually expecting too much out of it. The teacher wanted me to solve all of her problems in the classroom. Wanted me to come visit her quite a bit which I couldn't do because I was still teaching. Going to the classes, she seemed to be in it for the wrong reasons. She was having some discipline problems and some curriculum problems, and she wanted me to help her solve these problems which is not what peer coaching is
supposed to be about. So my experiences weren't that successful.

Interviewer: What was it supposed to be about?

Teacher J: Basically is was just (pause), the way we were taught peer coaching is that you pick a particular topic you want to specialize in or focus on, and you talk to that teacher about it, and they come in, and they would observe you with that particular area or topic. For example, one of mine was I just wanted to know how I responded to a student. Do I spread my responses, do I pick one side of the room, boys versus girls, and that was the focus I was looking for. Some of the teachers that I worked with wanted me (pause) how would you handle the discipline problem which was not what peer coaching is. Discipline is a whole other issue. Peer coaching is a teaching technique, and how you adjust or how you do that particular technique.

Interviewer: In spite of, maybe, the partner's expectations, were they able to give anything to you?

Teacher J: I mean I did get (pause). I shouldn't say it was not successful at all. I did get something out of it because any time you observe another teacher you get something out of it. I didn’t get out of it what I was hoping to.

Interviewer: Had you picked these people?

Teacher J: The 1st year, yeah. Basically, I picked them. The 1st year was one of those deals where I advertised. Who want's to do peer coaching with me. And this person finally said o.k. The 2nd year, I'd heard she wanted to do it, and I said, "O.K., I’ll do it with you." But I, again, there wasn’t a whole lot of people out there. This year I'm not doing it because I couldn’t find somebody to do it with. I advertised who wants to do peer coaching. I didn’t want to do it with the same two people so I said someone I haven’t done it with before. But I guess everyone else was taken or didn’t
want to do it.

Interviewer: You seem interested. You want to do this though?

Teacher J: Yeah. I want to make it work. My experiences weren’t that good so I’m trying to find somebody who wants to do it for the right reasons. And I didn’t find that person yet.

Interviewer: Why do you want to persist?

Teacher J: It can help me. I mean I want to try different techniques. I want to see if someone can help me with my (interrupted).

Teacher K: Well, if I were, let’s say, at a holiday gathering with someone in the neighborhood, and we just started talking to my neighbor, maybe, and she has a few kids in high school, the way I always think I would describe it in my mind this is odd, I guess, but I think of it as a contemporary version of team teaching is what it really turns out to be for me. My area is now it’s called family and consumer sciences. It used to be called living skills. It used to be called human ecology. Before that it was called Home EC. We do tend to be cloistered, and we tend to be stuck not in our minds, but in the public’s mind, in a certain pigeon hole. I really, I really cherish this opportunity to be able to, I think of it as team teaching because what I do with my peer partner who is an art teacher is that we get together and think of projects that we can, aside from just observing each other’s classes, we think of projects that we can do together with her art expertise and my teaching interior design or home design or even foods or whatever, you know, we sort of start to get into this. For instance, next week we’re observing each other, and I teach a health design class now and it being the holiday season at first, I really scoffed at kids are saying something about gingerbread houses. But then I started looking at some recipes that really have a foundation that you do, and they can decorate it with candy when they get home. But, you know,
like o.k., who would I offend? Who doesn’t celebrate Christmas? But then she’s, coming in also and just using that as a specific example, we were working out ideas for doing something with an art class and my sewing classes with doing T-shirts and doing some art work. We were working out the idea of doing book bindings with a home design with an interior design class and an art class doing some really clever and interesting book covers. And, you know, we find that our interests meld really well, and it keeps us from being categorized in one little place. So, I’m not sure I’m answering to the point. She can help me with ideas in the classroom, discipline, group. We do all of that kind of thing. But for me it’s such an opportunity to team teach, to bring in another discipline. And it really even makes me very understanding of how when, you’re probably aware that there’s been a lot of construction going on, I makes me very aware of the thinking behind the way the offices were arranged. For example, they’re a very unusual mix. They mix the offices with technology and science. Then they’ll mix English with, I don’t even know who is mixed with their offices. And the idea is almost to encourage team teaching. We don’t have access to that because we are not exactly the place that in the school where the big funds go. You know, we’re not one of the three basic “r’s.” But, I’m even interested in thinking about what I could do with a math teacher for instance. I don’t mean to be babbling, but I came across a plan for using geometry with planning of quilts. What peer coaching has done for me is not so much help me with my classroom technique, I guess that’s part of it, but it’s given me a chance to be much more interdisciplinary. I think that’s what I want to say.

Teacher L: Well, I’m new to peer coaching. It’s different than I envisioned. I thought that with peer coaching I would find my best friend, and we’d sit together and observe each other’s classrooms and write down everything that I liked about what they did. Peer coaching is more of an opportunity to work with maybe, colleagues I’ve
never worked with before or colleagues that I've admired, not necessarily my friends. First of all, I've found that my friends don't give me the constructive criticism that I need. And number two, I like to use it as an opportunity to get to know other people and to see how they teach. So at first I thought, oh, this is a way to get out of observations. Then I took the peer coaching course, and in the course we learned all the different types of classroom strategies that I hadn't really focused on in my undergraduate training. All of things like, advanced organizers, things like concept maps, and mind maps, all of the strategy that would help me as a teacher and across settings, whether it's special ed. or English or Science, just good teaching practices. So I was amazed at the end of my 1st year how much I did learn and when I went to my lab team partner, my peer coaching partner I had specific things to look for. I had to plan specifically for what I wanted them to observe me or what I expect them to see and exactly what I wanted feedback on. So, here I thought this is going to be something very easy and quick. I found it to be very detailed. I came out with an evaluation of my skills that I hadn't had in any prior evaluation, and I felt comfortable with the criticisms or the positive responses that I got, and I learned a tremendous amount just by observing and talking to other people.

Interviewer: Did you get to pick the people each time?

Teacher L: Yes. I always picked people each time, and I decided to stay with people, at first, like I said, I thought, oh, I'll just team teach with my friend and that was not as successful. Because, again, we were just team teaching, watching what the other person was doing, and maybe we weren't as critical as we could have been because we were friends. When I started team teaching with my in-class support partner, I found that the responses I got from a regular teacher compared to special education teacher, a regular teacher was watching what I was doing, and I was watching what the regular ed. teacher
was doing giving special ed. strategies. I felt that was much more helpful. So I purposely choose to work with different people.

Interviewer: How many different people have you worked with?

Teacher L: Uh, this will be two.

Interviewer: When you described before, advanced organizer, can you tell what that was about?

Teacher L: Yes, through some graduate study that I’ve done, mostly I think it’s probably a curriculum course, it’s probably a basic curriculum course, teaching methods and design, you know, a generic 101 course. I learned about advanced organizers which were ways that you can organize your classroom even prior to giving an assignment, prior to walking in the room. Things that would make students more responsible in handing in their work. And I had kind of, I had used that, but when I took the peer course, the peer coaching course, they revisited the whole concept of advanced organizers. For example, you have a message board in your classroom. If there’s a student who misses a couple of assignments, you can post a message and actually train students to check the message board. You can use index cards that you staple onto your bulletin board. Each index card would have the page number and a title for either that worksheet or the lab to coincide with the number in the notebooks. Their notebooks would always be in numbered order. In the very front of their notebook, you can put a homework tracker which they’d have to list every single assignment and their grade so at any point in time their parents would know exactly what their grade is without having to call or trust, you know, verbally, you know, the student’s memory or (pause). So advanced organizers are ways to cut down on the student excuses for not doing work.
Question 2

How do you feel about the issue of trust in teacher evaluation when evaluation is conducted with a peer?

Teacher A: I think it depends on how the peer coaching is set up in the school. If it's set up from above where people are dictated to, it's not going to work because it is totally built on trust. The success of it is built on trust. If my peer coach comes in and I didn't pick that person, say I had somebody come from the science department, and I'm teaching reading, am I going to take their clue on how to improve my reading lesson? Well, I don't know. I might just think about it, and just say it's not going to help me. It would be kind of like my supervisor.

Interviewer: As you said, you picked this person.

Teacher A: We were allowed that. We attended classes. You know, you really had to match yourself with someone who was also interested.

Teacher B: Well, because you select your own peer coach and the person is not assigned to you, I think you only agree to work with someone in whom you feel you can trust. So I don't think I had ever any concern whatsoever about anything that I said or did getting out or getting into the wrong hands. I had two different partners for each year, and I trusted both of them implicitly.

Interviewer: Was it in any way different than observation by a supervisor?

Teacher B: I was more relaxed with the peer coach because it wasn't a supervisor/teacher role. Not that I was ever real nervous with my supervisor, but I felt like my job didn't depend on what my peer coach saw or told me as opposed to how a supervisor could effect, when you're tenured not really, but certainly what they think of how you're doing has an effect on your life. The classes that you teach, the kinds of
responsibilities that you get, and some of those opinions are formed by the observations that they make in your classroom. So I didn’t feel that I had to prove anything to anybody. I could just be myself and know that person was there only to help me as opposed to evaluating me.

Teacher C: Obviously, you choose someone that you trust and respect. You wouldn’t choose to work with someone that you wouldn’t have trust in.

Interviewer: Is it different than being evaluated by a supervisor?

Teacher C: When it’s your colleague, you can talk more freely because your colleague knows what sorts of things are off the record and what things to write in a formal evaluation. Whereas when you are talking with your department chair or any administrator, you frequently have to measure your words and stop and think about what you’re saying. Whereas with your peer, the peer knows what words to eliminate and which words to leave in.

Interviewer: Did you pick things for the peer to look at?

Teacher C: Yes. that’s part of the process.

Interviewer: Can you share any of that with me?

Teacher C: We worked on classroom flow. We worked on question and answer, we worked on timing, we’re going to work a little bit on discipline and on cooperative methods.

Interviewer: That’s a wide range.

Teacher D: I personally have never had a problem with that. At (School Name) you take a class on peer coaching when you participate in it. One of the things that you talk about with your partner and with the other faculty members is that you must be able to trust your peer coach. They are simply not there to criticize you. The other big issue that resolves it for me is that you choose
your peer coach. One would tend to think you would choose someone you trusted. Otherwise it would be difficult to have a good coaching relationship with someone you didn’t trust. You simply wouldn’t choose that person.

Interviewer: Do you find a difference in trust between the person you choose versus the traditional model?

Teacher D: I feel like I’m working with my peer coach. I was never really working with my faculty advisor. I was being dictated to basically. I was either being criticized or praised. I’ve had both in traditional evaluations. I’ve had glowing evaluations, which is very nice, and that’s all well and good. You can file that away but that’s the end of it. In peer evaluation you find things to work on, and peer can come back again and again and see how you’ve succeeded in resolving a past issue. That would never happen in the traditional method.

Interviewer: So there’s follow up?

Teacher D: Absolutely.

Interviewer: Can you share an area that you picked?

Teacher D: Sure. I teach multi-level classes where there’s two or three levels in the same class simultaneously. I asked my peer coach to please come in with a stopwatch and tell me how many minutes I was spending with each level. So that’s what she did. That’s what her part of it was, and I worked on making that time. I kept thinking I was spending too much time with this group, so I’d move to the next. But I couldn’t watch the clock while I was teaching. It just wasn’t feasible because you’re involved in what you’re doing. And so she came in, and we worked on trying to find strategies that I’d say, OK, I have these five minutes, and then I would be able to move back and forth. Not that I’d be spending exactly half the class with one group, I’d be moving back and forth. Getting one group started
on an activity and move to the other, getting them started, and so on. So she was very helpful, and she was able to come back and see that I was able to work out those discrepancies.

Interviewer: Even when she didn’t come back, was there any carryover of thoughts you had when she was in the room or an awareness that carried over to when she wasn’t there?

Teacher D: When you’re peer coaching, the good thing about peer coaching is that you choose the problem that you are going to be working on. That is what your peer coach comes and observes. It was a problem that I wanted to deal with, that I felt I was having, that I was concerned about so I found myself better able to know if I was successful after she was there because I’d see her clicking. At then at the end, she would tell me, literally, how many minutes I spent with each one. So it gave me a realistic view of what I actually had done, as opposed to what my mind, what I thought I was doing.

Teacher E: I think that people pick partners that they do trust. I don’t know that I would pick somebody that I don’t know at all. I mean, we tend to work with people that we know and that we have confidence in that they are going to help us do the best job possible. I trust when I’ve had administrators evaluate me. I’ve always trusted their judgment as well. So, I don’t think that anybody would purposefully try to do something that would be detrimental to their teaching. I just think everybody is going, if you signed up for peer coaching, I would tend to think that they are going to be people who would want to work with other people and try to have them be the best teachers they can be.

Teacher F: Well, I wondered what you meant by that. Let me just guess, two things. Well, you say in evaluation. I’m guessing that in the final evaluation that you trust that what they write is going to be reflective of what you do.

Interviewer: That’s an aspect of it, and you can
speak to that. Also if you could talk about trust in the whole thing of teacher evaluation with peers doing it as opposed to evaluation in the traditional setting by a supervisor.

Teacher F: One of the things that I didn't like about peer coaching the 1st year when I did it with the teacher who, you know, we really worked well together. You're not allowed to evaluate each other. It's completely non-judgmental. Not that I want to be judged, but I didn't like that. I really don't mind being told where I can improve. You know, criticism, I kind of want to hear that. Likewise, I think it's also o.k. to put in, to be able to put in where someone thinks you're doing really well, and this process doesn't let you do that. It's just observe, observe.

Interviewer: So can you explain that on the form?

Teacher F: They don't want a judgment, like you did this really well. Or that area could be improved. You had a problem over here. They don't want that at all. It's just part one of the lesson, you reviewed homework. It's just reviewing what they saw. Let's say, for example, you want to see if the person ignores a certain area of the classroom. That's all they would record. You call on student A ten times, you call on student B ten times, you missed student C completely. And no evaluation at all. So when you say trust in it, there wasn't a thing to trust because they weren't in a position to evaluate me. The only kind of thing that came close to judgment was where you write up your year end evaluation, and you kind of write that yourself. You do that with them, but you do it yourself. You're in a lot of control about what is being written.

Interviewer: You can take this objective observation and when you make the summary, you make the judgments?

Teacher F: I don't even think they want judgments there. But I think it's broken down
into areas, like areas of strength, growths and successes. I don’t even think they’re judgmental there, but I’m just saying you’re participating in it as opposed to when your supervisor observes you and evaluates you. My supervisor used to present me with my year-end evaluation, and he’d ask if I had any questions and if I had any input. But certainly he was choosing what was going in there. He pretty much directed it. But with a peer, you’re doing it together; you’re kind of doing it yourself in a way. They don’t know everything about you like your supervisor does. They observe you in class a few times but when you talk about areas of growth, it’s much more broad for your entire year so you have to provide that. So I tell them I did this, this, and this. So I have an opportunity to tell them what I want to tell them. Trusting, in terms of being in your classroom is another thing. In actually talking about a lesson, I’ve had no problem with that even with the teacher that I didn’t work well with at all. But I think some people might. I certainly feel differently when someone’s in the room. Supervisor or not. I feel different. It hasn’t been threatening or anything like that. It was less threatening having a peer, and my supervisor is very supportive. I’ve never felt threatened. But it’s still the fact that it’s your supervisor carries with it more, it’s more ominous. It’s less threatening but they both carry a lot because they’re watching what you’re doing. We have an open sort of policy in that people will just come in and out of your room the whole time you’re teaching which is fine. We all do it. We talk to each other. We ask each other questions. We’re getting materials. But I notice a change in the way I am when they’re in the room. I’m very conscious of it. When someone else is in the room, I’m more restricted. I watch what I say more which might be better. I feel less comfortable just saying and doing what I would do normally.

Teacher G: Trust in regard to?

Interviewer: I guess in regard to this model. In
peer coaching, is that trust any different than trust in evaluation in the traditional method where a supervisor comes in.

Teacher G: Trust in its validity or in confidentiality?

Interviewer: Maybe just in any aspect that you feel in the process. It could be the validity or confidentiality, any aspect.

Teacher G: I don’t have a problem with confidentiality. I mean, these reports will go on to be read by my supervisor anyway. And also by (Assistant Superintendent’s Name). As far as trust in its validity. I trust strongly in its validity because the person observing me is doing what I do every day. My supervisor, as well, is a teacher, obviously; but she does what I do all the time, and she is very much into all the other little things. So I don’t have a problem with that.

Interviewer: So if I summarize it, you have trust in the validity of the peer coach because the peer coach is doing what you’re doing.

Teacher G: Exactly.

Teacher H: I would only undergo peer coaching with someone who I trusted. If there was someone that I didn’t have trust with, I would probably not undertake peer coaching. The people I’ve done it with I’ve trusted, they’ve trusted me, and I’ve had a lot of positive experiences. So my advice to someone who’s thinking about peer coaching would be to pick someone that they’re comfortable with, not just draw names out of a hat. Things might not go so well.

Interviewer: Is the trust different in peer coaching than in the traditional supervisor relationship?

Teacher H: Yes, with the people I’ve talked with. It seems as if there was more trust because it seemed like, although from a supervisor’s point
of view they only want to watch us and help us and get better. But from the person getting evaluated when the peers are telling, it seems like more confidence and more, listen, I want to see you do the best job possible to help the kids where as being evaluated traditionally by the supervisors, we tend to look at it as though they’re trying to rack up negative things against us. That’s just something that will probably never change.

Teacher I: Do you mean do I trust that what I say is going to (interrupted).

Interviewer: I think what I mean is trusting the model of the evaluation when done by a peer. If you want to talk about your trust in the peer, that’s fine, too. But I think just your trust in the evaluation process.

Teacher I: I feel very comfortable with it, very, very comfortable. I’ve always thought that teachers should evaluate each other. We can learn a lot from one another, and I think it’s a very good indicator. I don’t see any reason why it’s a model that shouldn’t be used. I think it should be used more often. I think that it causes us to interact with one another. There are so many positives about teacher evaluation conducted by a peer. Not only the chance to see a person, but the chance to watch another person gives ideas to me. It also helps me to have greater respect for what that teacher’s doing. In turn, if you really want to look at all the ramifications, too, if I have more respect and understand what she’s doing in the classroom, I’m then able to have a respect more for her requests and her needs as a teacher which then, it all benefits the students ultimately. Again, a negative aspect of the nature of schools today, in my opinion, is with the isolation comes territoriality. With the territoriality comes a lack of understanding as to when a student, for example, wants to go on a field trip for class or needs to be excused. Or let’s say, we took students to Russia a few years, several years back. And if I’m working with another teacher and
seeing what she or he is doing in the classroom, I'm going to be less apt to say, "But I need my time, and I need my class." There's going to be more interaction, and that's the way learning should be, in my opinion. Learning is not is not about isolated segments, but we make it that way. So I think it's a very excellent (pause) I think we should do it more often.

Teacher J: The people that I did work with were very honest with each other. We did tell each other what we thought. I don't think the areas that we were looking at were realistic areas though. We pretty much picked something that was very superficial, that, you know, anyone could go in a say, "yes" like I said, "How did I react to a certain part of the classroom?" That's pretty simple to respond to, or to react to. You have to trust the person. They have to be honest with you, they have tell you whether or not you've, they really think you're doing a good job or not. And I thought people that I picked would do that. But again the first person didn't want to do it at all. His attitude was we're just doing administrator's work. So why should I bother doing it at all? The second person, again, was just in it for the wrong reason. I don't see peer coaching as a discipline type of thing for the students. I see it as a teaching technique improvement program. And the second person wasn't in it for that reason. But again, trust is definitely a big factor. And I felt comfortable with those two people. I wouldn't have gone with them if I didn't feel I could be honest with them, or they could be honest with me.

Interviewer: So if I were to summarize, the issue wasn't trust with them, it was more the one person's expectations were beyond the scope of what you thought it would do and the other person got into it but for the wrong reason.

Teacher J: Right. I took a course. We have a course here that they teach. And in that course they go over the types of things you should be doing with your peer. And I wasn't doing those
things. We were sitting there saying you should talk about technique and try to improve your teaching technique, and then I would sit down with her, and she goes, "How do you handle this discipline problem? He comes in late every day." That's not teaching technique.

Interviewer: So from the course, it was supposed to be more technique that you would observe or you would pick a technique that you would watch each other?

Teacher J: They gave us some examples and suggestions of what we could look at, and then they say, "Well, you decide whatever you want the person to observe you doing, you decide." If you feel you need more work with using the board, for example, ask that person observe use of the board. And that's pretty simple. That's what some of the people were doing, just how do I use the board everyday? I don't know whether that's really productive for peer coaching. Tell me if I'm using the board enough or not today?

Interviewer: Do you think that could be the beginning, that maybe you start there at the more superficial?

Teacher J: Yeah, that's true. I mean, I guess it's tough if you don't really feel comfortable with the person to do something a little more in depth as far as evaluating, not evaluating, but techniques, I guess, coaching.

Teacher K: O.K., I almost when I read this didn't understand the question, just because I'm such, so much not a private person, and I don't tend to be a person, and I probably should in some cases, protect myself, it's just a personality thing. I don't lock my car. I don't worry about if the door is locked in the house. I don't always worry about where's my purse. Not being a private person, I tend to be trusting pretty readily and just pretty honest and blunt. And so long as I'm moral, ethical, and doing my job, I have the thought that anybody's going to come down the line and, you know, say that something's
going on in the room that didn’t. We’re adults, we’re intelligent people, and it seems to me that we’re able to assess what’s going on. I always have the theory that you can kind of walk down the hall and take a pretty good, have a pretty good knowledge of what’s going on in the classroom. Really, you can’t hide in a public school, so I’m not concerned about whether somebody would be inaccurate. It’s kind of like when people, I do a student groups with the counselors. We have this thing going on in our school where we have kids come in once a week and just talk about what’s going on. You know, I know that I don’t have professional training as a counselor, and we’re not counseling groups, but I’m a teacher whose been dealing with kids for 27 years so if I can’t trust another teacher whom I’m able to pick, we’d be in sad shape.

Interviewer: We’re talking about differences in trust in this method of evaluation versus the method of evaluation by a traditional supervisor.

Teacher K: Well, I think it engenders even more trust. Because particularly here also, our supervisors, for one reason or another, do not necessarily come from our field. And also, you know, another one of courses here, you know how one of the current trends is multiple intelligences, well I took that course. And I’m thinking the person who comes in to evaluate me, actually one who used to do it many years ago, I know was not tuned into my wave length in so far as multiple intelligence and vice versa. I’m a very, noise can be my clutter, is a way it has been expressed to me. And, you know, if there starts to be a din in my room, I know a lot can be accomplished, but it bothers me. Where in the meantime, she was very visual. And for instance, if a student plops down in my teacher chair, whatever, and you know, things look messy, that doesn’t disturb me in the least, and it would disturb her. So I find that this gives me the option to pick somebody who I work with a little more easily, and I’m not bound in by being evaluated by someone who might not even come from my area, and I just have no choice who does it.
Teacher L: Well, I wouldn't work with somebody I didn't trust. I just don't see that working. Since you can choose your peer coach partner, I think you would choose somebody who you had mutual respect for. I would not, I wouldn't work with anybody that I didn't trust, and number two, because you're taking a risk of letting someone else come into the classroom and seeing what you do every day, that is the most important thing and confidentiality. I don't know how to answer that then, I would never even put myself in that situation.

Interviewer: Was the level of trust in evaluation different than the level of trust in evaluation as conducted by a supervisor?

Teacher L: O.K., let me think. You know, I've always trusted my supervisors. So I've never been in the situation that I had to be mistrustful. I'm trying to think about, about being fearful. You know, I think when a supervisor comes in a room, and you know that they maybe are in only four or five times in a year, you feel like you have to put on, you know, the dog and pony show. Pull out all the fireworks. That's not real life. When you're working with somebody over a period of time, and you can see the ups and downs. That's, that's, that's a real trust situation. You can see their strengths and weaknesses, and get criticism that way, and give feedback, you know, positive and negative feedback that way. So it's more trust. Guess trust is more important in the peer coaching relationship. Does that make sense?

Interviewer: Yes, thank you.

Question 3

Based on your participation in peer coaching, how would you characterize your relationships with other teachers?
Teacher A: Well. I think I'm a pretty open person anyway. I'm not really sure about that question. I think I'm pretty honest with my collaborating partners. Generally when I work in a setting when I'm team teaching, I'm more the submissive of the two partners because I feel the kids that I'm there to accommodate or to work with don't necessarily need the person that's out front leading the pack to pay attention to them all the time. They sometimes need that little bit of organization that little bit of this, little bit of that, I just move around and try to get to everybody. I'm very good at working with others. All the people that I've ever been paired with love having me, and I love being there, so I know I can get along well with others. As far as the peer coaching goes, I did tend to pick somebody that I had respect for in the community, and again mine was more directed toward the content area so I picked somebody specifically for that content area. I think that's really the better way to go anyway when you're trying to work on your teaching skills. It's better to have a mentor-type person to mentor you, to help you, rather than a person coming in from the outside coming in and possibly doing damage.

Interviewer: When you picked this type of mentor person, did you pick the areas for her to look at? Or was it a combination of her (interrupted).

Teacher A: In our peer coaching set up here, I was able to pick a partner, I was able to pick the class, so I was pretty much directing the evaluation in that respect.

Teacher B: That question is a little fuzzy for me. Are you asking me, the teachers that were my coaches or in general, do I think my participation in peer coaching affected my relationship with teachers. Would I now relate differently with teachers than I did before my peer coach? I'm not sure about that.

Interviewer: I think there's an aspect of both in the question. With the person that you
participated in peer coaching, and then I think, is there some generalization or any spill over to other colleagues in terms of your relationship there?

Teacher B: I had good relationships with both of my peer coaches before we started so I think maybe I may have gotten even a little closer to them because in the process of sharing our thoughts I think we bonded and became better friends because of it. I don’t know that it affected my relationships with other teachers at all.

Teacher C: Well, my partner and I specifically help each other. We learn from each other. We find having a colleague as a coach is less intimidating, and we’re willing to try new things. You have a sounding board, and you can throw ideas out and come to conclusion. You can brainstorm a lot more.

Interviewer: Were you able to have the same partner as last year?

Teacher C: Yes. We liked it so well that we decided to do it again even though it is hard because we are in different buildings, but we’ll work on it.

Teacher D: I get along very well with most of the other teachers. I’ve had two different peer coaches over the last few years. I’m very good friends with both of them. Being a peer coach with someone else, for me anyway, has also formed a very strong bond of friendship. In addition, cause you have a certain trust and camaraderie with someone. Most teachers are not in other’s classrooms. I don’t see most of the other faculty members teach. I don’t know what’s going on in their classrooms. I’m sure it’s fine. I haven’t had the experience of seeing them. But I have seen, on a regular basis, the people that I peer coach with and that forges a kind of common ground. We’ve done things together and discussed them, and I can turn to that person for advice more easily because they’ve actually know what’s
going on in the classroom than I can to other faculty members.

Interviewer: Was that hard to enter into?

Teacher D: No. Not at all. It's fun.

Teacher E: I think it makes you more understanding of situations that arise in the class. You always tend to, like if someone needs something, you try to help them more because you understand what's going on in the classroom. There are classrooms that have very, very mixed groups of students and sometimes it can be very challenging, and so you try to give other people ideas constantly. Give other people ideas but not in a threatening kind of way, in a very helping, this is an idea you can use type of thing.

Teacher F: Mostly good. I've had mostly good experiences. I work with a couple of other teachers on a lot of things and I think that it goes really well. Peer coachingwise, it's just the same thing. When I worked with someone that I had a good relationship with, it was great. When we could tell each other when things weren't good, what areas needed improvement, we could give constructive criticism. And then when I got into situations where there wasn't a great relationship, it wasn't a good relationship.

Interviewer: So you could talk, even though certain evaluative comments didn't get on the form. You could confer and talk and enter into that if you wanted to.

Teacher F: Yes. The other thing is (pause) I think it's difficult to tell another teacher when you see something they do is not working or not effective or they have a problem. And like I said, with someone that you are very comfortable with, even friends with, the threat is gone so it is easier to say, "Hey, you kind of messed that up." But a teacher who you don't know as well, you might even not be sure how they are going to take things so to say to them, "That was really
inappropriate what you did or that you wasted
time there," I think is a little bit difficult.
You have to have a comfortable relationship in
order for you to get benefit from the process.
People could feel threatened.

Interviewer: Did you pick the people each year.

Teacher F: Yes, I did. You don’t really know.
I do in-class support too, with special ed.
teachers, and I characterize that a lot as
similar to being in a marriage. You have to be
compatible with someone to be in classroom with
them all the time. What is similar with peer
coaching is how do you have that comfortable
relationship to tell someone when you disagree
with like their policy or grading, or their plan
or instruction. It’s hard. Because you’re peers.
So I’ve always been uncomfortable with as a peer
sort of acting as a supervisor. That’s probably
me and so maybe for somebody like that peer
coaching wouldn’t be a good model to use because
maybe you need to be someone who could be a
little bit more aggressive.

Teacher G: You mean my peer coach?

Interviewer: It could be your peer coach. It
could be your peer coach, your other colleagues
in the department, or just general teaching
staff.

Teacher G: Well, we’re rather limited here in the
new building as far as being able to interact
with each other. Last year when we had like a
common faculty room and things like that, I had
better relationships only because I could spend
more kind of like free time with these people and
interact with them. We’re very big, obviously,
and I don’t see, I mean there is camaraderie, but
in little groups. It’s not like a whole school
kind of thing. My husband teaches at a
relatively small school so his atmosphere is very
different than ours.

Interviewer: Some physical things have changed
that have affected your relationship with most
teachers. How about your relationship with your partner then?

Teacher G: I don’t even see her much anymore. While we’re teaching three right now so its very difficult for us, and the second half we’re both teaching two. So I would expect to see her.

Interviewer: I don’t recall. Are you doing peer this year? Will you do it when you both have two blocks?

Teacher G: Well, we’re trying to do one observation before Christmas. Our days are being numbered here. That was our goal to do one before Christmas, but the way our schedules are for us to do that, for me especially, I’m going to need release time. Because she teaches the period I do.

Interviewer: How do you get release time?

Teacher G: Ask the supervisor. I’ll have someone come in and cover half a block, set my kids doing something, and then I can go.

Teacher H: I think with any place, or any job in life, there are some people that you have a better relationship with. As I said before, I would only peer coach with people that I have a good relationship with because I feel they would be honest with me in a way that would be not threatening. Again, I’m more likely to listen to advice and feel more comfortable with somebody I could trust and somebody who’s in a non-threatening atmosphere. I think I’ve had good relationships because we get to look at each other as far as improving ourselves academically. We base it on past experiences, and, you know, we bring a lot of good things into it.

Teacher I: Because of peer coaching?

Interviewer: Yes

Teacher I: Well, I only do it with one other teacher. But I’d say it’s very good. It’s
added, it's augmented, enhanced my relationship with this teacher, definitely. And with other teachers that I know who peer coached. I think it for the most part, it can only do good, I think. Sure, there might be areas of disagreement or, but it's a relationship, and I think it just enhances respect and appreciation for that other person, and it adds to the quality of the relationship. For myself and this teacher, although we are really opposites in certain ways, we, I mean, we, (pause) you know, it's added to such things that, you know, we'll say on our birthday cards to each other "to my peer coaching partner." You know, it's added a certain fuzzy, warm feeling I guess you could say. When you've been with each other for (pause), this has been, is going into maybe our 3rd year.

Interviewer: Had you know each other long before that?

Teacher I: Yeah. She and I, She began work here a year before I did. We've known each other, yes, known each other, but work friends more. She sticks to herself a lot. I'm more social. She's a quiet person. But we had known each other but I think this, it's really neat because I've gotten a chance to know her, I think, more than a lot of people have. It's nice.

Teacher J: I get along with most of them anyway. I feel that and this is a pretty good school, we're pretty close to each other. We get along with each other. I was kind of a little disappointed when I couldn't find another coach this year because I wanted to try. But I think that this school strongly encourages teachers to take alternate forms of evaluation, either portfolio or peer coaching. So when you get into the department, and they say, "Would you please do this?" I think most teachers are already involved with somebody in their department. In my department a lot of them are already involved with each other, and they didn't want to switch. And that may be a case where they realize that maybe two bad teachers were with each other or two good teachers were with each other. And maybe
want to switch. As in every school, there are some teachers you don’t want to be with. I think I was already with one of those two teachers, and I don’t want that happening again.

Teacher K: Well, I think, I’m not sure what the question is aiming at, maybe it purposefully general, I think we in the classes that we took, we had fun. So, yeah, we got to know each other a little bit better professionally, a little bit better what was going on in each other’s room. We have been encouraged to visit each other people’s classrooms also. So it was a fun experience and along with being useful. And I don’t feel that, I don’t think people are too generally even aware. We’re not stigmatized in any way. We’re not excluded in any way. I think people usually don’t even know, and I think the students are totally unaware a lot of times. They have no clue. You know, they’re not that interested as to how we go about our planning. They might be interested in what we are doing, but this other woman will be in the room, and, you know, it’s so funny. They actually usually think that she’s my boss at first. They’ll think the other person’s my boss, and they’ll be behaving really well. And then, I’ll introduce her and just say, you know, she’s just, I don’t know say something why this person is spending some time in here today. And the kids are really funny. I’ll purposely say she’s not evaluating me, something like I’ll just say she’s not my boss. She’s not judging me or something. And they just get, I said you can be your normal selves and then they’ll just get totally relaxed. I think it’s kind of cute.

Teacher L: Well, we worked the one semester that I took the course that was offered. It was offered once a month. We would meet for an hour and a half. We would have an hour of instruction and a half hour of just communication time if you didn’t have a common prep time or time to talk to anybody. And I think there are about 48 or 50 people in the class. So my partner and I always had time to talk. You know, we had a common prep. And we were very close. Our relationship is we
follow each other like Starsky and Hutch. Plus, being in in-class support, you need that, you know, going into IEP meetings, you can't just have one person saying one thing. So now, we're to the point where we finish each other's sentences, and we know what the other is going to say in response to whatever problem. So that has solidified our relationship. And then in the group, when we had the opportunity to sit down with all those other people, it wasn't even formal. It was just, you know, walking up getting a cup of coffee, and (Academy Teacher's Name) always had a lot of food around, you know, and you would talk to people about their experiences or overhear something or you'd be sitting at a table when you the other pairs were talking. You just get to talk to other people who are doing it. Those people, if I see them in the hall, or I know that they have gone through the same type of training that I have, I feel like I have a larger support group for some of the new strategies that I'm trying to implement. And I'm not threatened, I mean the administration here very clearly has encouraged us to take risks. You know, use cooperative learning. Use whatever you want. You know, if you want to try strategy "a", do it. So we're using those strategies, and I feel like we're on the cutting edge of some strategies, and we're being evaluated by people who are doing it. So not only do you get feedback, positive and negative feedback, but you get ideas, lesson plans. "Oh, you know what, why don't you come to my room, too? You don't have to do an evaluation, but just come in and look at this lesson. What do you think?" So I think there's like my circle of friends, number one, I know more people than I did than prior. You know, more informally than I did before like a general faculty. I have a whole (pause) a tremendous amount of respect for some of the people that are still working on different projects that I would have never even heard about.

Interviewer: Did you learn that through the course or just within the department?

Teacher L: Well, I heard about peer coaching
because it is part of our Academy. And the Academy is professional development programs that was implemented by (Assistant Superintendent’s Name). And it offers different courses in either strategies or content areas, or things, new technology, emerging technologies that teachers really need to be prepared for, and it was offered, the peer coaching option was offered, I guess, maybe 3 or 4 years ago.

**Question 4**

Based on your experience with peer coaching, how would you evaluate peer coaching as a model for improving instruction?

Teacher A: Well, I felt that the suggestions I was given from the peer coach were very useful, very practical, and it was all very supportive. I’ve been fortunate that I’ve never had a supervisor that did not support me. But I understand it happens and that when you are put in a position where you feel you are attacked, you’re less likely to give into that or succumb to their suggestions, you’re more likely to pull back and say, hey I know you hate me and you don’t want me to get that raise. It’s like that fight or flight thing. You’re more likely to fight with that person. You’re more likely to rebut what they say, to get into that issue of disputing. It takes a lot of the politics out of the process.

Interviewer: It sounds like you get much more feedback from this peer coach than under a different circumstance that might have seemed critical or more threatening.

Teacher A: Absolutely. I think if my supervisor had come in and made the suggestion about the timing of my lesson I would have seen it as, oh boy, I’m in trouble now. I would have viewed it differently. I might not have been as accepting of that suggestion. I might have said, "What
does she know about timing. She’s sitting in her office?” I might have been defensive about it because I work hard. It would have been hard for me to listen to that from somebody that I didn’t really feel had the practical end of it anymore. Not that she’s not practical. I know that she has a different job than I have. I’m fully aware of that. I’m fully aware of what we all do in this school district. So, I just felt like peer coaching was more helpful to me.

Teacher B: I think peer coaching is good for people who have a lot of experience in the classroom already and who don’t really need supervision anymore. But they just need some areas of improvement, or they’re curious about a certain strategy that they want to use or something specific that’s going on in their classroom. I don’t think peer coaching is structured enough for a new teacher, or a beginning teacher. I think those teachers need more supervision, and they need to be seen by someone who can evaluate them because peer coaching is not supposed to be judgmental. You’re not supposed to tell people this is good or this is bad. You’re just supposed to observe what they ask you to observe and talk about it. But I think that less experienced teachers need more supervision than peer coaching provides.

Interviewer: Did the non-judgmental comments assist in any way?

Teacher B: Absolutely. Sure, when someone, I mean it’s hard to be non-judgmental when you’re reporting something because sometimes you squeak in, well maybe it would have worked better if you had done this kind of thing, which tells the other person that maybe what they did wasn’t the best, but if you get someone to report on what they saw in your classroom. If I personally didn’t work on my curriculum improvement or my teaching methods improvement, I worked on more, what’s the word, the touchy-feely type of things.

Interviewer: Can you tell me about that. When you started you were saying that peer coaching, I
thought, was useful in trying new strategies. So you focused on affective kinds of things.

Teacher B: Yes, I was looking for things like are all my students on task, how am I relating with the students. Because, personally, I didn’t feel that I needed to improve in the way I’m delivering the instruction. I felt more that my interpersonal skills with the kids was an area where I might need improvement and so it was very comfortable to have another teacher come in, who’s been in the classroom, who knows how kids relate to teachers. In fact, my peer coach last year was a guidance counselor for particularly that purpose. And they tend to watch different kinds of things than another member of the same subject department watches. So both times I used non-math people, non-subject area people to be my peer coach.

Teacher C: Peer coaching is the best way for those who want input on a specific topic. It’s absolutely invaluable when you’re looking for one specific thing. And people who have been teaching longer than 2 or 3 years probably benefit most by it because at this point you know where your weaknesses are and where you want some help. The pre- and post-conferences in peer coaching are a wonderful way to brainstorm ideas and solutions on specific problems. These are the things you would not discuss with your department chair. You might be a little intimidated going into your department chair and saying I’m having some trouble with discipline in this classroom for fear that it might be written up that way. Whereas with a peer, it’s let’s see what we can do if you turn more specific, something like, what are some specific ways to maintain control when the students are working in groups. And it’s much less threatening.

Teacher D: I would say it’s the best one that I’ve used so far. I’ve been teaching a lot of years. I mean I’ve had the traditional model and I’ve had this. I don’t know about others. I haven’t had experience with them. But I find that peer coaching is designed to improve teaching
where traditional methods doesn’t really address that.

Teacher E: I think it’s very beneficial to observe other teachers, and I felt like this for a very, very long time. You can get so much out of seeing other people, how they do things, even when you’ve been teaching for a very, very long time. I think it’s very beneficial to see how other teachers do things, and peer coaching is again a healthy type of situation, and there are a lot of things that an administrator, just being an administrator, they just can’t have as good a handle on things as the teachers do. Not that administrators can’t evaluate teaching style, etc. etc., they can, but it’s different because you’re trying to help the person improve in their strategies.

Interviewer: You feel that another teacher adds a different dimension than the administrator (interrupted).

Teacher E: Definitely. I have no problem with the administrators coming in and observing whatsoever. And I never did. It never made me nervous or anything like that. But there are several teachers who get very, very nervous when an administrator walks into the room. You don’t have that with peer coaching, because it’s another teacher. They’re like on your level. They’re not someone like above you. They’re not going to determine whether you get your pay check the next day kind of thing. It’s very relaxed. It’s very collegial. It’s very helping. I think it’s very positive.

Teacher F: Well, I think it’s an excellent tool. I think it’s an excellent model for improving instruction because it gives the teachers more of an active role. Again, it just has to hinge so much on what the partners put into it. Because I do worry about the possibility of abuse. There is no real checks on the system. I know what I’m supposed to do but I think that it’s possible that the people who participate in this could not do what they’re supposed to do and
get out of evaluations entirely. I worry about the checks, the controls on the system and having people not use it. I know for myself, personally, I say that it’s an excellent tool because I want to get something out of it. I enjoy having the opportunity to look at another teacher and how they operate a classroom and then to talk with them about what they do and about what I do. That’s very helpful in improving my teaching.

Interviewer: That’s a consistent theme with you. Being able to observe someone else has benefit. You worry that two people may enter into this and just say look, we’re home free with no commitment to change anything.

Teacher F: That would be a problem if there were a teacher who was not doing their job. There would be nobody evaluating them and checking them.

Teacher G: I think peer coaching can give you a lot of feedback, (pause) non-evaluative feedback. Very often supervisors, they are exactly that, they are evaluations. I think that, although we have a formal written report we need to complete, when we talk about our observation experiences, we talk about a lot more things and maybe go into the actual written report. Things that may stick with us, that we can use in the future.

Interviewer: Do you have any examples of that?

Teacher G: Well, the one thing my peer coach and I, like for example, she observed a classroom demonstration, and I wasn’t asking her to watch, but she looking at my wait time. Like when I ask question, how long do I wait for an answer. And I wasn’t asking her to look for that, it wasn’t part of our written part of it, but she noticed that I really kind of pushed things along a bit, on that particular day I did. When she brought that to my attention, that was like last year, at the beginning of last year, every time I ask a question, I’m counting in my head almost. Am I waiting long enough?
Teacher H: I think peer coaching is very, very good. I plan on doing it. I may eventually go into portfolio or something else. But I like peer coaching. There might be a year or two that I might go back to traditional just to have a supervisor in the room also, but I'm very pleased with peer coaching. Talking to someone else about lessons and ideas. Sometimes the person I choose is in my area and sometimes the person I choose is not in my area. So I've done both.

Interviewer: Do you feel it has it affected your instruction in any way?

Teacher H: I feel, think it did for the positive part. Yes. I've become aware of things much more often as far as even body position, where I stand, classroom organization, order of calling on, method of questioning, wait time. All of those things came out as a result of my peer coaching.

Teacher I: When I thought about this, I said it's a good model, and it has lots of potential. I think it depends on how it's carried out and what's there to support the teachers in doing this. So peer coaching as a model is theoretically, I think, is excellent. But then we have to look practically at what happens. For me, I would warrant it good, but for me I need to allot more time for meetings, and it has great potential. But in terms of how it is practiced for me now, I would have to say that I feel somewhat middle-of-the-road about it. Just because what I need to think, I want to do more of, in terms of this.

Interviewer: Is that a time issue or are there other issues?

Teacher I: I would say mostly time. Yes. And also, I guess we're needing more guidance and more ideas as to what we should be doing. Because I'm not trained in evaluation. So therefore, we had that our 1st year, but I just think, think we need more of that. For improving my instruction,
it’s good, but then, I need to be very honest that only meeting, only observing two times a year, it’s got limitations. And whereas my supervisor coming in, in an observation, I would probably have to get more detailed, thorough feedback.

Teacher J: Obviously, from my experience, it did not help. But, again, I’m looking for that person who would want to do that. But as you suggested, it’s probably one of those deals where you may have to work over a couple of years.

Interviewer: Did you find any change when you were in the room and the person was observing you? Any change in your instruction?

Teacher J: I was aware the person was there. Probably at first, we have block periods. So after the first fifteen minutes, it kind of like, you know, don’t worry about them and just keep going anywhere. I don’t think it affected the way I did anything. But again, you are aware that they’re there. I will say that I have tried to change because if I draw up the plans saying, “Would you please observe this?” and whether or not they observe or not, I still try to change that if they’re not in the room. I am aware of what I’m trying to do. So whether they’re there or not, I’m trying to change my techniques.

Teacher K: Well, I think it’s very helpful just in terms of the flexibility that’s built in. So that allows us to brainstorm and not to think, what is the supervisor going to say? It allows us to try things out and to be, not even just experimental, but I think I like that word brainstorm. To just like sit back and say, “Gee, what if we could do this? What if we could do that?” Even the things that we’re never going to do but the fact that they crossed our minds, and we thought, “Wouldn’t this be neat if we could try this?” It’s motivating, and it, you know, I think it helps our motivation, and it helps the things that we really try. So I think in that way, again, not that it makes me better in so far as how I handle my room, and the seating, blah,
blah, blah, whether I’m doing it in a group or lecture. It helps me to think of ideas that we wouldn’t have thought of otherwise.

Teacher L: Well, I think it motivates some people to improve. Just because, like myself, I didn’t realize how valuable a tool it was. Once you’ve done it, and really seen how much it benefited you and your students and, you bonded with that peer coaching partner as somebody that you can go to, somebody that you trust in the school to say, “What do you think about this lesson? I’m having a problem with this student.” I think, and I forgot the original question, but I think (pause).

Interviewer: I think the original question was like peer coaching as a model for improving instruction.

Teacher L: Yes. O.K., I think it is the model, it’s the only model that I see that would really work for improving or evaluating someone because it’s self-motivated. And also, even if you have two teachers who, you know, are not crackerjack teachers, are, you know, are somewhat weak in skills and haven’t kept up with the newest literature, by having two people work together and talk together, and forming this close bond, you just don’t want to embarrass yourself in front of anybody. I mean, I think it just motivates people because they trust people, and because they just, you just don’t want to humiliate yourself in front of anybody. That’s different than having a supervisor coming in. That’s like an us against them situation. Here it’s these are my colleagues. These are my peers. These are people I want to respect me all the time or not that a supervisor, you wouldn’t want your supervisor to respect you. But it’s kind of an intrinsic motivation.

Question 5

What attracted you to peer coaching?
Teacher A: That’s what attracted me. The fact that I could direct it. It was something that I felt was helpful. I understand the need for evaluation in the public schools totally. And I totally agree with it. You have to have it as a state monitoring situation. And it’s a good thing. Unfortunately, I think sometimes that duty is thrust upon people that might even see it as a chore. They might have had their minds made up before they come into the classroom on how you’re doing. Obviously they would, they talk to parents, and they talk to kids. They have an idea what you’re doing. It’s not like they’re in this vacuum. They’re aware. I think the whole idea of peer coaching is really teacher directed. Like the teacher saying this is something I really want to fix this year. I know there might be other things, but this year I’m focusing on this issue and for me the 1st year it was the reading issue and dyslexic kids, severely handicapped children.

Interviewer: It’s interesting. So you picked the area to focus on.

Teacher A: I’m going to focus on this, and I’m going to do better in this area, and then at the end of this, go ahead and test my program and see if it worked. See if I improved. I welcome that in the end. But at the beginning, when I’m saying here’s an area where I need to improve I don’t really need somebody coming in saying, "O.K., Well this, this, and this are a few helpful suggestions.” Well, that’s good. That’s what you saw. But how do I know, how does that help me? I could never really see the connection.

Teacher B: I didn’t really want to be evaluated by my supervisor anymore. I didn’t feel that I was getting anything out of it. I felt as though I was being evaluated, and I really feel that I’ve reached a point where I don’t need to be evaluated anymore. I realize that supervisors have to keep up with their people, but I think, after a while you develop a certain reputation and when the reputation is sound, and you’ve proven that you can teach, I think it’s almost
demeaning to have to have a supervisor come in and watch you a couple of times a year when all they basically do is report on paper what they saw, and then they write an evaluation at the end of the year which is not anything in my department, we basically write our own evaluations in that he gives us a sheet and asks us what are your strengths, what are your weaknesses, what have you done this year kind of thing. And unless he has something that really sticks out that has happened during the year that he feels that he commenting, I don’t know that the observations are that important for the evaluation.

Interviewer: Now as opposed to – I’m going back a little–where you pick the affective area I’d wanted to ask you at that time you mentioned that the guidance counselor was there who was probably more tuned into that area as opposed to the subject area, were you more aware of affective things when that person was in the room?

Teacher B: Sure. And that’s the thing. When you know that the person is there to watch those things, it makes you watch them more because you know that they’re looking for them. She did point out a few things to me in how I was dealing with the kids that made me realize that I have come along. Because I used to be much more black and white. I didn’t consider the students’ individual differences or their outside life. I figured, this is your responsibility, you have to do your work. And just do it, don’t give me excuses or don’t tell me other reasons. And in working with her I found that there are an awful lot of baggage that kids carry around, and you can’t always go black and white. So I tuned into that more, and she pointed out to me specific things that I said and did with kids that showed that I was caring more and feeling more for them, and I know what I was like years ago. So she’s not comparing me to the way I used to be. I’m comparing me to the way I used to be. Based on what she is telling me about how I’m relating to the kids now. I know that I’ve improved.
Interviewer: It's interesting feedback then.

Teacher C: Actually, my department chair told me to try peer coaching, and I went in kicking and screaming. But I found out that I did get much more out of the peer coaching than when my chair observed me for the reasons I mentioned before. Also you can pick up little hints and tips when you are watching someone else's class. Either in there observing one thing, but then you say when I do that, I think I'll do that that way too. You know, just watching the lesson in general when it's someone in your field.

Interviewer: So there were things you picked up being in your partner's room?

Teacher C: Yeah. Yeah. And she said the same about me that there were things that she picked up. It's like a win-win situation.

Teacher D: Initially, the isolation of my classroom. One of the strongest magnets for me was the idea that you never really saw other people. When you are teaching as I am now, well, at that time, it wasn't block scheduling, we started peer coaching before, this was before block scheduling, but if you were teaching five periods a day alone, and you had lunch where maybe you saw other people, the idea of spending time doing something constructive with other faculty members was incredibly appealing.

Interviewer: You did peer coaching before the waiver. So you were peer coached and had traditional?

Teacher D: I peer coached from the 1st year we did it here. Initially, (Principal's Name) asked if anybody was interested, and I was very interested. And I've been peer coaching. Initially it really was just a committee off of our shared decision making committee. And I peer coached with one woman. I don't know that we ever, yes, I think maybe the 1st year they had the dispensation she and I were still peer
coaching together, and then I have been peer coaching with someone else. Actually, one year we had tryouts. We peer coached together which was fun. Now I’ve been working with the other peer coach for 2 years with the dispensation.

Teacher E: I just decided I just needed a change. I just thought it would be nice to see how it would be to be evaluated, rather than having an administrator come in, that’s just your typical situation having the administrator evaluate you. But just to see how it would be for a difference. Would it be more beneficial? I think that administrators should still evaluate teacher performance. I don’t think you can put that in the hands of other teachers. I really don’t. Especially for a teacher who is going to get tenure. You need somebody who is in the position to decide whether this person should continue teaching or not. But I think for teachers that are beyond that and have been teaching for several years, this is a nice change. There is a lot of work involved. I’m not going to lie to you. There’s an awful lot of work involved.

Interviewer: Can you explain that?

Teacher E: You have to meet with the teacher before you observe them. You have to discuss what it is you are going to be looking for. You have to toss a lot of ideas around. You have to actually go and observe their class. After you observe the class you have to meet again, discuss what is you saw or bring to their attention whatever it is they’re trying to discover. Then you have to write up a report, and then they have to do this all over again. You have to take turns. This is done four times.

Interviewer: Is that two for each person?

Teacher E: Two for each person which is more than for a traditional evaluation type. I mean if you’re a tenured teacher, it is I think if you are a tenured teacher, you only have once or twice. It could be just once. In this case you
are doing it four times. And then after you do your observing you have a summary or a final report that you do. You also plan your own Pip's. So you have to brainstorm and come up with ideas for Pip's'. So it's much more time consuming. It's much easier to have an administrator walk in, he stays for 20 minutes, writes the report, discusses with you for 10 minutes and that's it. And there's no more. It's very time consuming because you have to meet with them at least three times for each observation, and there's four observations. Then you have to write those reports which, you know, takes time. You can't just whip it off because you have to give it to your administrator, and they in turn will discuss it with you as well.

Interviewer: Is that part of what makes it harder. If it was just you and the other, and you wrote things would that be easier? Or is it harder because now you feel this has to pass a certain criteria?

Teacher E: No, it's not harder. No it's just that it's time consuming. It would be great if you are only teaching two blocks, and you had this extra block of time in order to work on this. But now I don't have five minutes to spare. I teach three blocks, and when you teach three blocks, it is incredible. But two blocks is heaven. It is. So I wish there were some way to even it out so that you could have two and a half blocks each semester. That would be great. But I just like the idea of changing. It is time consuming so that is a consideration for some people. If they don't have any time, then they really can't do it because it is really very time consuming.

Teacher F: There were a lot of reasons. I had done this a little bit in my Master's program and talked about it. I thought it would give me broader insights. Really the first thing that brought me was the idea of looking at the students I taught in the low level in a different subject. That was kind of what brought me in. For me, I guess what brought me in was observing
other teachers and working with other teachers. But really seeing how other people teach. Because we really don’t have a very big opportunity to do that, as it is we’re so busy, we never get into somebody’s classroom. But obviously, I was able to get some credits, have more control in my evaluation and also my PIPS. So I kind of think that I like that too, having a little bit more control.

Teacher G: I think it’s a good alternative. We’re so kind of geared to, like o.k., you go into our classroom and you close the door and that’s what you do. Actually she approached me over the summer before we started, and I just thought it was a really good way to kind of see what other people were doing. You know, I was so focused on my stuff. I wanted to see what other people were doing. I knew there were some things I needed help with or would be interested in knowing how other people did it.

Teacher H: I took the course first of all, just to see what it was all about. You know, I was really interested in finding out all the new technology. I was a newer teacher here. So I did take the course and after I got into it the 1st year, I was really pleased with it. I liked the way that it made other teachers (pause) it forced people to get together and talk curriculum where sometimes they don’t. Sometimes, you know, we’re so busy and separated in our own little boxes, our offices, we don’t talk curriculum. And it’s making some teachers get together, it’s spreading it across disciplines, bring a lot of other experiences into it. I’m very pleased with it. And I guess that’s why I’ve continued to do it because, you know, I can only picture good stuff coming from it.

Teacher I: O.K., I think primarily (pause). It was something different. It gave me a chance to work with another teacher which I’ve always wanted to do, and I never had the chance to really do that, to evaluate. And also, to be very honest, it was something different than the traditional evaluation by a supervisor. It gave
us more autonomy. There were times. There’ve been times in my career where I’ve felt like I wanted to be a little loosened from the grip of my supervisor which at times I felt it has been a very, tight grip, all in my best interest I’m sure, but time where I’ve just wanted to say, “OK, I need my own space here.” And this really, to be very honest, was a way, I think, for both of us to get our own space. And the benefits have really been, only been good. And we still, like I still really do like to get feedback from my supervisor, and he’s always willing to give it. But to be honest, very honest, initially it was kind of to have more hands on for us, hands off for him.

Teacher J: Well, one was we were strongly encouraged to do it because our supervisor were overburdened with evaluations, and they would say, “Please do this so I don’t have to evaluate you.” Plus, I thought it would be something that could help me, and I did want to get into other classrooms and see what other teachers were doing.

Teacher K: I think I was looking for an alternative to how rigid I think the normal evaluation method is where your supervisor comes in and, not that I had poor evaluations from my most recent supervisor at all, but it’s not even her field, and, you know, she’s going to do about over twenty of these things, and it just seemed to be a much more human and viable way to do it. It does remove any fear for me of, gee, this authority person, nervousness, coming in to observe, even though that always seemed to work out just fine. So the one thing I might mention is that it in no way, is easier than being evaluated by the supervisor. I do know people who have dropped out, when we were chatting casually, I was telling you about another woman before we started here. And the reason she stopped doing it is because it’s so much work. It’s a whole lot of work in turning in the forms and doing these evaluations. And I know it does take somewhat of a load off of our supervisors in having to do it. But there’s no way that it’s
easier than being evaluated by a supervisor. That would be anybody who chose it for that reason is no longer doing for that reason. My favorite part about it is how the flexibility allows us to be as good as we can be and how it allows us to really become team teachers.

Teacher L: Well, it was so difficult to plan lessons. Like I said the dog, pony show lesson, the firework lesson, and then to have, you know, a supervisor come in. It was difficult to plan, you know, when the supervisor was going to come in. Sometimes they’re out of the building. Sometimes they need other things, and with a peer partner, it just seemed easier to meet or to cancel meetings. You didn’t feel as if you were interrupting the supervisor’s day. And our supervisors still come in, but it doesn’t have to be something that is put on. And I don’t know how to explain it other than when my partner, my peer coaching partner is there, my comfort level is such that I’m not afraid to make mistakes or to say the wrong thing because they’ve seen me a number of times, and we’ve talked about different things.

Question 6

Why have you continued to participate in this model of teacher evaluation?

Teacher A: Well actually I’m not in the model this year. I did my 2 years. My partner, who I had great respect for moved on to the child study team and so she’s not doing the peer coaching. And for me to do it this year, I would have had to re-attend classes or else get another partner that probably teaches three all year round to re-attend the evening classes which you don’t get reimbursed for or anything. So the timing wasn’t right. So I went into portfolio assessment this year which I love. I love portfolio. It’s great. I’m really getting (pause) so now my supervisor, she saw me go through 3 years of peer coaching, and now she’s going to see my portfolio, which is
a perfect progression as far as evaluations go.

Interviewer: How does it progress? Can you help me understand that?

Teacher A: Peer coaching, I pick the area I want to focus on. I pick the somebody to evaluate me, and they focus on the area with me. Now with portfolio, now it's more of introspection. I'm not having somebody come in and observe me. Now I'm bringing my work out to the public. You put together this whole really neat assortment of situations that you been placed in over the year, and I have a lot of stuff this year. So my situation is starting to look really good. I'm kind of proud of that. I'm going to take that out and show people outside the classroom because I tend to hide a little bit.

Teacher B: I continued because I thought it was a good experience and because I really, again, did not want to be observed by my supervisor. Do you want information as to why I'm not doing it.

Interviewer: Go ahead because as you told me at the start of the interview, you participated for 2 years, but you're not participating in this 3rd year.

Teacher B: Right. When I did peer coaching both years, I could only manage to do it during the semester that I taught two classes. We have one semester of three and one semester of two with a duty and this ties in with the main reason that I didn't continue with peer coaching is the amount of paper work involved. And the amount of time that it takes. When you teach three classes as I do now, that's the equivalent of six classes by the old method, and you get one block where you're unassigned and you get 20 minutes or 25 minutes for lunch and when you're teaching three classes, you need every bit of that time for yourself just to keep your head above water, so I could never peer coach during a semester when I had three classes, so this year since all I got was a semester with three classes, there was no room for it. I wish there could be less forms to
fill out in that they didn’t have to be so
detailed because I really don’t like doing that.
I really don’t like the forms so I went to the
traditional method this year where my supervisor
will observe me because it was easier. But next
year I don’t know, I just might go back to it
again. Because once again, I don’t feel I’m
getting anything out of being observed and
evaluated by my supervisor because he doesn’t
really comment on much of anything unless it’s
subject area related. Maybe it’s somewhat
egotistical to say it, but I really don’t think I
need too much improvement in that area.

Teacher C: Because I really had help on specific
issues on which I needed some help or feedback.
And then it was just such a positive experience.
It was helpful for me with the problems that I
had, and then observing my partner, I was also
able to work on some of the problems that she had
said she wanted to work with, not problems, but
issues that she had said she wanted to work on.
And I also implemented some of that in some of my
classes, and then I observed her and got some
ideas from her as well.

Interviewer: So there was follow up to this?

Teacher C: Yes. And pre- and post-conferences, a
lot of brainstorming goes on. Not all of it is on
paper. But a lot of things are very helpful. It
was a very positive experience.

Interviewer: Is there anything that you would
want to add?

Teacher C: Other than, give it a try.

Teacher D: I find it to be rewarding in many
ways. Both in terms of camaraderie and in terms
of content. Being able to share my style and see
my peer’s style when I watch her teach and being
able to solve problems in a much more
constructive way than I think I did under the
traditional model.

Teacher E: Because I thought it was very
beneficial. I just felt it was a very relaxed situation. I felt I would learn more from it than have someone come in. Also, not all administrators have command of the subject area. You could have somebody that is supervising in an area for which they don’t have the knowledge base. So it’s better to have somebody who’s in the same area, discipline because this way they know, more or less, the subject area a little bit better. So in that sense, I think then it’s definitely more beneficial.

Interviewer: And you feel it has been for you?

Teacher E: It’s been very beneficial. Yes, I think so.

Teacher F: Same reasons. I’m not sure if I’m going to do it always. And I think one of the things that I thought would probably be a good thing would be to do peer coaching for one or 2 years and then do standard evaluation. Have some kind of a balanced model, might be better than just saying, do peer coaching for the rest of my career.

Teacher G: My peer coach and I are very, very different. Where I am (pause) I want to schedule every minute of every day, and I even have it. I have a thing for every day. I know what I have to get done in order to finish on time. And she is an excellent teacher, but she doesn’t seem to be so bogged down in these little details like I do, like I get bogged down in. So when she has a class discussion, she really has a good discussion. She’s not so hindered by like, oh, my gosh, I didn’t finish what I was supposed to finish today. So, she’s kind of opened this new little window for me. I appreciate that. I think on her behalf, too, and we’ve discussed this. One of her main issues with herself is that she does that too often, and then she finds herself way behind, and then, she can’t finish. So I kind of have taught her how to keep herself more on track, and she’s kind of shown me that it’s okay not to finish what you have planned for the day. You’ll make it up. It’s definitely well
worth the time to spend it in a good discussion or something like that. So, consequently, I don’t get bent out of shape anymore.

Teacher H: Yes. I continue to participate because I feel it’s effective. It’s changed the way I think. I’ve gotten a lot of positive feedback, and I enjoy the feedback from it.

Teacher I: Basically, because I had a good experience. My coach and I, it’s worked for us, and I think it needs to be improved upon. And to be very honest with you, this year I questioned whether to continue because there was another mode of evaluation offered which was portfolio, and I was real interested in that because I thought it would just help. It would be a good thing for me to do and help me. And maybe next year I’ll do that. But I continued because I like working with this person, and it’s helped me, and I just wanted to make it better basically.

Teacher J: Well, and next year I told them I want to try to get somebody and want to ask at the end of this year rather than wait next year. But I think it’s something that could work as long as you get the right partner. It may take more than one year for that to be successful. But I’m hoping. They tell me if you don’t like peer coaching then do portfolio assessment. There’s all kinds of forms that we’re doing here. It almost seems that they don’t care what you do as long as the supervisor doesn’t have to observe you. Do something. I don’t want to take that attitude. Just because they don’t want to do their job, I don’t want to it for them. I want to do it because it’s something that going to make me a better teacher. And I believe that peer coaching does allow you to get to see other teachers in their environment so it is probably more beneficial than portfolio assessment which is another choice we have.

Teacher K: Just because, you know, every year the time comes around, and you have to make a choice. It works well. It’s just good to, you know, people tend to get so settled into their
own area, and I really like being able to get those ideas and motivation from some other areas. And actually the only thing that I find limiting so far is that I really like to expand and be able to do this with more partners from other areas. I like doing it with the same woman who I've done this with so far, and art is close to my field if we're talking interior design or whatever, but although, we do still work together in foods and so forth. But, you know, I was serious before, I would really love to be able to do something with a science. And I think it engenders more confidence and respect for the students, too. For instance, I've turned back papers where I would just put like spelling, you know. The kids are so perplexed. They're like, oh, my goodness, she put spelling. She knows how to spell. And they'll say to me, "Did you have to go to college to do this?" And, you know, it really allows us to bring in more of our skills, and everyone of them doesn't have a college credit that goes with it. But it just comes with the job, it comes with the territory, from doing different things.

Teacher L: Well, I'll tell you. There's two sides to that. I participate in peer coaching because I really, I'm encouraged, you know, and I want to keep that bond with my peer coaching partner, and we're learning new things when we do that. But it's a lot of paperwork for me. And there are times when I say, "Well, gee whiz, I should have my supervisor come in and supervise me because this is a lot of work that I'm taking on. Where they could just come in for half hour, come see what I'm doing. You know, I'll set up the lab, and then they leave. They have to fill in the paperwork. They have to do everything. They do the pre and post conference. I don't have to worry about any of that. Peer coaching is more work for me. But I can schedule my observations. I can make sure (peer coach's name) sees the vacuum pump lab. The lab that I need him to see on the day that I need him to see it, or we rearrange the lesson with more flexibility. And so there are days when the deadline is looming, and I'm like why did I ever
agree to this, you know, because of the paperwork. And there are times like now since the deadline is about a month and a half away, I think it’s January 15th, that I’m not so worried about it. I know we’ll be able to do an observation, and we’ve been talking about this observation all year, and we’ve done a lot of stuff together that I know I can put some something together. So I vacillate, you know, well, gee whiz, as a supervisor, I couldn’t imagine having to write all of these evaluations, in the depth that some of the peer coaching partners do.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the statistical analyses for the survey data. Statistical analyses to address the hypotheses compared the data for those teachers who participated in the traditional model of teacher evaluation for 3 years with those teachers who participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years. Supplemental analyses compared the data for those teachers who participated in the traditional model of teacher evaluation for 3 years and for those teachers who participated in peer coaching for only 1 year. Analyses for all three evaluation classifications were conducted. An examination of the background data for all three evaluation classifications was also presented. The responses of the respondents to the six interview questions were organized on a cross-interview basis. Verbatim transcriptions of the responses to the
interview questions comprised the data for qualitative analyses. The data presented in Chapter IV will be analyzed in Chapter V.
Chapter V
SUMMARY QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Research Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the use of
two different models of teacher evaluation, peer coaching
and traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor,
employed in one New Jersey regional high school district
over a 3 year period. This study analyzed the effect that
each model had on the following: (a) collegiality among
teachers, and (b) change in instructional practice. This
study also examined the role of trust in the evaluation
process as a means of improving instruction.

The first hypothesis of this study was that there is a
relationship between the model of teacher evaluation and
levels of collegiality.

The second hypothesis of this study was that
there is a relationship between the model of teacher
evaluation and changes in instructional practices.

An additional area of inquiry entailed an
examination of the relationship between removal of the
perceived threat that the results of evaluation by a
certified supervisor could be utilized in a negative manner
and trust in evaluation as a means of improving
instruction.

The two hypotheses were tested using several one-
way Analysis of Variance presented in the previous chapter.
The additional research question surrounding the issue of
trust in evaluation was examined through an analysis of the
verbatim transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews
also presented in the previous chapter.

This chapter will provide an analysis of each of the
hypothesis tested and an examination of the additional
research question.

Analysis of Survey Data for Collegiality

The data needed to analyze collegiality were the
responses to the five survey questions under the subsection
on Collegiality Index and the 16 survey questions under the
subsection on Department Community Index from the CRC
Teacher Survey (1991). The two indices were analyzed to
examine different dimensions of collegiality.

**Collegiality Index**

A one-way ANOVA and one-tailed t-test for independent
samples were conducted to answer the research hypothesis for Collegiality. The one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for the Collegiality Index for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 years. The results of the one-way ANOVA just missed significance for social science research at the .05 level of significance ($p = .058$). Given that the ANOVA is a two-tailed test, a one-tailed t-test for two independent samples was conducted and produced results that were statistically significant ($p = .029$).

Supplemental analyses were also preformed. A one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for the Collegiality Index for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year. The results of the one-way ANOVA were not statistically significant ($p = .454$). A one-way ANOVA was also employed to analyze the mean scores for the Collegiality Index for three groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years, those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year, and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 years. The results of the one-way
ANOVA were not statistically significant ($p = .061$), but may point to a trend that was supported by t-test analysis of the traditional group and the group that was peer coached for 2 or 3 years.

The z-score analysis for the Collegiality Index also indicated that the group that had participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years scored significantly higher than the national sample ($p = .023$). The result of the z-score analysis for the Collegiality Index for the group that had participated in traditional evaluation for 3 years was not statistically significant when compared to the national sample ($p = .107$), and the z-score for the group that participated in peer coaching for only 1 year was less significant than the traditional group when compared to the national sample ($p = .180$).

**Conclusion.** The statistical analysis for the dimension of collegiality measured by the Collegiality Index supports the rejection of the null hypothesis. Given the effect seen for the group that participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years as measured by the Collegiality Index, the researcher suggests that there is a strong association between the dependent variable, collegiality, and participation in peer coaching for more than 1 year.
Department Community Index

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to answer the research hypothesis for Collegiality. The one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for the Department Community Index for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 year. The results of the one-way ANOVA were not significant for the dimension of collegiality as measured by the Department Community Index ($p = .435$).

Supplemental analyses were also preformed. A one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for the Department Community Index for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year. The results of the one-way ANOVA were also not statistically significant ($p = .432$). A one-way ANOVA was also employed to analyze the mean scores for the Collegiality Index for three groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years, those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year, and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 years. The results of the one-way ANOVA were again not statistically
significant ($p = .988$).

Spearman's Correlation Coefficient for ranked data was performed to describe the relationship among the qualitative, dependent variables. Although the analysis of the relationship between model of evaluation and Department Community Index did not produce statistically significant results, there appears to be a strong relationship between the Department Community Index and the Collegiality Index ($r = .51$ and $p < .001$).

A z-score analysis for the Department Community Index was not performed because there were no national norms for this index.

**Conclusion.** The statistical analysis for the dimension of collegiality measured by the Department Community Index does not support the rejection of the null hypothesis. The Department Community Index has typically been used as a measure for comparing shared cultures within high school departments. Talbert, McLaughlin, and Rowan (1993) have reported that departments form a boundary within high schools. This researcher had suspected that peer coaching or model of evaluation might form an additional boundary that could also be measured by the Department Community Index. The data suggests otherwise. Although the results of the Spearman's Rho suggests a statistically significant
relationship between the Department Community Index and the Collegiality Index, the null hypothesis should be retained for the dimension of collegiality as measured by the Department Community Index.

Analysis of Survey Data for Change in Instructional Practice

The data needed to address subproblem two were the responses to the survey questions ranked along the various Likert Scales for the 26 questions from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) that contained three subsections used to measure the dependent variable of change in instructional practice. For the purposes of this study, "change in instructional practice" was defined as the use of instructional activities that are student-directed and the use of a new range of assessments. Student-directed activities were measured by the third section of the survey instrument which consisted of 11 questions. New range of assessment was measured by the fourth and fifth sections of the survey instrument which consisted of seven and eight items respectively. The total of these 15 items was also measured separately.
Student-Directed Activities

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to answer one dimension of the research hypothesis for "change in instructional practice." The one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for student-directed activities for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 years. The results of the one-way ANOVA were not significant (p = .422).

Supplemental analyses were also performed. A one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year. The results of the one-way ANOVA were statistically significant at the .05 level (p = .039). A one-way ANOVA was also employed to analyze the mean scores for student-directed activities for three groups, those who participated in the traditional model for 3 years, those who participated in the peer coaching model for only 1 year, and those who participated in the peer coaching model for 2 or 3 years. The results of the one-way ANOVA were not significant (p = .108), but may reflect the strong trend seen when the traditional group was compared to the peer coached group of 1-year only.
Conclusions. The statistical analysis for the dimension of "change in instructional practice" as measured by the section for student-directed activity supports retention of the null hypothesis. There was no difference in student-directed activity for the traditional group and the experimental group, those who participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years.

The supplemental data for the group that participated in peer coaching for only 1 year provided some surprising, contradictory results in terms of the stated hypothesis. On face value, it would appear that continued participation in peer coaching may be associated with less student-directed activities. This researcher suspects that the results may be explained by some dynamics for those who participated in peer coaching for 1 year. Those who participated in peer coaching for 1 year may have been the "early adopters" or "pioneers" in the district who would also be more likely to employ activities that were more "student-directed." The district had originally applied for the equivalency waiver to do peer coaching to facilitate its move toward intensive block scheduling. The district indicated that "intensive block scheduling is more engaging for students" (Equivalency Application, 1995).
New Range of Assessment

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to answer the second dimension of the research hypothesis for "change in instructional practice." The one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for new range of assessment for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for 2 or 3 years. New range of assessment was measured in three ways. The results for section four of the survey. The results for section five of the survey. The combined results for sections four and five. The results of the one-way ANOVA for the respective analyses were not significant (p = .231, .699, .358).

Supplemental analyses were also performed. A one-way ANOVA analyzed the mean scores for two groups, those who participated in the traditional model of evaluation for 3 years and those who participated in the peer coaching model of evaluation for only 1 year. The results of the one-way ANOVA were statistically significant for the items measured in section four at the .05 level (p = .048). The results for the second range of assessment were not significant (p = .142), and the results for the total new range of
assessments just missed significance (p = .052). A one-way ANOVA was also employed to analyze the mean scores for the three measures of new range of assessment for three groups, those who participated in the traditional model for 3 years, those who participated in the peer coaching model for only 1 year, and those who participated in the peer coaching model for 2 or 3 years. The results of the one-way ANOVA were not significant (p = .133, .423, .186), but may reflect the slight trend seen when the traditional group was compared to the peer coached group of 1 year only.

Spearman's Correlation Coefficient for ranked data was performed to describe the relationship among the qualitative, dependent variables. There appears to be a strong relationship among the qualitative, dependent variables of student directed activities and the first new range of assessment (r = .60, p < .001), the second new range of assessment (r = .56, p < .001), and the total new range of assessment (r = .64, p < .001).

**Conclusions.** The statistical analysis for the dimension of "change in instructional practice" as measured by the sections for new range of assessment supports retention of the null hypothesis. There was no difference
in new range of assessment for the traditional group and the experimental group, those who participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years.

The supplemental data for the group that participated in peer coaching for only 1 year again provided some surprising, contradictory results in terms of the stated hypothesis. On face value, it would again appear that continued participation in peer coaching may be associated with fewer new range of assessments. Like the results for student-directed activity, this researcher suspects that the results may be explained by some dynamics for those who participated in peer coaching for 1 year. Those who participated in peer coaching for 1 year may have been the "early adopters" or "pioneers" in the district who would also be more likely to employ a new range of assessments.

The district had originally applied for the equivalency waiver to do peer coaching to facilitate its move toward intensive block scheduling. The district further indicated that "intensive block scheduling...encourages and requires alternative instructional strategies and assessments" (Equivalency Application, 1995).

Supplemental analyses also indicates a strong relationship between student directed activity and all of the measures for new range of assessment.
Analysis of Interview Questions

The purpose of this section is to analyze the responses of the 12 teachers who participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years to the six questions posed during the semi-structured interviews. The six open-ended questions used in the semi-structured interviews were related to the goals of the study: (a) to understand the phenomenon of peer coaching more clearly by exploring the experience of peer coaching from the participants' points of view, (b) to examine trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement in instruction, and (c) to analyze the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instructional practice through a combination of methodologies.

The 12 interviews were recorded on audiotape and transcribed. The researcher reviewed each of the transcriptions checking for the accuracy of the transcriptions while listening to the audiotapes. The researcher filled in any gaps and corrected any transcriptions that were not verbatim. Patton (1990) discussed the importance of reviewing the quality of the information and indicated that verbatim transcriptions were the essential raw data for qualitative analysis (p. 379).
"Once the interviewer is certain that all the data are there, has checked out the quality of the data, and has filled in any missing gaps, formal analysis can begin" (Patton, 1990, p. 380).

Patton (1990) further indicated that the purpose of qualitative inquiry was to produce findings by making sense out of the massive amounts of data. Patton (1990) suggested that "there are no formulas for determining significance" (p. 372). This researcher sought to identify patterns and themes from the responses to the focused interview questions by (a) employing cross-interview analysis, (b) developing themes by drawing from theory, prior research, and data-driven approaches, and (c) organizing the data using a matrix based on content analysis.

Patton (1990) recommended using cross-interview analysis as opposed to case analysis when searching for different perspectives on central issues. The data were organized in Chapter IV to facilitate cross-interview analysis. The data in this section will also be presented using cross-interview analysis. Krathwohl (1998) indicated that the method of analysis should follow the nature of the study. In this study, both deductive and inductive reasoning were employed. Boyatzis (1998) viewed the
approaches in developing themes as "a continuum from theory-driven to data-driven approaches" (p. 29). This study will attempt to employ the more ecumenical approach advocated by Boyatzis. The development of the focused interview questions were derived from theories and prior research about the independent and dependent variables. The analysis of the phenomenon of peer coaching and the examination of trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement in instruction will be conducted inductively through an exploration of the experience of peer coaching from the participants' points of view as expressed in the interviews. The researcher will then attempt to construct some generalizations from the interview data. The analysis of the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instructional practice from the interview data is intended to serve as methodological triangulation. The analysis of the dependent variables will also employ an inductive approach based originally on the literature review.

The cross-interview analysis will be supplemented with a matrix organizing the major themes for each question and supporting data from each of the 12 teachers who were interviewed. The matrix and identification of major themes were developed through content analysis of each of the 12 transcriptions. "Content analysis is the process of
identifying, coding, and categorizing the primary patterns in the data" (Patton, 1990, p.381). This researcher began by making notes in the margins of each transcription and then, organizing those notes as part of a cross-interview analysis.

The next sections will analyze the responses to each of the six questions posed to the 12 teachers who participated in the interview phase of the study. The rationale for each question will be stated immediately after the question in each section. The researcher discovered that the responses to one question may relate to the intent or purpose of another question. For example, in answering the question regarding their experiences with peer coaching, many teachers addressed the issue of trust in evaluation posed in a later question. Given the overlap among responses and the questions, there will be a brief summary presented after each question has been analyzed. The researcher will conclude the analysis of the interview questions with an examination of trust in evaluation as a route toward the improvement of instruction.

**Analysis of Question One**

"How would you describe your experiences with peer coaching to someone who has never participated in peer
coaching?" The first question was designed to understand the phenomenon of peer coaching more clearly by exploring the experience of peer coaching from the participants' points of view (Patton, 1990).

Teacher (A) described her experiences as positive. Specifically, Teacher (A) stressed that she had been looking for feedback in specific areas. She reported the feedback from her peer coach "was so encouraging and so wonderful that...I just had nothing but good feelings about the whole thing. It was nice to have another teacher's viewpoint.

Teacher (A) also reported that she felt less threatened. She indicated that it was helpful for her professional growth not to have "that threatening or that intimidation factor." Teacher (A) felt that the feedback from peer coaching was very direct and useful. "The remarks that were made were more teacher oriented...She gave me specific situations." Teacher (A) referred to traditional evaluation by stating, "I was always getting these glowing evaluations, and yet, I felt as though my kids weren't really doing that well. What can I do differently? Show me something. Give me an idea."

Teacher (B) reported that "having the input of one of my peers in watching my classroom was a very good
experience." She also balanced her response about this positive aspect by adding that there was a great deal of time needed "to do all of the paperwork and submit all of the forms."

Teacher (C) believed that peer coaching was a more valid model of evaluation. She reported the benefit of having someone, who is also a teacher, look for "specific weaknesses or specific areas of interest." She indicated that "having someone else there who has been there and taught what you taught makes it easier to see where you need improvement or where you are strong. A department chair generally will come in and evaluate you in general, but it's not as valuable as looking for specific things that need improvement."

Teacher (D) discussed her reaction to peer coaching in terms of empowerment. She believed that the peer coaching model liberated her from the traditional model where "there's someone who feels it's his job to find something wrong with what you are doing." Teacher (D) indicated that she was in control of what she was working on and that the process was non-judgmental.

Teacher (E) also reported that peer coaching was positive for her. "It is going to enable you to be the best teacher you can be because you are trying to work with
each other. She further indicated that "it's definitely more of a helping kind of situation than having an evaluator, an administrator coming in." She felt that with peer coaching, the teacher focused on one specific thing as opposed to traditional evaluation where the supervisor looks at a number of areas. In addressing the one specific area, Teacher (E) believed that the partners "can come up with strategies and plans that they can try to implement."

Teacher (F) recounted that she has had three peer coaching partners and that the success of peer coaching depends "on you and your partner...and on whether you're willing to do the work...and whether or not you have a rapport." Teacher (F) reported that even in the year when the partnership was not effective, there were still benefits in observing another teacher. Teacher (F) cautioned that it would be easy for partners to abuse the system by just doing the bare minimum or to not take the process seriously. She indicated that there was benefit in working with another teacher and that the process was more active. She concluded by stressing that the experience was very dependent on one's partner.

Teacher (G) centered her responses on the issues of isolation and control. She discussed how teachers are very busy and tend to be isolated. Peer coaching provided
"another pair of eyes, another pair of ears to kind of focus in on something they wish to refine or focus on."

Teacher (G) reported that the classroom teacher controlled what the partner's role would be and that that role was one of an observer, not an evaluator. "You decided what they're there for...that experience changes you in the future, you still remember that particular interaction that particular day, the feedback you got, and it's helped a lot." Teacher (G) shared that she asked her partner to see if she was keeping the entire class focused.

Teacher (H) discussed the opportunity to work with someone that he had not worked with before and how he felt less defensive about comments made by the peer coaching partner. "We were able to say more truthful things without them getting upset by it." He felt that his partner was more comfortable with comments made by another teacher and that the process entailed more "...collaborating, working together with other teachers."

Teacher (I) cited her overall experiences with peer coaching as positive. She also reported that teachers are isolated and that without peer coaching, teachers would not get a chance to see how other teachers teach. "So, for collegiality purposes,...I know (peer coaching) has really added to my relationship with this particular teacher."
Teacher (I) described finding sufficient time for observing as one of the negative aspects of the model. She also reported some difficulty in finding the right balance in making a comment to another teacher. "There's still a little bit of a blurry line and confusion as to what we're actually supposed to be doing there." Teacher (I) believed that the second peer coaching course may be useful in defining the roles. Teacher (I) reported that she and her partner were opposites who complemented each other. Based on their work with each other, Teacher (I) indicated that she became better organized and that her partner learned to relax and engage in more discussions with her students.

Teacher (J) indicated that his experience was not really successful. He reported that the difficulties surrounded the issue of his partners. Teacher (J) believed that his first partner did not want to put time or interest into the process and that his second partner wanted help with classroom discipline problems which he felt went beyond the scope of peer coaching. Despite these difficulties with his partners, Teacher (J) reported that there were still benefits in seeing other teachers and that he wanted peer coaching to work because he wanted to try different techniques. "I did get something out of it because any time you observe another teacher, you get
something out of it.”

Teacher (K) saw peer coaching as a contemporary version of team teaching. She reported that teachers “do tend to be cloistered and...tend to be stuck...in a certain pigeon hole.” “It’s such an opportunity to team teach, to bring in another discipline.” Teacher (K) indicated that peer coaching gave her a chance to be more interdisciplinary.

Teacher (L) reported that peer coaching was different from what she had envisioned. She believed that peer coaching would entail working with a friend. She stated, “Peer coaching is more of an opportunity to work with maybe, colleagues that I’ve never worked with before or colleagues that I’ve admired, not necessarily my friends.” Teacher (L) reported that being paired with someone who is not a friend may make it easier to be more honest. Teacher (L) also discussed several of the specific classroom strategies that were presented in the peer coaching course and tried by her and her partner. In comparing peer coaching with traditional evaluation, Teacher (L) observed, “I found it (peer coaching) to be very detailed. I came out with an evaluation of my skills that I hadn’t had in any prior evaluation, and I felt comfortable with the criticisms or the positive responses that I got, and I
learned a tremendous amount just by observing and talking to other people."

**Summary.** The responses to the first question are organized in a matrix of teachers' responses by interview question, research question, and major theme in Table 25 (see Appendix I). The major themes are listed under the heading of "Peer Coaching Experience" which captures the main purpose of the question. However, patterns and themes that were related to the three research questions also emerged in the respondents' answers to the first question. Those patterns and themes are organized under the headings of "collegiality," "change in instructional practice," and "trust in evaluation." There is also a heading for "other issues."

Most of the respondents gave evaluative comments about their experiences with peer coaching. Overall the teachers responded that their experiences were very positive. The opportunity to observe and work with another teacher emerged as the strongest theme. The time for observations, conferences, and paperwork emerged as a downside of the peer coaching model. The researcher found that despite the additional work and some difficulties in finding the appropriate partner, the respondents in this sample perceived the overall benefits to outweigh the negatives.
Analysis of Question Two

"How do you feel about the issue of trust in teacher evaluation when the evaluation is conducted with a peer?" This second question was designed to examine the issue of trust in evaluation and was "aimed at understanding the emotional responses of people to their experiences and thoughts" (Patton, 1990, p.291).

Teacher (A) reported that the issue of trust was related to how the model is implemented. Her answer focused on the ability to select one's peer coaching partner. "If it's set up from above...it's not going to work because it is totally built on trust."

Teacher (B) also reported the importance of selecting one's peer coaching partner. "Because you select your own peer coach, and the person is not assigned to you, I think you only agree to work with someone in whom you feel you can trust. Teacher (B) shared that she trusted both of her partners implicitly. She also noted that she was "more relaxed because it wasn't a supervisor/teacher role."

Teacher (B) indicated that she was not nervous with her supervisor, but believed that opinions formed through observations could effect "the classes that you teach and the kinds of responsibilities that you get." She felt that
the peer coach was only there to help her and not to evaluate her.

Teacher (C) responded that she would only choose someone whom she trusted and respected. She also discussed the difference between evaluation conducted by a peer as opposed to evaluation conducted by a supervisor. "When it's your colleague, you can talk more freely because your colleague knows what sorts of things are off the record and what things to write in a formal evaluation." She shared that she had worked on classroom flow, questions and answers, timing, discipline and cooperative methods with her partner.

Teacher (D) indicated that the ability to choose the partner resolved the issue of trust for her. "One would tend to think you would choose someone you trusted. Otherwise it would be difficult to have a good coaching relationship with someone you didn't trust." She reported that trust is discussed in the peer coaching class and that the other faculty member is not there to criticize you. In describing difference in trust between the two models of evaluation, Teacher (D) stated, "I feel like I'm working with my peer coach. I was never really working with my faculty advisor...In peer evaluation you find things to work on, and the peer can come back again and again and see
how you’ve succeeded in resolving a past issue. That would never happen in the traditional method.”

Teacher (E) stated that people pick partners that they do trust. She also indicated that she always trusted her administrators and never felt that they would do anything detrimental to her teaching. Teacher (E) believed that people who signed up for peer coaching tended to “be people who would want to work with other people and try to have them be the best teachers they can be.”

Teacher (F) believed that she could trust the evaluation by a peer as being “reflective of what you do.” In responding to this question, Teacher (F) spent considerable time reporting that peer coaching was too non-judgmental and limited solely to objective reporting of what was observed. She would prefer more criticism. Teacher (F) indicated that she had never felt threatened by her supervisor whom she felt was very supportive. She did find a difference with peer coaching. “It’s less threatening having a peer, and my supervisor is very supportive. I’ve never felt threatened. But it’s still the fact that it’s your supervisor carries with it more (pause) it’s more ominous.”

Teacher (G) reported that she had trust in the validity and confidentiality of peer coaching. Teacher (G)
believed that there was greater validity in having another teacher conduct the evaluation. "I trust strongly in its validity because the person observing me is doing what I do every day."

Teacher (H) indicated that he would only go into peer coaching with a partner he could trust. He cautioned others to select someone that they would be comfortable with and to "not just draw names out of a hat." Teacher (H) believed that there was a disconnect between the supervisor's desire to help teacher and how that help was perceived by the teacher being observed. He indicated greater confidence in another teacher's motivation to help him do "the best job possible to help the kids whereas being evaluated traditionally by the supervisors, we tend to look at it as though they're trying to rack up negative things against us. That's just something that will probably never change."

Teacher (I) indicated a very high level of comfort with peer coaching and believed that teachers should evaluate each other because they can learn from each other. "I think that it (peer coaching) causes us to interact with one another." Teacher (I) felt that the opportunity to observe another teacher generated ideas and a greater respect for what other teachers were doing. She discussed
the problem of teacher isolation and believed that isolation created territoriality that was not in the best interest of the students. Teacher (I) believed that peer coaching produced greater interaction and that learning was not "about isolated segments, but we make it that way."

Teacher (J) indicated that "trust is definitely a big factor." He indicated that he felt that the people he worked with were honest. "I wouldn't have gone with them if I didn't feel I could be honest with them, or they could be honest with me." Teacher (J) also discussed difficulties with his partner's expectations and his concern that the observation process was very superficial.

Teacher (K) believed that peer coaching engendered even more trust. Her belief seemed to be based on the ability to select a partner more familiar with her teaching field and with, as she described, her multiple intelligence or teaching style. Teacher (K) stated, "So I find that this (peer coaching) gives me the option to pick somebody who I work with a little more easily, and I'm not bound in by being evaluated by someone who might not even come from my area, and I just have no choice who does it."

Teacher (L) indicated that she could not work with someone that she did not trust. She saw trust and confidentiality as two very important dynamics for the
success of peer coaching. Teacher (L) compared and contrasted the two models of evaluation. "I think when a supervisor comes in a room, . . . you feel like you have to put on . . . the dog and pony show. Pull out the fireworks. That's not real life." Teacher (L) believed that when you work with someone over time, they have seen your ups and downs. "That's a real trust situation. You can see their strengths and weakness, and give feedback. . . . So it's more trust. Guess trust is more important in the peer coaching relationship."

**Summary.** The responses to the second question are organized in a matrix of teachers' responses by interview question and major theme in Table 26 (see Appendix I ). The major themes are listed under the heading of "Trust in Evaluation" which captures the main purpose of the question. Unlike the responses to the first question that addressed the broader area of peer coaching, the responses to question two were more focused on the issue of trust. Those responses that were related to the dependent variables of collegiality and change in instructional practice will be reported in a summary matrix of the responses to all six interview questions in Table 31 (see Appendix I ).

The majority of the respondents stressed the importance of selecting one's peer coaching partner. The
respondents indicated that the ability to choose a partner was essential because teachers would only choose partners whom they could trust and who would be honest and confidential. Other themes surrounding the issue of trust emerged from the interviews. These themes entailed the issue of participants having greater trust in the process when conducted by a peer and feeling more relaxed or less threatened. The respondents reported that peer coaching was more valid because the partner was not removed from the classroom setting. The respondents perceived peer coaching as having greater depth and being less artificial than the traditional annual observation.

Analysis of Question Three

"Based on your participation in peer coaching, how would you characterize your relationships with other teachers? This question was designed to examine the dependent variable of collegiality and to capture "the cognitive and interpretive processes of people" (Patton, 1990, p.291).

Teacher (A) indicated that she was a pretty open person who has been honest with her peer coaching partner. She reported that she selected a partner that she had respected in the school community. Teacher (A) believed
that her partner served as a mentor from the same content area. "It's better to have a mentor-type person to mentor you, rather than a person coming in from the outside."

Teacher (B) reported having good relationships with both of her peer coaching partners. Teacher (B) believed that "...I may have gotten even a little closer to them because in the process of sharing our thoughts I think we bonded and became better friends because of it." She indicated that her participation in peer coaching did not affect her relationships with other teachers.

Teacher (C) felt that she and her partner helped each other and learned from each other. "We find that having a colleague as a coach is less intimidating, and we're willing to try new things."

Teacher (D) indicated that she has formed "...a very strong bond of friendship...you have a certain trust and camaraderie." She reported that most teachers do not go into other teachers' classrooms. "But I have seen, on a regular basis, the people that I peer coach with and that forges a kind of common ground." Teacher (D) felt that she could turn to her partners for advice because she knew what was going on in her partner's classroom as compared to other faculty members.

Teacher (E) believed that peer coaching had made her
more understanding of her partner. She indicated that partners were constantly exchanging ideas in a way that was not threatening.

Teacher (F) indicated that most of her experiences were good. Teacher (F) reported that when she worked with a partner with whom she had a good relationship, the peer coaching experience was very good. “When we could tell each other when things weren’t good, what areas needed improvement, we could give constructive criticism.” Conversely, if the relationship with the partner was not strong, Teacher (F) reported that it was difficult to offer suggestions. “You have to have a comfortable relationship in order for you to get benefit from the process. People could feel threatened.”

Teacher (G) felt that camaraderie existed on a small group level, but not on a large scale given the size of the school. The teacher also reported that she does not see her partner frequently given that they are both teaching three blocks of instruction this semester.

Teacher (H) felt that in any organization there will always be some people with whom one would have a better relationship. She indicated that she would only select a partner with whom she had a good relationship. In discussing both trust and relationships, Teacher (H)
stated, "...I'm more likely to listen to advice and feel more comfortable with somebody I could trust and somebody who's in a non-threatening atmosphere...We get to look at each other as far as improving ourselves academically."

Teacher (I) reported that peer coaching has "...augmented, enhanced my relationship with this teacher." Teacher (I) further indicated that peer coaching "...just enhances respect and appreciation for that other person, and it adds to the quality of the relationship." The teacher also described how she and her partner were opposite in many ways, but came to respect and help each other. "We'll say on our birthday cards to each other, 'to my peer coaching partner.' You know, it's added a certain fuzzy, warm feeling."

Teacher (J) believed that people were close to each other in the school and that the school strongly encouraged teachers to use alternate forms of evaluation. Teacher (J) reiterated his concern and disappointment over his partners. The researcher was interested that this teacher wanted very strongly to participate in peer coaching despite his disappointment with his previous selection of partners.

Teacher (K) reported that the teachers got to know each other better through the peer coaching classes. She
indicated that she got to know her partner better professionally. Teacher (K) indicated that she and her partner had a better understanding of what went on in each other's classrooms.

Teacher (L) also reported that the peer coaching classes were an opportunity for the partners to learn about each other. She indicated that time was allocated in the class specifically for the partners to dialogue. Teacher (L) felt that peer coaching had affected her relationships with other people in the class. "I feel like I have a larger support group for some of the new strategies that I’m trying to implement. And I’m not threatened." Teacher (L) described how the school administration encouraged risk taking. She also indicated that peer coaching created an openness where she would invite other teachers in to observe a particular strategy outside of the normal evaluation process. In speaking of her relationship with her partner, Teacher (L) believed that peer coaching "...has solidified our relationship." "So now, we’re to the point where we finish each other’s sentences."

**Summary.** The responses to the third question are organized in a matrix of teachers responses by interview question and major theme in Table 27 (see Appendix I ). The major themes are listed under the heading of "collegiality"
which captures the main purpose of the question. Those responses that were related to trust in evaluation or change in instruction will be reported in a summary matrix of the responses to all six interview questions in Table 33 (see Appendix I).

The responses centered mainly on the teachers’ relationships with their peer coaching partners. In one case, the respondent reported seeing the members of the peer coaching class as a large support group. Outside of that single observation, the respondents made no generalization regarding any change in their relationships with teachers other than their peer coaching partners.

This researcher suspects that this lack of generalization of reported change in relationships from the peer coaching partner to other staff members may be an underlying reason why the survey results for Collegiality Index were significant, and the survey results for Department Community Index were not significant.

In addition to the discussions about building relationship, the respondents’ answers addressed the issue of collegiality. For the purposes of this study, collegiality is defined as the presence of four types of interactions between and among teachers: (a) Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete
and precise talk about teaching practice; (b) Teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful critiques of their teaching; (c) Teachers plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together; and (d) Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching (Little, 1982). The following major themes emerged from the responses: (a) peer coaching creating bonds and building relationships, (b) exchanging ideas and learning from one another, (c) the existence and importance of trust, (d) the non-threatening atmosphere, and (e) the ability to take risks.

Analysis of Question Four

"Based on your experience in peer coaching, how would you evaluate peer coaching as a model for improving instruction?" This question was designed to examine the dependent variable of "change in instructional practices" and to capture "the cognitive and interpretive processes of people" (Patton, 1990, p.291).

Teacher (A) believed that peer coaching was more helpful. She reported that she found the suggestions from her partner were very useful and practical. Teacher (A) also indicated that she was more open to suggestions from another teacher as opposed to suggestions from a
supervisor. "When you are put in a position where you feel you are attacked, you are less likely to give into that or succumb to their suggestions." Teacher (A) felt that it was hard to listen to a supervisor who was no longer involved in the practical end of teaching.

Teacher (B) indicated that given the non-judgmental nature of the peer coaching process, the peer coaching model lacks sufficient structure for new teachers. Teacher (B) indicated that she did not need to work on curriculum improvement or her teaching methods. Her partner gave feedback on her interactions with the students and affective areas of teaching.

Teacher (C) found the conferences with her peer coaching partner to be "a wonderful way to brainstorm ideas and solutions on specific problems." She also reported that she could be specific about her needs with the partner. Teacher (C) indicated that discussing those same items with the supervisor would be intimidating "for fear that it might be written up that way." She found peer coaching to be "much less threatening."

Teacher (D) simply stated that she had been teaching for many years and had experience with the traditional model and the peer coaching model. She believed that peer coaching was designed to improve teaching and that
traditional methods do not address improving teaching.

Teacher (E) reported that observing other teachers was very beneficial. She believed that peer coaching was different from traditional evaluation because "you're trying to help the person improve in their strategies." Teacher (E) also indicated that she was never nervous when an administrator came into the room, but that many teachers are nervous. She believed that there was an advantage to evaluation by a partner who is "on your level." "They're not someone...above you. They're not going to determine whether you get your pay check...It's very relaxed. It's very collegial. It's very helpful. I think it's very positive."

Teacher (F) believed that peer coaching was an excellent model "...because it gives the teachers more of an active role." Teacher (F) also reported the personal benefits of participating in peer coaching. "I enjoy having the opportunity to look at another teacher and how they operate a classroom and then to talk with them about what I do. That's very helpful in improving my teaching."

Teacher (G) indicated that peer coaching allowed for a great deal of feedback. By contrast, a supervisor may simply write an evaluation report. Teacher (G) reported that the partners also write a report, but "...we talk
about a lot more things...Things that may stick with us, that we can use in the future."

Teacher (H) indicated that she was very pleased with peer coaching because of the opportunity to talk with someone else about the lessons and ideas. As a result of these discussions, Teacher (H) reported that "...I've become aware of things much more often as far as even body position, where I stand, classroom organization, order of calling on, method of questioning, wait time."

Teacher (I) reported that peer coaching has been good for improving her instruction. She indicated some concerns over the time needed for peer coaching and the need for additional training. Teacher (I) saw these issues as limitations of peer coaching. "I'm not trained in evaluation...And whereas my supervisor coming in...I would probably have to get more detailed, thorough feedback."

Teacher (J) felt that peer coaching did not help in the area of collegiality given the difficulties that he experienced with his two partners. Teacher (J) did report that he would draw up plans with specific areas for his partner to observe. He indicated that "whether or not they observe or not, I still try to change...I am aware of what I'm trying to do. So whether they're there or not, I'm trying to change my techniques."
Teacher (K) believed that peer coaching was helpful because of the flexibility and opportunities for brainstorming between the partners "...and not to think, what is the supervisor going to say?" Teacher (K) felt that peer coaching was motivating. "It helps me to think of ideas that we wouldn't have thought of otherwise."

Teacher (L) discussed how she had bonded with her peer coaching partner "...as somebody that you can go to, somebody that you trust in the school..." Teacher (L) also reported the difference between her relationship with the partner versus the supervisor in the traditional model. "That's like an us against them situation. Here it's these are my colleagues. These are my peers. These are people I want to respect me all the time...it's kind of an intrinsic motivation."

**Summary.** The responses to the fourth question are organized in a matrix of teachers responses by interview question and major theme in Table 28 (see Appendix I ). The major themes are listed under the heading of "change in instruction" which captures the main purpose of the question. Those responses that were related to collegiality or trust in evaluation will be reported in a summary matrix of the responses to all six interview questions in Table 31 (see Appendix I ).
The respondents answered the question about change in instruction by intertwining themes related to both trust and their relationships with the peer coaching partners. Often, the respondents would compare and contrast the relationship with a peer with the relationship with a supervisor. The major themes surrounded the following issues: (a) the benefits of discussing and observing other teachers, (b) the practical suggestions, brainstorming, and feedback, (c) the focus on the improvement of instruction, (d) the credibility of observation conducted by a peer, and (e) the less threatening and less intimidating nature of peer coaching.

Analysis of Question Five. "What attracted you to peer coaching?" This question was designed to capture the opinions of the teachers regarding their selection of peer coaching. The primary purpose of this question was to provide greater insight into the phenomenon of peer coaching and to gather data for further research.

Teacher (A) believed that peer coaching was helpful. Teacher (A) reported that she was attracted to peer coaching because she could direct the areas of improvement. "I think the whole idea of peer coaching is really teacher directed. Like the teacher saying this is something I really want to fix this year... I’m going to focus on this,
and I’m going to do better in this area, and at the end of this, go ahead and test my program and see if it worked, see if I improved. I welcome that in the end.” She indicated that she never saw the same connection with the traditional model. Supervisors would make suggestions and she felt “…Well, that’s good. That’s what you saw. But how do I know? How does that help me?” Teacher (A) indicated that she focused on teaching reading skills.

Teacher (B) stated that she did not want to be evaluated by a supervisor anymore because she did not feel she was “…getting anything out of it.” With peer coaching, “…you know that the person is there to watch those things, it makes you watch them more because you know that they’re looking for them.” Teacher (B) indicated that she saw things in “black and white.” She worked to consider the affective domain. “And in working with her (peer coaching partner) I found that there are an awful lot of baggage that kids carry around, and you can’t always go black and white.” Teacher (B) reported that the partner “…pointed out to me specific things that I said and did with kids that showed that I was caring more and feeling more for them…Based on what she is telling me about how I’m relating to kids now, I know that I’ve improved.”

Teacher (C) indicated that her department supervisor
encouraged her to opt for peer coaching. Despite initial resistance to the idea, Teacher (C) stated "...I found out that I did get much more out of the peer coaching than when my chair observed me...You can pick up little hints and tips when you are watching someone else's class...And she (peer coaching partner) said the same about me that there were things that she picked up. It's like a win-win situation."

Teacher (D) reported that she was attracted to peer coaching because of the isolation of the classroom. "One of the strongest magnets for me was the idea that you never really saw other people." Teacher (D) found that "...the idea of spending time doing something constructive with other faculty members was incredibly appealing."

Teacher (E) indicated that she "...just needed a change" and wanted to see what it would be like to be evaluated by someone other than an administrator. Teacher (E) felt that there is still a role for evaluation conducted by a supervisor especially in making decisions about granting tenure. Teacher (E) also described at some length the amount of time required to participate in peer coaching as it was designed. "If they don't have any time, then they really can't do it because it is really very time consuming."
Teacher (F) selected peer coaching because she felt that peer coaching would give her broader insights. "I guess what brought me in was observing other teachers and working with other teachers...really seeing how other people teach." Teacher (F) also believed that peer coaching would give her more control over her evaluations and her professional improvement plan (PIP).

Teacher (G) thought that peer coaching was a good alternative to traditional evaluation. She indicated that teachers are isolated and that she was approached to participate by her current partner. "I was so focused on my stuff. I wanted to see what other people were doing. I knew there were some things I needed help with or would be interested in knowing how other people did."

Teacher (H) reported that he became interested in peer coaching through the peer coaching class. As one of the newer teachers in the district, Teacher (H) was interested in learning about the new technologies. Teacher (H) stated, "We're so busy and separated in our own little boxes...We don't talk curriculum." Teacher (H) felt that peer coaching was "...making some teachers get together. It's spreading across disciplines."

Teacher (I) reported that she selected peer coaching because peer coaching was different and gave her a chance
to work with a teacher with whom she always wanted to work. In addition, Teacher (I) described how she wanted more control and autonomy from her supervisor. "...I still really do like to get feedback from my supervisor...but to be honest...initially it was kind of to have more hands on for us, hands off for him."

Teacher (J) indicated that he chose to participate in peer coaching because participation was strongly encouraged by his supervisor. Teacher (J) also reported that he wanted to "...get into other classrooms and see what other teachers were doing."

Teacher (K) reported that she was looking for an alternative to the traditional model of evaluation which she perceived as rigid. Teacher (K) felt that peer coaching removed the fear and nervousness associated with an authority coming into the classroom. Teacher (K) believed that peer coaching entailed more work and was not easier than traditional evaluation. "...Anybody who chose it for that reason is no longer doing it for that reason."

Teacher (K) indicated that peer coaching allowed flexibility "...to be as good as we can be and how it allows us to really become team teachers."

Teacher (L) believed that there was something artificial to observation by a supervisor. "It was so
difficult to plan the lesson...the dog, pony show lesson, the firework lesson...when my peer coaching partner is there, my comfort level is such that I'm not afraid to make mistakes or to say the wrong thing because they've seen me a number of times, and we've talked about different things."

Summary. The responses to the fifth question are organized in a matrix of teachers responses by interview question and major theme in Table 29 (see Appendix I). The major themes are listed under the headings for all of the dependent variables. Those responses will also be reported in a summary matrix of the responses to all six interview questions in Table 31 (see Appendix I).

The major themes expressed by the respondents surrounded the following issues: (a) desire to move from the traditional model conducted by the supervisor, (b) reduce the isolation of the classroom, (c) have more control of evaluation, (d) opportunity to learn from a colleague, and (e) greater comfort in working with a colleague. Some of the respondents indicated that while they were attracted to peer coaching, they believed that peer coaching required more time and work than the traditional model of evaluation.
Analysis of Question Six

"Why have you continued to participate in this model of teacher evaluation?" This question was designed to capture the opinions of the teachers regarding their reasons for either remaining with the peer coaching model of teacher evaluation or for opting out. The primary purpose of this question was to provide greater insight into the phenomenon of peer coaching and to gather data for further research.

Teacher (A) indicated that after participating in peer coaching for 2 years, she had selected portfolio assessment as the model of teacher evaluation for the current school year. Teacher (A) reported that her partner was not available this year and that she saw portfolio as "...a perfect progression as far as evaluations go...I’m bringing my work out to the public...and show people outside the classroom because I tend to hide a little bit."

Teacher (B) also participated in peer coaching for 2 years but was not going to continue with the model. Teacher (B) felt that peer coaching was a good experience, but is not continuing because of the demands of teaching three block periods of instruction and the amount of paperwork involved.

Teacher (C) decided to continue because she "...had
help on specific issues." She also reported that she had implemented ideas gained from observing her partner's classes. Teacher (C) believed that the brainstorming between the partners was helpful.

Teacher (D) reported that peer coaching was rewarding "...in terms of camaraderie and in terms of content."
Teacher (D) indicated that watching her partner teach and being able solve problems with her partner was more constructive than the traditional model.

Teacher (E) indicated that she will continue because she believes that the peer coaching model is beneficial for her. She also reported that peer coaching was "...a very relaxed situation."

Teacher (F) indicated that she was continuing with peer coaching but also believed in a balance of models. She reported that she may return to the traditional model for a year rather than "...do peer coaching for the rest of my career."

Teacher (G) had previously indicated that she would continue with the peer coaching model of evaluation. She responded to this question by relating how she and her partner were very different. Teacher (G) felt that both partners benefited from those differences. Teacher (G) felt that she would get "...bogged down in details" that would
keep her from holding "...good classroom discussions." In return, Teacher (G) reported that she helped organized her partner.

Teacher (H) indicated that he would continue with peer coaching because he also felt that peer coaching was effective. "It’s changed the way I think. I’ve gotten a lot of positive feedback, and I enjoy the feedback from it."

Teacher (I) indicated that she was very interested in switching to portfolio assessment as an alternative model of teacher evaluation. She reported that she decided to continue with peer coaching because of her partner. "But I continued because I like working with this person, and it’s helped me."

Teacher (J) who had previously reported some of the disappointment with his partner decided to continue with the peer coaching model because of the benefit of observing another teacher. "And I believe that peer coaching does allow you to get to see other teachers in their environment so it is probably more beneficial than portfolio assessment which is another choice we have."

Teacher (K) reported that she continued with peer coaching because she liked "...being able to get those ideas and motivation from some other areas." Teacher (K) indicated that her partner is from a related field but one
that was outside of her academic discipline. Teacher (K) felt that she would like to select a partner from a discipline that was very different from her discipline.

Teacher (L) indicated that she decided to continue with the peer coaching model. "I want to keep that bond with my peer coaching partner, and we're learning new things." Teacher (L) also discussed at length how she was continuing with the model even though peer coaching entailed more time and work.

Summary. The responses to the sixth question are organized in a matrix of teachers responses by interview question and major theme in Table 30 (see Appendix I). The major themes are listed under the headings for all of the dependent variables. Those responses will also be reported in a summary matrix of the responses to all six interview questions in Table 31 (see Appendix I).

The majority of the respondents indicated that they were continuing to participate in the peer coaching model of teacher evaluation. Two of the respondents indicated that they had participated in peer coaching for 2 years but had opted out of the model for this current school year. One teacher had decided to participate in portfolio assessment. The other teacher had decided to return to the traditional model of teacher evaluation because of the
amount of time and work required for peer coaching. Three teachers indicated that they were initially undecided about continuing, but then continued with peer coaching. All three of those teachers saw benefit in observing and interacting with other teachers. Two of the three teachers also reported that the bond with their partner influenced their decision to continue with peer coaching. The major themes expressed by the respondents surrounded the following issues: (a) bonding with the peer coaching partner, (b) the importance of observing other teachers, (c) the relevance of feedback for another teacher, (d) the ability to brainstorm and solve problems, and (e) the less threatening relationship in peer coaching.

Examination of Trust in Evaluation

The issue of trust in evaluation was one of the district's stated reasons for implementing peer coaching as an alternative evaluation model. The research question examines whether the removal of the perceived threat that the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor could be used in a negative manner builds greater trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction. The district's application for an equivalency waiver indicated that under the traditional model of
teacher evaluation, "it is less likely that risks will be taken by teachers to expand competence in these new areas. A peer coaching model would appear more appropriate in the collegial atmosphere which is being fostered through shared decision making." The waiver further indicated that "the equivalency is necessary to remove the threat of the results of traditional observation/evaluation being utilized in a negative manner. Instead, staff members will team with a partner and the focus for improved instruction and risk taking will be peer coaching."

The district's reasoning, as stated in the equivalency waiver application, was consistent with the findings of Egelson (1994). Issues surrounding the dissatisfaction of teachers with the traditional teacher evaluation model included questions about the supervisor's expertise in the subject area, the infrequency and artificial nature of classroom observations, and the perception that traditional evaluation does little to improve instruction. Conversely, Egelson (1994) reported that teachers supported peer coaching because peer coaching was less stressful and less intimidating, afforded greater control and empowerment, and facilitated greater reflection on the teaching process and methodology.

This researcher examined the issue of trust by
conducting an inductive analysis of the taped transcription of the teacher responses to the six interview questions. The research also believed that concern for trust in evaluation as expressed by the district had a theoretical basis as reported in the research literature.

The researcher suggests that the dynamics that exist through participation in a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation entail an interaction among collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. The direction for instructional change appears to be closely related to the instructional areas presented in the peer coaching classes. The relationship among the three variables is illustrated in Figure 1.
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**Figure 1.** The inter-related dynamics of peer coaching
The inductive, cross-interview analyses of the interview questions supported the interconnection among the three dependent variables. There were several times during the analyses of the questions that the researcher had to go back to check the questions to which the respondents were answering because similar, common themes would emerge and appear in the responses to each of the six questions.

An examination of the research question entails an analysis of each component of the research question: (a) Is there a perceived threat that the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor could be used in a negative manner, (b) Will the removal of that perceived threat build greater trust in evaluation, and (c) Will greater trust result in evaluation as a means of improving instruction?

One of the major themes which emerged from the responses of the 12 teachers to the interview questions addressed the issue of "perceived threat that the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor could be used in a negative manner." The respondents indicated that the peer coaching model was less intimidating and less threatening. Although most teachers did not speak negatively of their supervisors and seemed to believe that
their supervisors wanted to assist them, the respondents voiced a concern that there could be a connection between how they were perceived as a result of classroom observations and how those perceptions would effect issues like scheduling, duties, or other aspects of their school lives.

There were major themes that emerged from the responses that addressed the issue of whether "the removal of that perceived threat would build greater trust in evaluation." The responses seemed to indicate that the participants were more relaxed when working with a peer, less defensive, and more open to suggestions. The respondents expressed a common theme that peer coaching was a more valid form of evaluation for them. The respondents perceived their peers as having more credibility because they were also involved in daily teaching. The respondents also indicated that they perceived their peers as wanting to help and as being more confidential. The respondents reported that although they wanted to perform professionally in front of their peers, they were less worried about making mistakes or having those mistakes held against them. The major theme regarding trust expressed throughout the questions was the importance of selecting one's own peer coaching partner. The data from the
interviews also seemed to support the role of trust in building relationships between the partners and the importance of those relationships in reducing isolation.

There were major themes that emerged from the responses that addressed the issue of whether "greater trust in evaluation would serve as a means of improving instruction." Those themes surrounded the issues of focusing on specific areas of instructional change, the ability to exchange ideas and learn from each other, and an overall focus on improving instruction. The major themes for selecting peer coaching surrounded the issues of control, reduction of isolation, and the benefits of working with a peer in a more comfortable, less threatening environment. The major themes for continuing with the peer coaching model surrounded the issues of continuing the relationship with the partners and the ability to problem solve and get specific feedback.

Summary

The researcher would suggest, based on the data from the study, that there appears to be strong support for the premise that the removal of the perceived threat of the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor used in a negative manner builds trust in evaluation as a
means of improving instruction. The researcher would also suggest that there is a strong interconnection among collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. Given the results of this inductive analysis for a small sample and the theoretical basis in the literature, the researcher would also suggest that these results may generalize to other populations.

**Summary of Conclusions**

The purpose of this section will be to summarize and synthesize the conclusions and summaries presented in this chapter for the survey phase of the study and for the interview phase of the study. The summary will entail a discussion of the three dependent variables of the study, collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. The summary will also include conclusions that were derived from the supplemental analyses.

**Collegiality**

The statistical analysis for the dimension of collegiality as measured by the Collegiality Index supports rejection of the null hypothesis. The researcher suggests that there is a strong association between the dependent variable, collegiality, and participation in peer coaching
for more than 1 year. The research found the statistical difference between the traditional group and the group that had participated in peer coaching for 2 or 3 years to be interesting in light of the many reform movements implemented at the regional high school where the study was conducted. The research did not expect to find a significant difference for this particular treatment, peer coaching, given the investment in collaborative programs such as shared decision making and the quality education reform taking place. The relationship between the treatment and collegiality was supported by the qualitative interviews. The respondents consistently reported the importance of the bonds and relationship between the partners and how those bonds facilitated a specific focus on the improvement of instruction.

Although the results of the Spearman’s Rho indicated a strong relationship between the Department Community Index and the Collegiality Index, the statistical analysis for the dimension of collegiality as measured by the Department Community Index did not support rejection of the null hypothesis. The researcher had suspected that the model of evaluation may form an additional boundary within the school community. The data did not support that hypothesis. The themes derived from the interview questions were
consistent with the statistical findings. The respondents reported that collegiality was developed between the peer coaching partners. The respondents did not report any generalization of collegiality to other teaching staff members with the exception of one teacher who described bonds formed among the members of the peer coaching class.

**Change in Instructional Practice**

The statistical analyses for the two dimensions of change in instructional practice, student-directed activities and new range of assessment" indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained. The supplemental analyses for these same dependent variables for those teachers who participated in the traditional model of teacher evaluation for 3 years and those teachers who participated in peer coaching for 1 year provided some surprising and contradictory results. The one-way ANOVA's were statistically significant for student-directed activity (p = .039) and for the first measure of new range of assessment (p = .048). The results of the Spearman’s Rho suggest a strong relationship between the two variables that represented change in instructional practices in this study, student directed activity and new range of assessment.
The researcher suggests that the significant results for the variable of change in instructional practice in favor of the group that participated in peer coaching for 1 year only could be the result of the composition of those who first participated in peer coaching as opposed to any effect by the treatment, peer coaching. The results of the qualitative interviews suggest that there is a strong association with participation in peer coaching and change in instructional practice. Smylie (1988) also reported that greater collegiality gave rise to greater experimentation by teachers. The researcher suggests that the disconnect between the statistical results and the qualitative results could be due to the instructional areas targeted in the peer coaching classes. The respondents reported focusing on specific instructional change or strategies agreed to by the peer coaching partners. A closer examination of those instructional areas reveals that the specific areas reported by the respondents were not directly associated with the outcomes of student-directed activity or new range of assessment reported in the Equivalency Waiver. The researcher suggests that change in instruction practice did occur, but that change was directly linked to the strategies suggested in the peer coaching class. A closer alignment with the strategies presented in the peer
coaching classes and the outcomes predicted in the waiver may have produced some very different results.

**Trust in Evaluation**

The data gathered from the qualitative interviews would suggest that there may be strong support for the premise that the removal of the perceived threat of the results of traditional evaluation by a certified supervisor builds trust in evaluation as a means of improving instruction. The data also suggest that a strong interconnection among collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation is part of the dynamics of the peer coaching model of evaluation. Given the results of this inductive analysis for a small sample and the theoretical basis in the literature, the researcher would suggest that these results may generalize to other populations.

**Other Findings**

The data obtained through the qualitative interviews also suggest that the respondents may have opted for peer coaching because they believed that peer coaching gave them control over the evaluation process, reduced isolation, was less threatening, and provided the benefit of working with
and observing other teachers. The ability to observe other teachers and work with them to focus on specific areas of improvement appears to be a compelling reason for the respondents' decisions to participate in peer coaching. The ability to select both the method of evaluation and one's peer coaching partner and the ability to participate in peer coaching as an alternative model as opposed to an additional method appeared to be essential for successful implementation of the peer coaching model of teacher evaluation. The majority of teachers from the group that participated in peer coaching for 1 year indicated that the issue of time for paperwork, conferencing, and observations was the major reason for not continuing in the peer coaching model.

An analysis of the background information of those 152 who completed the surveys indicated that gender may also be a variable associated with continued participation in peer coaching. Gender may be a factor associated with the treatment of peer coaching. There were a disproportionate number of female teachers in the 2 or 3 year peer coaching group.

Recommendations

Recommendations for further research are presented for
consideration as a result of this study:

1. This study could be replicated in those districts that have been granted similar waivers by the State Department of Education.

2. This study could be replicated at the elementary and middle school levels to determine the effect of level of instruction on peer coaching.

3. A more comprehensive study with a larger sample size could be conducted or a more in-depth qualitative study could be conducted with another small sample.

4. A longitudinal study could be conducted in the same regional high school district where this study was conducted to determine if the association with time spent in peer coaching and level of collegiality strengthens or diminishes.

5. The current study could be replicated if the district were to align more closely the focus of the peer coaching classes with the stated purposes of the waiver. The study could employ either the same measures for student-directed activity and new range of assessment or employ the scales for these variables when they are published by the Center for Research on the Context of Teaching at Stanford University (CRC). Additional measures could be employed to investigate those dependent variables
not addressed in this study, that is, increased use of interdisciplinary activities and incorporation of new technologies.

6. A qualitative study could be conducted to explore the profiles of those who select traditional evaluation or peer coaching evaluation to determine other variables associated with those models of teacher evaluation.

7. A quantitative study could be conducted to explore the personal characteristics of those who select traditional evaluation versus those who select peer coaching. A similar quantitative study could analyze the personal characteristics of those who continue in peer coaching versus those who opt out of peer coaching.

8. Further research could examine the role of gender and the selection of peer coaching to determine if gender is a variable associated with increased collegiality.

9. A study could be designed to examine why those teachers who participated in peer coaching for 1 year exhibited levels of student-directed activity and new range of assessment that were significantly higher than the traditional group.

10. A similar study could be conducted to investigate the relationship between the portfolio model of teacher evaluation and the dependent variables of this study.
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Appendix A

Letters to the Superintendent and Teachers
October, 1998
2 Smoke Run Road
Pittstown, NJ 08867

Dear (S) Name:

I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University who is currently employed as the superintendent of the Delaware Township School District. My dissertation topic is The Effect of a Peer Coaching Model of Teacher Evaluation Used in Place of the Traditional Model of Teacher Evaluation. This study will examine the effects of the model of teacher evaluation on collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. Your school district is the only high school district in the state of New Jersey to have a waiver to use peer coaching as an alternative to evaluation by a certified supervisor.

I am requesting permission to conduct my study in your high school. The study will entail the administration of a survey to all teachers at the end of a district staff meeting. It should take approximately 15 minutes to complete the survey. This survey instrument is composed of sections of the Summary of CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) developed by the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching (CRC) at Stanford University. This instrument has been reproduced and used with the permission of the CRC. The study will also entail conducting semi-structured interviews with teachers who have participated in peer coaching for more than one year and who volunteer to be interviewed. The interviewees will answering a series of five open ended questions related to peer coaching that have been approved by my dissertation committee.

Participation in both the survey and the interview is strictly voluntary. The results will be coded to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of the teaching staff. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you and your staff upon its completion. The anonymity of the district will also be protected unless you give permission to release the name of the district.

Sincerely,

Bob Connelly
908-735-4479
robertjc@ptdprolog.net

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB). The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject’s privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services, 973-275-2974.
November 1998
2 Smoke Run Road
Pittstown, NJ 08867

Dear Teacher:

I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I am currently employed as the superintendent of the Delaware Township School District. My dissertation topic is The Effect of a Peer Coaching Model of Teacher Evaluation Used in Place of the Traditional Model of Teacher Evaluation. This study will examine the effects of the model of teacher evaluation on collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. Your school district is the only district in the state of New Jersey to have a waiver to use peer coaching as an alternative to evaluation by a certified supervisor.

This survey instrument is composed of sections of the Summary of CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) developed by the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching (CRC) at Stanford University. This instrument has been reproduced and used with the permission of the CRC.

Thank you for completing this survey. Your support of my study is truly appreciated. Remember your participation is strictly voluntary and the results will be coded to protect your anonymity. At the end of the meeting, the surveys will be placed in sealed envelopes and given to an independent third party so the codes will remain anonymous.

It should only take approximately 15 minutes to respond to the 47 questions. Please answer the questions openly and honestly.

Sincerely,
Bob Connelly
908-735-4479
robertjc@ptdprolog.net

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB). The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject’s privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services, 973-275-2974.
Completion and return of the questionnaire indicates that the respondent understands the research and agrees to participate in the study.
November 1998  
2 Smoke Run Road  
Pittstown, NJ 08867

Dear Interviewee:

I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I am currently employed as the superintendent of the Delaware Township School District. My dissertation topic is The Effect of a Peer Coaching Model of Teacher Evaluation Used in Place of the Traditional Model of Teacher Evaluation. This study will examine the effects of the model of teacher evaluation on collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation. Your school district is the only district in the state of New Jersey to have a waiver to use peer coaching as an alternative to evaluation by a certified supervisor.

Thank you for participating in this interview. Your support of my study is truly appreciated. Remember your participation is strictly voluntary and the results of the interview will be coded to protect your anonymity. Please read the following statements before signing:

Bob Connelly, the researcher, has discussed the nature of the peer coaching study and has requested that teachers who have participated in the peer coaching model volunteer to participate in the interview.

I have been told the researcher has taken a neutral stance toward the peer coaching study and is soliciting the most accurate perspective possible that may include both positive and negative indicators.

I am aware that any field notes or audio tapes associated with my participation will be coded to protect my anonymity. In addition, recordings will be destroyed following interview transcription.

I realize that I may withdraw my consent for participation in this study at any time without prejudice.

I have been provided with the name, address, e-mail, and telephone number of the researcher so that I may contact him at any time should I have any questions about my participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Bob Connelly  
908-735-4479  
robertjo@ptdprolog.net

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB). The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject’s privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services, 973-275-2974.

Signature of the Participant

Date________
Appendix B

Teacher Survey Instrument
Teacher Survey Instrument

Name: __________________________________________________________
Code: ________________________

1. Please indicate the number of classes you currently teach in the following subject areas. WRITE IN NUMBER. (If you teach 3 English classes, write "3" on the line next to English; if you teach in more than one subject area, write in the number of classes you are teaching in each subject.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/Family/Home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts (except Music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies, History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indicate the number of the classes that you teach according to the students’ grade level. Use "grade mixed" when a class includes more than one grade level. WRITE IN NUMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th Graders</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th Graders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Graders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade-mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Graders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In what year did you begin your first regular teaching job at the elementary or secondary level? WRITE IN DATE 19___

4. What is the total number of years that you have been teaching including this current school year? _________
5. How many years have you taught in this school? ___ years

6. What is your gender? Male____ Female____

7. Which evaluation model did you select for the following years? PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traditional by a Supervisor</th>
<th>Peer Coaching</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If you selected peer coaching, did you participate in the peer coaching class through the district’s Academy? Yes____ No____

9. If you participated in peer coaching and opted to return to the traditional model of evaluation, please comment on your reasons for not continuing in the peer coaching model:

10. If you participated in peer coaching, would you be willing to volunteer to be interviewed by the researcher? The results of the interview would also be strictly confidential. Yes____ No____

If you answered “yes”, please list either your e-mail address or telephone number where you can be reached:

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SURVEY QUESTIONS THAT BEGIN ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
1. Using the scale provided, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. You can count on most staff members to help out anywhere, anytime—even though it may not be part of their official assignment.

b. Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas.

c. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members.

d. Staff members maintain high standards.

e. This school seems like a big family, everyone is so close and cordial.

2. To what extent does each of the following statements describe relationships among the teachers in your primary subject area in this school? (This study will examine differences in model of evaluation and will not compare the results between and among departments.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. We share ideas about teaching openly.

b. We have very different ideas about what we should emphasize in the curriculum.
c. It is common for us to share samples of work done by our students.  
   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

d. This subject area faculty falls into quite different groups or cliques.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

e. We regularly meet to discuss particular common problems and challenges we are facing in the classroom.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

f. It would be inappropriate to offer help to a colleague who hasn’t requested it.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

g. We often work together to develop teaching materials or activities for particular classes.  

h. We have little idea of each other’s teaching goals and classroom practices.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

i. There is little disagreement about what should be taught in our subject area.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

j. Colleagues are generally protective of instructional materials or activities they’ve developed.  

k. Relations among us are cordial and caring.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

l. We often seek each other’s advice about professional issues and problems.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 |
m. There is a lot of disagreement among us about how to teach the subject.

n. We share views of students and how to relate to them.

o. Most take a "hands off" attitude toward each other's careers.

p. We admire one another's teaching on the whole.

3. Please review the following list of possible student lesson activities. About how much time, if any, do your students do each of the following during class time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Work individually on exercises, worksheets, or workbooks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Work in groups on in-class assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work on a project that requires data collection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Review and discuss the work of other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Work on group investigations that extend for several days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Explain their reasoning to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

1  2  3  4  5

1 or 2 times 1 or 2 times A few times per semester per month per week per day Every...
g. Listen to or observe teacher presentations.  

h. Answer factual questions in a whole class setting.  
i. Work on an individual project that takes several days.  
j. Discuss ideas for a sustained period.  
k. Reflect on their work and set future learning goals.  

4. How important are each of the following kinds of assessments for you in judging how well students are learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Multiple-choice tests</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Essay tests</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Student work on open-ended problems/projects.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Portfolio of student work.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Products of group projects</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Standardized test results.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Work samples</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How much emphasis do you place on each of the following criteria in assessing student progress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Emphasis</th>
<th>Heavy Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The student showed increased ability to:

a. Recall factual information

b. Ask probing questions about subject matter.

c. Apply what he/she has learned to new questions, situations, and subjects.

d. Reflect on his/her progress.

e. Master basic skills

f. Express his/her own ideas about subject matter.

g. Work with speed and accuracy.

h. Provide constructive feedback to other students.

Appendix C

Permission to Use Survey Scales and Items
2 Smoke Run Road
Pittstown, NJ 08867
October 13, 1998

Center for Research on the Context of Teaching
School of Education, CERAS Building
520 Galves Mall
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-3084

Dear Dr. Talbert:

I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University who is also currently employed as the superintendent of the Delaware Township School District.

My dissertation topic is The Effect of a Peer Coaching Model of Teacher Evaluation Used in Place of the Traditional Model of Teacher Evaluation. This study will examine the effects of the model of teacher evaluation on collegiality, change in instructional practice, and trust in evaluation.

I am requesting permission to use the indices for collegiality and department community from the Summary of CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991). The collegiality index is cited in “Boundaries of Teachers’ Professional Communities in US High Schools” and in “What Matters Most in Teachers’ Workplace Context.” The department community index is cited in “Teacher Professionalism in Local School Contexts.”

I am also requesting permission to use items selected from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-98). In particular, I wish to use items 13, 14, and 15 as I believe those items are associated with “student-directed instruction and a new range of assessments” that the district under study is attempting to promote through a peer coaching model of teacher evaluation. In both instances, I will acknowledge through appropriate citations that the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching at Stanford University (CRC) was the source of the items and that those items were used with the permission of the CRC.

In closing, I again thank you for your kindness and assistance. You have been most helpful. I will most assuredly share the results of the study with you.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Connelly
October 20, 1998

2 Smoke Run Road
Pittstown, NJ 08867

Dear Mr. Connelly,

Dr. Talbert asked that I write to you granting permission for you to use the two indices from CRC research study Teacher Surveys from the Summary of CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) for which you asked: the collegiality index and the department community index. She also grants permission for you to use items #13, 14, and 15 from the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Questionnaire (1997-1998).

In your citations acknowledging the source, please use our current Center name—Center for Research on the Context of Teaching (CRC) at Stanford University.

We wish you the best of luck in your dissertation research, and look forward to hearing the results of your study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Julie Cummer
CRC Project Administrator
Appendix D

Teacher Interview Questions
Teacher Interview Questions

1. How would you describe your experiences with peer coaching to someone who has never participated in peer coaching?

2. What do you think about the issue of trust in teacher evaluation conducted by a peer?

3. Based on your participation in peer coaching, how would you characterize your relationships with other teachers?

4. Based on your experience, how would you evaluate peer coaching as a model for improving instruction?

5. What attracted you to peer coaching?

6. Why have you continued to participate in this model of teacher evaluation?
Appendix E

Permission to Conduct Study
(Regional High School Name)

Mr. Robert J. Connelly
2 Smoke Run Road
Pittstown, NJ 08867

Dear Bob:
I am happy to know that you are at the point in your doctoral studies where you will be able to collect data about peer coaching and collegiality. I am aware that you have been working with (Assistant Superintendent’s Name) and (Teacher Association President’s Name) to collect data from the (District’s Name) staff. I know that your survey instrument composed of sections of the Summary of CRC Teacher Survey Data (1991) and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Teacher Survey (1997-1998) had been reviewed by (Assistant Superintendent’s Name) and (Teacher Association President’s Name).

It is my pleasure to give you permission to conduct the data gathering portion of your study at our regular faculty meeting on Monday, November 16, 1998. I believe that the work that you are doing will be extremely helpful to the (District’s Name). My best wishes as you continue to work toward completion of your dissertation and your doctoral program.

Sincerely,
(Superintendent’s Name)

cc: (Assistant Superintendent’s Name)
     (Teacher Association President’s Name)
Appendix F

Statistical Analysis Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9

Research Questions
Table 4

ANOVA for Collegiality - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.068</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>50.476</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.476</td>
<td>3.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.786</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>949.510</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.736</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>999.986</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

ANOVA for Department Community Index - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.182</td>
<td>12.554</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>73.191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.191</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55.250</td>
<td>7.570</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8323.795</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>118.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53.986</td>
<td>10.875</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8396.986</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

ANOVA for Student Directed Activities - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.205</td>
<td>7.654</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>37.178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.178</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.679</td>
<td>7.364</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3983.266</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56.904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.778</td>
<td>7.525</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4020.444</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment 1 - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.955</td>
<td>4.291</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>28.716</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.716</td>
<td>1.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.250</td>
<td>4.648</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1375.159</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.458</td>
<td>4.447</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1403.875</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment 2 - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.682</td>
<td>2.971</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.036</td>
<td>4.773</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>992.510</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26.819</td>
<td>3.747</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>996.653</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment Total - Traditional (0) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.636</td>
<td>6.470</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>46.548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.548</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52.286</td>
<td>8.623</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3807.896</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54.399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51.278</td>
<td>7.368</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3854.444</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Statistical Analysis Tables 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20

Supplemental Data
Table 11

ANOVA for Student Directed Activities - Traditional (0) and Peer (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.205</td>
<td>7.654</td>
<td>264.926</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.926</td>
<td>4.427</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.231</td>
<td>7.876</td>
<td>4069.774</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36.700</td>
<td>7.926</td>
<td>4334.700</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment 1 - Traditional (0) and Peer (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.955</td>
<td>4.291</td>
<td>73.616</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.616</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.077</td>
<td>4.195</td>
<td>1231.755</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24.743</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>1305.371</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment 2 - Traditional (0) and Peer (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.682</td>
<td>2.971</td>
<td>25.180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.180</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.923</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>775.392</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.143</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>800.571</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment Total - Traditional (0) and Peer (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.636</td>
<td>6.470</td>
<td>184.904</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184.904</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54.000</td>
<td>7.521</td>
<td>3214.182</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.886</td>
<td>7.019</td>
<td>3399.086</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

ANOVA for Student Directed Activities - Traditional (0) and Peer (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.205</td>
<td>7.654</td>
<td>177.120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177.120</td>
<td>3.025</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.907</td>
<td>7.651</td>
<td>5621.696</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58.559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36.694</td>
<td>7.732</td>
<td>5798.816</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment 1 - Traditional (0) and Peer (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.955</td>
<td>4.291</td>
<td>69.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.541</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.648</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>1824.224</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.888</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td>1893.765</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment Total - Traditional (0) and Peer (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.636</td>
<td>6.470</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148.485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148.485</td>
<td>2.709</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.111</td>
<td>8.081</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5261.515</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52.000</td>
<td>7.468</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5410.000</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

ANOVA for Collegiality Index - Traditional (0), Peer (1) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.068</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.452</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.726</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.308</td>
<td>4.602</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1479.048</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.786</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568.500</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.357</td>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

ANOVA for Student Directed Activities - Traditional (0), Peer (1) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.205</td>
<td>7.654</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264.935</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132.467</td>
<td>2.274</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.231</td>
<td>7.876</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5533.882</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>58.251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.679</td>
<td>7.364</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5798.816</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36.694</td>
<td>7.732</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

ANOVA for New Range of Assessment 1 - Traditional (0), Peer (1) and Peer (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.955</td>
<td>4.291</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.380</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.077</td>
<td>4.195</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.250</td>
<td>4.648</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1893.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.888</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Statistical Analysis Tables 22, 23

Background Data
Table 22

Respondents by Years Teaching and Evaluation Model Selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Model of Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Peer (1)</td>
<td>Peer (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 20 yrs.</td>
<td>27 (61.4)</td>
<td>21 (80.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 33 yrs.</td>
<td>17 (38.6)</td>
<td>5 (19.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (100.0)</td>
<td>26 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

Respondents by Gender and Evaluation Model Selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Model of Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Peer (1)</td>
<td>Peer (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19 (43.2)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25 (56.8)</td>
<td>15 (57.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (100.0)</td>
<td>26 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Analysis Tables 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31

Interview Questions
Table 25

Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent Variables—Question One: “How would you describe your experiences to someone who have never participated in peer coaching?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange ideas/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and discuss</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Isolation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Instructional Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific feedback/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on one area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less threatening/more</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of selecting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one's partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More valid process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X- Evident
Table 26

**Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent Variables:** Question Two: "What do you think about the issue of trust in teacher evaluation conducted by a peer?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegiality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange ideas/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and discuss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Instructional Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific feedback/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on one area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less threatening/more open</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of selecting one's partner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More valid process</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X - Evident
Table 27

Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent Variables - Question Three: "Based on your participation in peer coaching, how would you characterize your relationship with other teachers?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegiality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange ideas/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds relationship with partner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less threatening/more open</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not build other relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X- Evident
Table 28

Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent Variables - Question Four: "Based on your experience, how would you evaluate peer coaching as a model for improving instruction?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange ideas/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and discuss</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Instructional Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific feedback/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on one area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less threatening/more open</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of selecting one's partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More valid process</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X - Evident
Table 29

Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent Variables - Question Five: “What attracted you to peer coaching?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Isolation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More valid process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time demands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted a change from</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X- Evident
Table 30

Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent Variables- Question Six: "Why have you continued to participate in this model of teacher evaluation?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange ideas/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds relationship with partner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and discuss with other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Instructional Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific feedback/ focus on one area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less threatening/more open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X- Evident
Table 31

Matrix of Teacher Responses by Theme and Dependent

**Variables- Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegiality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange ideas/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and discuss</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Instructional Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific feedback/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on one area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less threatening/more open</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of selecting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one's partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More valid process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other issues

| Time demands        | X | X | X |   |   |   |
| More interdisciplinary|   |   |   |   |   | X |
| Wanted a change     | X | X | X | X | X |   |
| Did not build other | X |   |   |   |   |   |
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